

appeared in print, its readers were thrown into confusion, the editor-in-chief into hysterical rage, and the skillful editorial writer out of his job. For the blunder had resulted in enfoldng a very attractive young woman "in the arms of the Mincio." We recall this old yarn of New York's "Newspaper Row" about the New York Times, because a recent editorial in the Times reads as if the ghost of the writer who participated in getting that young woman placed affectionately "in the arms" of an Italian river had returned to comment upon the British budget. At any rate the budget editorial in the Times of May 26 might have been written as two editorials, either by a Liberal and a Tory, or by an ambidextrous writer with Liberal sympathies in one cerebral hemisphere and Tory sympathies in the other, and have got mixed in the distribution of "copy." It has all the absurd flavor of the old Times article on the young woman "in the arms of the Mincio."

+ +

The Futile Fundamental Argument Against Land Value Taxation.

The weakness of the Tory opposition to the land value taxes proposed in the British budget is well illustrated—aye, it is demonstrated—by the editorial summing up in the London Times (May 13th) of Harold Cox's "damaging indictment," as the Times calls it. According to the Times, Mr. Cox "demonstrated in close-packed and incontrovertible argument that the alleged difference between land and other forms of property" has no substantial existence, because land "is offered in the same way as other property in the market, and is acquired in the same way by the investor, small or large." That truth, says the Times, and it calls it a "fundamental" truth, "lies at the root of the whole question, and upsets all the distinctions" between property in land and property in the products of human industry. This must be gratifying to Lloyd-George. He would be a captious man if he were not pleased with the assurance from such irreproachable authority that the best argument the Tories can make against land value taxes, that their fundamental principle for considering property in what Nature alone supplies as identical with property in what labor only can furnish, property in natural sources and sites with property in artificial products, is that which the Times puts forward when it argues that both are offered and acquired "in the same way." Why, in our country, this was once also true of property in men. Under our slavery regime, Negroes were

"offered in the same way as other property in the market," and were "acquired in the same way by the investor, small or large"—great planter, thrifty workingman, or poor widow. Do the British defenders of landlordism, Mr. Cox included, believe that this "fundamental truth" of the market "upsets all the distinctions" between property in slaves and property in houses or wheelbarrows? Doesn't the fact that slaves are men and not industrial products, count for something "at the root" of that question? And doesn't the fact that the planet is the natural abiding place, the source of supply and the workshop for all sorts and conditions of men, and not an industrial product of any—doesn't this count for something "at the root of the whole question" which Lloyd-George has raised in the British Parliament? Fundamental differences such as these cannot be obliterated by parallelisms of the market place.

+ + +

THE PERSECUTION OF EMMA GOLDMAN.

We are constrained again to ask (p. 508) the motive for the persecution by the police in so many places of Emma Goldman.

Not only is she persecuted to the extent of deprivation of unquestionable rights under American law, but peaceable and law abiding persons who wish to hear her speak and have the right under American law to hear her speak, are treated as rioters and dispersed without a shadow of necessity or right.

When a hall is engaged for her to speak in, the owner is threatened, lawlessly threatened, until he breaks his contract. Should he withstand this pressure, his hall is invaded by anarchistic policemen who disperse the peaceable audience with threats of violence.

+

That is what happened in Lexington hall, New York, a few days ago. The facts reported at the time (p. 516) have since been more definitely presented in a letter to Mayor McClellan from Alden Freeman, a well known and respected man both in New York and the New Jersey suburb of East Orange.

Mr. Freeman, who had twice before heard Miss Goldman in New York, and hadn't, as he explains, the slightest premonition or thought of the experience before him, went to hear her Lexington hall lecture on the Modern Drama on a Sunday morning two weeks ago. He describes himself as "a law-abiding citizen who has always believed

that police officers were maintained by the whole body of citizens to uphold our rights and add to our comfort and to promote the peace." With recollections of previous lectures by Miss Goldman, he "was anticipating an intellectual treat," for he is interested in dramatic literature; but after what happened he felt as if he "had made a journey to Russia." Here is his experience:

