

advocacy of murder, arson, and treason." We trust in all humility that a protest against this reckless purpose may be made without incurring accusations of defending crimes like murder and arson, to say nothing of treason. For the question which President Roosevelt raises is not whether anybody shall be permitted to advocate murder, arson, and treason; it is whether the President of the United States shall decide what constitutes advocacy of murder, arson, and treason, and whether he himself or a clerk in one of his bureaus shall determine guilt or innocence. Shall publishers have their property confiscated without due process of law? Shall the American Bill of Rights be nullified? Shall the American system of personal liberty and equality before the law be ruthlessly overturned by Presidential edicts?

+

Let it be noticed, too, that advocacy of murder and arson, as the President may from time to time understand that offense, is not the only crime for which periodicals are to be suppressed by Presidential ukase. Advocacy of treason, as the President understands that, is also under the ban. He implies that advocacy of the abolition of coercive government, however peaceable the method proposed, is advocacy of treason; but he gives no other notice of the limitations he places upon this offense which he calls "advocacy of treason." So far as is yet known the limitations are only the President's personal will and his arbitrary power. But the safety of American institutions should depend upon no one's personal will and power. It should depend upon Constitutional principles of universal application, alike in their restraint upon the strongest and in their protection of the weakest. It does so depend, unless President Roosevelt's "big stick," like the New York policeman's club, is "bigger than the Constitution." Friends of Mr. Roosevelt might do him a salutary favor and render his party a substantial service by inducing him to read the sedition law episode which culminated in the death of the Federal party something more than a hundred years ago. History has a way of repeating itself.

* *

Postal Revelations.

Edwin C. Madden, formerly Third Assistant Postmaster General, has made an exposure of Secretary Cortelyou's administration of the Postoffice Department which may prove to be the beginning of the end of a great abuse of postal authority. This exposure refers especially to the attack of the

Department upon the newspaper and banking business of E. G. Lewis of St. Louis, upon which we commented (vol. ix, p. 3) at length at the time. Lewis's business was broken up by a "fraud order," ruthlessly and despotically as was evident, and lawlessly as Mr. Madden now distinctly charges. Mr. Madden implies, moreover, that this was not without a certain sort of corrupt purpose, for he shows that the express companies and certain banks had an enormous financial interest in suppressing Lewis's bank. In our comment at the time, we suggested that this "fraud order" system—whereby the Postmaster General makes postal outlaws of any victims he may pitch upon, denying them the use of the mails for any purpose whatsoever, by orders which the courts refuse to investigate—would enable an unscrupulous Administration to repay campaign contributions by destroying the business of persons in competition with contributors. Mr. Madden's exposure indicates that Mr. Lewis may have been the first victim of that novelty in the way of raising campaign funds. It seems that Mr. Madden's resignation was requested because he refused to carry out the programme in the Lewis case.

* *

Who are the Dangerous Anarchists?

In the din of all this outcry about "anarchists," is there not one question which may be overlooked? Who are the dangerous anarchists? May they not be those sordid rich men who murder their hundreds and their thousands in mines and factories and on railroads for the sake of dividends? May they not be those business men who reject safety appliances in dangerous occupations because it is cheaper to hire new employes in place of the injured than to buy safety devices? May they not be the rich rascals who ruin banks, corrupt legislators, taint the judiciary, and perpetuate economic systems that divert the products of toil from industrious earners to cunning idlers? Or is it true that the dangerous anarchist is the unfortunate madman whose sympathetic passions are inflamed by his consciousness of hunger and cold among the industrious, by the side of luxury for the cunning? May the dangerous anarchist not be he who fosters this insanity among sympathizers with the industrious and plundered poor, by defending or excusing the conditions that cause it? Or is it rather he who may possibly foster it by denouncing the conditions? In our opinion the most dangerous anarchist is not the man made murderously mad by industrial injustice, nor the man whose denunciations of this injustice may incidentally inflame that madness. The most

dangerous anarchist is he who, profiting by industrial injustice, selfishly insists upon its perpetuation. Your really dangerous anarchists are to be found not among the poor and frenzied who are being hunted down as "anarchists," but among those cold and calculating parasites upon industry who join vociferously in the hunt.

*

We live in the richest country on the globe. Its possibilities have been but barely touched upon, and the labor power of its population is incalculable. Yet the masses of its people are either abjectly poor, or are in a daily struggle with poverty, or are on the edge of industrial disaster. Why? The answer is plain. We let our natural opportunities lie fallow, and thereby allow our labor power to go to waste through unemployment. And then, when ominous discontent naturally results, we are aghast at the appearance of "anarchy"! If anarchy is indeed inhuman, what better explanation of it could we ask for than our familiar condition of involuntary unemployment? Unemployment is demoralizing. Among those who live by employment, it is dehumanizing. Involuntary unemployment is the first step downward from human dignity, downward from a vitalizing sense of manhood. It is a school that graduates loafers, drunkards, and criminals. Prior to this stage, the unemployed want work. They detest charity and abhor crime. But after opportunity for work fails them, they are apt to become social pests. Whose is the fault? Not theirs. Having asked for work and been denied it, they have followed the line of least resistance into crime or beggary. The school is ours; they are but the graduates. And what a school, in its magnitude!

*

Doesn't this indicate the incompetency with which the people of this country are served by their public servants? Could industrial conditions possibly be worse if the professed anarchist had his way and all coercive government were abolished? Think of it. In one single State of the Union—the State of Texas—all the inhabitants of this whole country could be accommodated with two acres or more apiece. Many is the acre there would be for each, if all the unused land of the country were open to use. And when you consider that in social environments the utility of land is measured by its value rather than its acreage, and consider further that a city acre is equal in value to a good sized farm—often to hundreds of good sized farms,—you realize that there is land enough for limitless employment of

all kinds of labor power, in all kinds of useful occupations, and all the time. Why then have we the dehumanizing conditions of involuntary unemployment which every one is now forced to acknowledge?

*

Most obtrusive among our industrial phenomena are production, consumption and wages. Yet our public servants seem incapable of grasping the significance of the fact that large production depends upon liberal consumption, and that liberal consumption is dependent upon high wages. The involuntary unemployment of many is attributable to the restricted wages of all. And if we trace this fact to its cause, we shall find low wages due to the barriers between the labor power of our population, and the locations where labor power can be most profitably exerted. Those who hold the golden key to these locations create a glutted labor market, and a glutted labor market maintains low wages. We are all responsible—morally, politically, almost criminally—for this condition. Yet we have the temerity to denounce as dangerous anarchists those among us who rise up and say that governments which grow such dead-sea fruit are worse than no government at all—that this "archy" is worse than "anarchy."

* *

Polish Priests and American Politics.

The report from Milwaukee that Polish priests of that city abused their spiritual influence on the eve of the recent municipal election by instructing their parishioners to vote against the Socialist party, is a serious matter. That the object of their opposition was a political party whose doctrines most of us do not accept, makes no difference. The principle is the same and the danger as great as if it were the party of Lincoln or the party of Jefferson. And that the Milwaukee report is substantially true, there is good reason to believe. In Chicago, at any rate, it is understood that Polish and Italian priests frequently take advantage of their spiritual authority to influence elections by commanding pliant parishioners in the use of their vote. It is this sort of thing that feeds the fires of anti-Catholic prejudice in this country; and American Catholics who recognize the importance of keeping church and state apart, ought to be alert in discouraging it. As important to them as to the rest of us, is it that priestly intervention in politics be frowned upon. When Daniel O'Connell said for Ireland, "All the religion you please from Rome, but no politics!" he phrased the American as well as the Irish idea. We of this country believe in