

ernments, and that the present government of Russia is barbaric. But the treaty exists, and the President must obey it. If, then, the Russian refugees now held for extradition here are accused of civil offenses within the treaty, the President must extradite them. The only other recourse is to abrogate the treaty through the Senate. But if their offenses are political, it is equally the President's duty to refuse the demand for extradition. And how can there be any reasonable doubt that these offenses are political?

+

Rudowitz in Chicago and Pouren in New York are held for acts committed as agents of a revolutionary government in possession of the territory where those acts were committed at the time of their commission. Not only was Russia then in a state of insurrection throughout her boundaries, but the Baltic provinces, where these acts were committed, had established a revolutionary government, and the acts charged as crimes against these men were the acts of that government. To send them back to Russia is therefore to close the traditional doors of this country as an asylum for political refugees. Every son and daughter of the American Revolution ought to protest against it. Every son and daughter of the German refugees of half a century ago ought to protest against it. Every son and daughter of the Irish who found refuge here when Great Britain was "hanging men and women" in Ireland "for the wearing of the green," ought to protest. Not only should the President be strengthened by popular appeal in any desire he may have to refuse the Czar's demand; the popular appeal should be so insistent that he could not extradite these patriotic Russians if he wanted to.

+

In the Kuklux days of the early '70's a physician of the Kuklux region in South Carolina, Dr. J. Rufus Bratton, was charged with murdering a Negro. He escaped to Canada. Efforts were made to secure his extradition. They did not succeed. He was kidnaped and brought into the country. The British government demanded his return and he was returned. Now, why did the British government refuse to extradite Dr. Bratton, charged with murder as he was, and why did our government acquiesce? Probably the records of the State Department would show. But what other reason could there have been than that the Kuklux region of South Carolina had been put under martial law by suspension of the writ of habeas corpus? The Bratton case and these Russian cases may not

be alike; but in so far as they differ, the difference is in favor of the refugee Russians.

+

One consideration which doubtless weighs against the Russian refugees in American public opinion is the fact that they have had hearings before judicial officers of the United States, and that these officers have decided against them. If the truth about this consideration were generally known, it would arouse the deepest indignation. For while these men were tried by judicial officers, the officers were, for those cases, almost as distinctly employes of the Russian government as were the lawyers retained by Russia. We make no imputations against the officials themselves. They are United States Commissioners, and all are entitled to the benefit of every doubt as to good faith. They may in fact have decided in all good conscience, and we shall assume that they did. But no man can serve two masters. The Russian government selected them out of several whom our statute authorizes to act, and the Russian government pays them. For they are officers whose compensation is in the form of fees. When they act in a Federal case, the Federal government pays them their fees; when they act in extradition cases, the foreign government pays them their fees. If a commissioner selected by the foreign government decides against it in one case, that government may indeed engage him for its next case, but is it likely to? Isn't it more likely to put a Commissioner of independent mind upon its blacklist for employment? We may be considerate of these officials in such circumstances, but the thing itself is scandalous. Our government ought not to permit a foreign government to pick and chose and pay the fees of our officials before whom it goes to prove its cases in extradition proceedings. Should the Secretary of State go behind the judgment of the Commissioners in these cases, and consider all the facts, well and good. But as a substantial basis for Executive action, or for public opinion, the adverse decisions of the Commissioners before whom those Russian refugees were tried are worth as much, in the very nature of such proceedings, as the adverse opinions of the lawyers for Russia—and they are worth no more.

+ +

The Fear of Socialism.

When Leslie M. Shaw, a country banker who was for a time secretary of the treasury, told the alumni of Dickinson College last week that socialism is rampant and alarming, he did not allude

to the Socialist party. The Socialist party having fallen back in its vote, has lost its power of frightening the Leslie M. Shaws. Neither did he allude to scientific socialism. He doesn't know what that kind of socialism means. What does alarm Mr. Shaw is the trend of thought that may be called socialistic in contradistinction to socialist. He fears the tendency toward securing to every worker what the worker earns. This cannot be done, and the Leslie M. Shaws know it cannot be done, without cutting off supplies from men who, like himself, do not earn all that they get. What Mr. Shaw means by socialism, and what he fears and condemns as socialistic, is the growing sentiment, as yet unorganized, of hostility to privilege and in favor of equal opportunity.

✦

His condemnation is of course futile. Socialism is intended as a refuge from plutocracy, and plutocracy is a present evil whose intolerable oppressions are known and felt. Society is resolved to escape from plutocracy by any means that promise betterment. Plutocracy centers wealth and power in the hands of the few, while socialism promises equitable distribution. If Mr. Shaw helps to save the country from plutocracy by any other means he will have done something toward saving it from socialism. But there is no power on earth that can stem the rising tide of socialism in any other way. Escape from the clutches of plutocracy is the goal toward which society irresistibly moves, with increasing momentum, utterly regardless of the fanatic "warnings" of conservatism. If a better way than socialism shall be revealed to the understanding of the majority, then the country will be saved from socialism. But not otherwise.

✦

Were Mr. Shaw asked what his objection to socialism is, he would doubtless answer that, for one principal thing, socialism ignores the difference in individual services in its distribution of rewards. In fact, he prophesies wreck to the nation "whenever we go out to teach that men must succeed equally regardless of aptitude." This means (does it not?) that in Mr. Shaw's opinion the individual should be rewarded in proportion to his services. But that is precisely where the existing regime fails. The prodigious inequities of the present are what is turning men's thoughts to socialism as a means of defense. And which were the better—that the great mass of men and women should consent that the more efficient receive less than their due in order that those of less "aptitude" may live in comfort? or that we continue a

regime in which a few individuals, utterly regardless of service rendered, rob the world of half its product, force the masses into desperate jug-handled competition for what they can get of the other half, and condemn multitudes of despairing men, women and children to abject poverty and frequent starvation?

✦

No man who is not exerting all his powers to free society from the wicked and intolerable conditions of the present is fit to raise his voice against socialism, or any other "ism" that honestly promises amelioration, even remotely. The courage and hope of all economic reformers of whatsoever specific faith rise in exultant response to every shriek of alarm from the camp of plutocracy. Regarding Mr. Shaw's outcry, we can all join with Prof. Ross in saying that "Mr. Shaw seeks only business prosperity," while the men and women he condemns seek "the welfare of the people and the nation." It is the normal man who is becoming socialistic in Mr. Shaw's sense; and, as Prof. Ross observes, "the normal man sees farther than money." So did the Master whom Mr. Shaw professes to serve.

✦ ✦

Workingmen's Clubs.

The suggestion is publicly made by Edward V. Wilbern of Cincinnati that what that city needs is a workingman's club, with all conveniences for comfort and rational pleasure and without religion or politics. To quote him, "a warm place for every honest workingman, a home for the man that would take an interest in public affairs, public economy, and government matters, a place to go to and read books, and one where the women would be welcome." We dare say that this is what every city does need. We should be surer of it, however, if the workingmen themselves were able to establish such a club and did so. But no people need to have clubs made for them. Well-to-do people would regard the suggestion for themselves as an impertinence. While they may take Carnegie libraries for their towns, and even beg for them, they don't want Carnegie clubs for themselves—not until self-respect has been wholly stamped out of them. If rich people would do as much to release the workingman from the fetters of law-made privilege, as they do to make him over according to patterns of their own contriving, we should probably have in every city such clubs as Mr. Wilbern describes. But they would be clubs of men and women, and by and for the men and women, and not clubs of and for improv-