Miss Goldman had rented the hall and had a contract for it. Just as she was about to begin to speak, four police officers came in and notified the hallkeeper that if Miss Goldman was allowed to speak he and his wife and children would be arrested. The hallkeeper replied that Miss Goldman had a contract for the hall, and therefore he was powerless to do anything. Thereupon the police said to the frightened hallkeeper that he and his family must come to the station. Then the hallkeeper notified Miss Goldman that she must not speak. A detective and three uniformed policemen walked up to the platform, telling Miss Goldman that the hallkeeper didn't want her to lecture. Miss Goldman quietly replied that as the hall was hers she would speak, especially since the audience insisted on her speaking by remaining in the hall. The detective and policemen left the place and all was quiet for a few minutes. Suddenly a squad of a dozen policemen rushed into the hall and turned the audience out into the street. Most of the people present were Americans in whose blood the love of freedom of speech and assembly had been bred. It was probably their first experience, and much indignation and protest were aroused. They could not help but feel that free speech is a farce, and that the American police can exercise more arbitrary authority than is conceivable in monarchical countries.



The influences which are making these precedents for a Russianistic suppression of free speech in the United States, with Miss Goldman as the horrible example, apparently spring from sources farther back and higher up than the police.

One indication among many of less recent date is a letter which appeared in the Newark (N. J.) Evening News of May 26th. It was from the public prosecutor of Essex county, in which Newark lies, and referred to an arrangement Mr. Freeman had made to have Miss Goldman deliver her lecture on the Modern Drama at his home town of East Orange. This prosecutor addressed the chief of police of East Orange, who thereupon communicated with the owner of the hall and he canceled his contract. The letter contained a threat to prosecute him if Miss Goldman preached "her dangerous and forbidden doctrines," her "peculiar and obnoxious doctrines," upon his premises.

Some notion of the influences back of this assault upon the American right (possibly it is not

a New Jersey right, but it certainly is American) to discuss doctrines which are "peculiar and obnoxious," may be had from this prosecutor's explanation to the Newark News reporter that he had "sent the letter because he considered the general feeling of unrest among the striking haters of the Oranges a most inopportune time for any inflammatory speeches." Not only does this suggest the prosecutor's animus, but, far more important, it is significant of what speakers on labor subjects may soon expect, wherever there is a "feeling of unrest" among strikers, if these Goldman precedents are allowed without protest to establish themselves as Americanisms.

Indeed the thing reasonably to be expected is already here. Following their policy and methods for the suppression of the Goldman meetings, the police of New York are actually suppressing peaceable meetings of labor strikers. From the New York Call of the 28th, we learn that meetings of a bakers' strike were stopped by the police the night before. It would seem, according to that paper, that—

the police notify the proprietors of the halls where meetings are to be held, and urge them to withdraw consent for such meetings. The proprietor of Lenox Assembly Rooms, 216 2d street, where a meeting was advertised for last night, sent word to the union that the police told him not to allow the meeting to take place on his premises. The proprietor of a hall at 115 Lewis street also sent word that the police warned him not to allow the meeting to take place. Another disappointment that almost led to trouble was at 62 Pitt street, where a crowd assembled in response to an announcement that a meeting would be held. When the time arrived and the crowd gathered the proprietor of the place told them that he was warned by the police not to allow the holding of the meeting.

That there are potent influences behind and above this police repeal of the American policy of open meetings and free speech, with Emma Goldman's meetings for the starting point, with striking bakers for a further step, and with God knows what for the goal, is further evident from the studied indifference of most of the newspapers and the inaction of civil authorities. In the case of the suppression of the Goldman meeting in New York, the orders came apparently from police headquarters. In the subsequent suppression—on the 28th—of a meeting to be addressed by Miss Goldman in Brooklyn, the lawless orders are directly traced to the Chief of Police, for whose action Mayor McClellan must be regarded as responsible unless he repudiates it. This is the Call's report (May 29) of the Brooklyn suppression:

Declaring that he was acting under orders from Commissioner Bingham, Captain Hughes, of the West

