

times his rights as a freeman were taken away from him.

† †

Mayor Johnson's Following.

Northern Illinois (Dupage County) Democrat (ind. Dem.), May 21.—Tom L. Johnson has a following of young men as well as old. They are not hard to get for the man who does not sit on the fence. Yet Tom L. Johnson is a politician and cannot be sand-bagged nor soft-soaped, the only modern machinery now used to prevent the success of nominating conventions in the interest of real democracy. He never swerves from his purpose and his followers know the object of the journey, although they may not always know the road to be taken. Special privilege has no more relentless nor more resourceful enemy than Tom Johnson, and no one knows it better than they.

† †

The Chase of Emma Goldman.

Chicago Record Herald (ind. Rep.) May 25.—Emma Goldman manages to be martyred several times a week. It isn't the stupidity of her own creed but the stupidity of the police which is responsible. Usually she is driven out of some hall in which she is going to speak. Occasionally she is arrested. But if she is arrested she always gets free quickly enough to advertise another speech without undue delay, and the process begins over again. . . . Either she advocates violence or other crime, or she doesn't. If she does she ought to be properly punished for it. The police would do well to wait until they can make out a case and then insist on a conviction and a sound sentence. If she does not advocate violence she ought to be let alone.

† †

Elastic Neutrality Laws.

The Chicago Daily Socialist (Soc.), May 24.—Some Mexican workmen are alleged to have attempted to organize a revolution against the blood-thirsty Diaz. . . . They are accused of having risked their lives that their fellow workers might be made free. All these acts are undoubtedly illegal. . . . It is an accepted principle of international law that one nation cannot allow its territory to be used as a basis from which to make war upon a "friendly power." But in cold practice it makes a great difference who is organizing the revolution upon a friendly power. . . . When an American corporation fails to secure the favors it wishes from any government it proceeds to "organize a revolution." . . . To all of this the government of the United States is discreetly blind, if not openly favorable. Indeed, when the asphalt trust organized a revolution in Venezuela . . . the United States government kindly took a hand, recalled such of its representatives as did not suit the trust, and has now used its diplomatic service to secure the co-operation of other nations in exiling the legal ruler of that country. When a revolution was needed in Panama in order to secure control of the canal zone the President of the United States took a hand directly and assisted in organizing a successful revolution against a "friendly power." Of course no one suggested the imprisonment of Theodore Roose-

velt for violating the laws he had sworn to enforce. But the Mexicans were just workmen. The people they were seeking to benefit were just plain peons. The object of the revolutionists was the welfare of men and women and children and not the increase of profits. Therefore the Mexicans are on their road to the penitentiary while Roosevelt is shooting lions in Africa.

† †

Roosevelt's "Outlook" Editorial on Tolstoy.

The Commoner (Dem.), May 21.—Tolstoy has incurred the wrath of ex-President Roosevelt by saying that "Bryan represented the party of peace" in the last campaign; and the "mighty hunter" pauses long enough to administer a rebuke to the Russian philosopher. He says that Tolstoy has swayed "only the feeble folk and the fanatic folk." There now, let Tolstoy wipe the blood off his face and take a back seat. No wonder Mr. Roosevelt does not like Tolstoy—they represent opposite schools of thought. Mr. Roosevelt is the exponent of the brute force idea. With him man is an animal and must be ready to kill any other animal that opposes his plans. With Tolstoy man is the spiritual agent of God and is bound to observe spiritual laws. Mr. Roosevelt thinks that man would degenerate without an occasional opportunity for blood letting. Tolstoy believes that love is greater than force and that man is ennobled by accepting love as the controlling principle of life. Naturally Mr. Roosevelt thinks that the world can be scared into peace when armaments become great enough to make each nation afraid of every other nation. Tolstoy believes that the spirit that leads nations to desire big navies will lead them to use them without excuse, and he insists that a good example will do more than a threat to prevent war. This fundamental difference between Roosevelt and Tolstoy is not, however, new. When Jesus visited a village of Samaria and the people refused to receive him, some of the disciples suggested that fire should be called down from heaven to avenge the insult; but the Master rebuked them and said: "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of; for the Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them." Suppose he had said: "We will thrash them until they understand who we are," how different would have been the history of Christianity! Compare, if you will, the swaggering, bullying, brutal doctrine of Roosevelt with the golden rule of Tolstoy and the commandment, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Again, Christ answered one who would use force to defend him by saying: "They that draw the sword shall perish by the sword." Tolstoy has good authority for his position—better than Mr. Roosevelt can offer for his bullying and swaggering policy. Mr. Roosevelt will hardly charge all the followers of The Prince of Peace with being "feeble folk and fanatic folk."

† † †

"But how, then, is my brother's unkindness to be cured?"

"Bring him to me, and I will tell him, but I have nothing to say to you about his unkindness."—Epicetetus.