163d street station, of Brooklyn, descended upon Liederkranz hall last night with about twenty-five policemen and ten plain clothes men, denounced the proprietor, prohibited the lecture announced by Emma Goldman, closed the hall, and drove away the hundreds of people who came to hear the much-persecuted speaker. It was about 7 o'clock when the little army of police arrived at the hall, which is at the corner of Manhattan avenue and Meserole street, and is one of the largest in the vicinity. The lecture, on "The True Significance of Anarchism," was announced for 8 p. m., and the audience had not yet assembled. The hallkeeper was told that the meeting would not be permitted, and ordered to keep the doors closed. A number of policemen were stationed inside the hall, and the rest cleared the streets, a crowd of about 2,000 people having collected. . . . When interviewed by the reporter of The Call, Captain Hughes refused to give his reasons for preventing the lecture. "I am acting under orders, and cannot discuss this matter with reporters," said the Captain. "Would you have stopped this meeting if the hallkeeper had refused to call it off when you demanded that he do so?" "Yes." "Under what law would you have taken such action? Does not the Constitution guarantee free speech?" "I cannot give you the reasons for this action," said Captain Hughes, "It would be against the rules of the Department for me to do so. I have no choice in this matter. You will have to see some one higher up."

+

What, then, does the Goldman persecution mean? It may not mean that there is any conscious conspiracy afoot for utilizing Miss Goldman's newspaper reputation to break down the bulwarks of free speech in the United States. But its tendency is clearly toward that result.

Two kinds of people are a menace to free speech in this country. One is the kind, such as Miss Goldman has been persistently represented to be, who take advantage of freedom of speech to preach violence; the other is the kind who take advantage of violence preachments to create public sentiment in favor of restrictions upon freedom of speech.

It was through dread of what the latter might accomplish, using the former for their leverage, that Henry George refused to take such a part in behalf of the law-lynched "anarchists" of Chicago as would imply sympathy with the policy of violence which some of them had proclaimed. "One bomb," he said, "exploded under circumstances favorable for the purpose, might create a panic in popular opinion that would enable the privileged classes to throttle free speech on labor subjects for fifty years to come."

That his outlook was right, the persecution of Emma Goldman goes far to prove. Whether justly or unjustly, she has the reputation of a preacher of violence; and that reputation alone,

with nothing to verify it and much to discredit it, has been enough to put the long cherished American principle of free speech in jeopardy.

The appalling thing about the suppression of her meetings is not that they are suppressed, but that public opinion has become so demoralized with fear of Emma Goldman as a bogey that most people are not only willing but anxious to have her meetings suppressed, law or no law. It is appalling because it is prophetic of possibilities in this country of which Russia gives but a hint.

+

So much for the impersonal side of the matter. On the personal side it should be said of Emma Goldman's speeches, of recent years at any rate, that whenever they have not been interfered with, and she has spoken freely, there has been no accusation of violence preaching. Her lecture on "The True Significance of Anarchism," for instance, has elicited the praise of the judicious and peaceable, wherever it has been delivered. A comparison of her speeches as they are reported by fair auditors, with the arbitrary efforts to prevent her speaking, suggests that maybe the real objection to her on the part of anarchistic authorities, is not that she does preach violence but that she does not.

On one occasion, it will be remembered, a soldier of the United States army was sentenced to prison (p. 40) for having, while in uniform, listened to a lecture by Emma Goldman and then publicly shaken her hand with friendly words of approval. He had become a convert to her "peculiar" and "obnoxious" and "dangerous" and "forbidden" doctrines. After many months of imprisonment this convert of Miss Goldman's was pardoned by President Roosevelt. His name was William Buwalda. Mr. Buwalda is still under the spell of those doctrines, so it is said, and here are some of the things they have made him say and one of the things they have led him to do. We quote a recent letter of his to the Secretary of War, in which he enclosed a medal awarded him for faithful army service in the Philippines:

Hudsonville, Mich., April 6, 1909.

Hon. Joseph M. Dickinson, Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.:

Sir:—After thinking the matter over for some time I have decided to send back this trinket to your Department, having no further use for such baubles, and enable you to give it to some one who will appreciate it more than I do.

It speaks to me of faithful service, of duty well done, of friendships inseparable, friendships cemented by dangers and hardships and sufferings shared in

common in camp and in the field. But, sir, it also speaks to me of bloodshed—possibly some of it unavoidably innocent—in defense of loved ones, of homes; homes in many cases but huts of grass, yet cherished none the less.

It speaks of raids and burnings, of many prisoners taken and, like vile beasts, thrown in the foulest prisons. And for what? For fighting for their homes and loved ones.

It speaks to me of General Order 100, with all its attendant horrors and cruelties and sufferings; of a country laid waste with fire and sword; of animals useful to man wantonly killed; of men, women, and children hunted like wild beasts, and all this in the name of Liberty, Humanity, and Civilization.

In short, it speaks to me of War-legalized murder, if you will—upon a weak and defenseless people. We have not even the excuse of self-defense. Yours sincerely,

WILLIAM BUWALDA.

There is authority for the principle—"pernicious," "obnoxious" and "dangerous" authority it was in Palestine somewhat less than two thousand years ago—that "by their fruits ye shall know them." If Mr. Buwalda's sentiments are legitimate fruit of Emma Goldman's doctrines, what shall we say of her doctrines? By that test they are indeed "peculiar," but if they are "obnoxious" and "dangerous," to whom are they so? To all the barbarian gods of war, no doubt, but not to the Prince of Peace.

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

GOVERNMENT BY GROUPS: A TENDENCY.

20 Ridgewood Ave., Newark, N. J.

The question of direct nominations merges itself in a much greater and more significant problem. The American people are in fact already deciding this question of political institutions: Shall power be, as heretofore, delegated to representatives; or shall as much of it as possible remain in the hands of those among whom it originates? The issue is, in other words, between so-called representative and so-called democratic government—an old issue.

✦

With the establishment of the Republic the problem was decided in favor of representative government; now, with the renewal of the question, there is more doubt as to the issue of discussion. In considering the matter today, it is perhaps wise to review the well known reasons for the selection of representation by the builders of the Constitution.

They had before them as models the ultra-democratic regimes of ancient Athens and Rome, where every citizen had a hand in making the laws; nevertheless, a historical factor, a rational factor, and a physical factor determined them in the choice they finally made.

The historical factor was the example of England

and the previous scheme of government in several of the colonies.

The rational factor was a general distrust of a majority rule, with a resultant desire to place in the hands of the "best citizens," good men and true with the respect of their communities, the power which it was deemed inexpedient to leave in the control of the people at large.

The physical factor was even more potent, depending as it did on apparently uncontrollable forces of nature and circumstance. For it was in fact impossible in 1787 that the people should rule directly. How could problems involving imminent dangers of war and peace be proposed to communities so widely separated, with so little intimacy of communication, as the original States? It was a necessity that all powers be temporarily delegated for fixed periods to a central body, able to decide questions at short notice.

In the course of a little over a century the value of all three factors has altered radically. The historical factor, involving the example of another country, is no longer of particular validity, since from the success of the past it may be argued without paradox that American communities have become sufficiently experienced in political affairs to undertake experiments of their own. Democratic feeling has, meanwhile, been triumphing over oligarchic,—the "American Bill of Rights" has been added to the Constitution in the shape of the earlier Amendments, the franchise has been widely extended, the slave has been freed, the ballot has been made secret and purified. Jefferson's ideals are regnant today, curiously admixed to be sure with the forms and opinions of government advocated by Hamilton;—that is to say, it has been found that a democratic movement is best founded on a strong central government! Finally, in respect to the last factor, the United States has ceased to be a somewhat artificial conglomeration of diverse elements; it has become a unified community in absolute fact. For the farthest points of the country are in easy and intimate bonds; railroads, telegraphs, telephones, newspapers and periodicals, the postal system, and many other miracles of human invention have pulled more tautly together New York and Nome at the beginning of the present century than Boston and New York were on the day of the adoption of the Constitution. As a result, the inhabitants of Los Angeles, of Helena, of Santa Fe, of Tallahassee, know as soon as Congress does what needs of legislation the President has urged and conditions demand. The citizen of the pettiest town can be as well informed, if he so wish, concerning the situation of the country as any Representative or Senator. What applies to the central government applies naturally in even greater degree to each single State, to each single community of city, borough, township and village.

Considered from these points of view, representative government is today as supererogatory and obsolete as would be the use of a written communication instead of every "call" on the telephone in a modern business office. Any defense of the plan must be on a new basis. For example, it might well be argued that we need economic and political experts to govern us, in which case we might proceed