

WHO IS AN ANARCHIST?

CHICAGO newspaper called Henry Ford an anarchist. Ford sued the newspaper, and the trial is in progress. The case has developed some fine word splitting and some useful word analysis.

The evidence shows that Mr. Ford was opposed to the war with Germany. He thought it not necessary to go to war, and from time to time, before the war began, he made remarks in which his views were exhibited, or explained.

It was on account of these views that the Chicago newspaper called Ford an anarchist. All sorts of witnesses, testifying as experts, are being put on the stand to tell what an anarchist is.

One of these witnesses is a learned professor. Another is a bishop of the Episcopal church. The former thinks Ford's language entitles him to be regarded as an anarchist, while the bishop thinks not, and feels sure that Mr. Ford ought to be looked upon as some kind of a Christian, a sort of extremist who would carry the golden rule to a perfectionist application.

An anarchist is one who practices anarchy. Anarchy is the condition of having no head, that is to say, no government.

It is of a species of philosophy based upon the notion that men left to act as freely as they wish to, will in all material matters conduct themselves so as to promote the good of all.

There is an element of reason in this philosophy. In some particulars men are so good that government could not constrain them, even by passing a law, to do certain evil acts.

If government should pass a law requiring each man to murder his mother, that law would not be obeyed. Broadly there is no need of a government to keep men from murdering their mothers. The idea of such a crime is abhorrent.

Anarchy has its profound philosophers, its authors and its active proponents, who have divided as to ways and means of accomplishing anarchy. Some have become pacifists, or even devotees to non resistance, believing in the rule which says that a man smitten on one cheek shall turn the other. Some have resorted to violence, and try to destroy government by force. The great majority go along without taking much heed, being satisfied to think of themselves as anarchists and let it go at that.

The division among the anarchists is not directed by the philosophy, but by indifference in human nature. Every movement is composed of a mass of people, the largest, who are patient and not very active; a part who try to gain the goal by peaceful and constitutional means; a part who resort to violence.

The labor movement shows these three groups. The suffrage movement shows them. The socialist movement shows it. The Christian movement had three groups as described?

Besides the reasoned meaning of anarchy it has a popular meaning. It stands for disorder, directed to the destruction of civil government, and especially for disorder accompanied by mob violence.

Hence an anarchist is one who holds to the philosophy of anarchy, and in popular speech, one who seeks to promote anarchy with disorder and violence.

Under neither of these definitions, the close one nor the popular one, is Ford an anarchist. He does not desire the overthrow of civil government. He does not believe that men can get along at this stage of their development without civil government.

There is a yet looser use of the word anarchy to describe any disorder, or violence especially coming from a mob or other undisciplined group.

In this view of the word Ford is not an anarchist. He did not advocate disorder or violence. On the contrary he advocated peace and abstention from violence.

Ford was a pacifist, but not of an extreme type, because war being declared he was willing to help wage it. He was not even a conscientious objector.

Mr. Ford's notions are very much like those of a majority of the American people, who do not believe in war and want to keep out of war, and will go a long way to keep out, but will fight the war if they once get into it.

It will be easier to understand the mutations of this word anarchy by reflecting upon the checkered career of the word Bolshevism, which in the beginning was the strictly technical name of a Russian political party, and which has come to stand for any kind of rebellion or threatened rebellion whatever, until now the term Bolshevik is applied to every man who wants to change any established thing.

Undoubtedly the Chicago paper, in characterizing Ford, wished to apply the word anarchist in its popular meaning. But it got the wrong word. Not that Mr. Ford is much damaged by what was said about him. He is too big a man, and the people know him too well and are too sensible to let such a Polish accusation alter their opinions.

But the editor who used the word ought to submit his editorials hereafter to somebody who is able to say the precise he intends to say. It was just as easy to dub Ford a pacifist as it was to call him an anarchist, and it was practical to describe and limit Ford's pacifism within the reasonable and intelligent boundaries which it actually had. In this way nobody would have been injured. Few papers can afford to carry editors who use such costly language as that Chicago editor used.

A SHELTON WONDER

ONE McMANUS is entitled to rank as the eighth wonder of Shelton where he declares that during three hours he drank a hundred moderate sized glasses of 2.75 beer before he became intoxicated.

A moderate sized glass of beer is an indefinite size. In these days in Shelton, where they used to serve them large, an eight ounce glass would be about the thing. In this case our friend drank 800 ounces of beer in three hours, which would have contained 22 ounces of fluid alcohol, or more alcohol than would be contained in a quart of ordinary bar whiskey.

If the beer approximated but one-half of one per cent McManus would have acquired about four ounces of pure alcohol.

He received into his miraculous stomach during three hours four gallons of ice cold fluid, weighing forty pounds, or thereabouts.

It does not appear that the gentleman's reputation for truth and veracity was the subject of judicial inquiry.

Twenty-five dollars and costs was too little to fine a man of such capacity. He ought to get something for attempting to corner the market.

WASHINGTON RACE RIOTS

THOUGHTFUL AMERICANS will not too hastily declare against the colored man, in making up his mind regarding the responsibility for the Washington race riots.

To the war the South sent 370,000 white men and 239,000 negroes. The total contribution of the black race to the manpower of the United States was 360,000. These black men wore the uniform with honor. They did good work, and were often decorated, or commended by their white officers.

In what they accomplished the colored men take pride. Theirs is a just pride, and their fellows have a right to share the feeling with them.

It would be strange if the valor of negro soldiers did not stir in the hearts of the black people a desire for juster treatment and a fairer chance.

The negroes have their criminals, who should be arrested and punished, as white criminals are. It is wickedly unjust and oppressive to hold negroes collectively accountable for the offenses of individuals.

In Washington certain offenses were committed by negroes against women. The criminals were individuals, who should have been apprehended and punished as individuals.

The negroes and the whites in Washington are shooting at each other. The black men give what they get. This is to be expected from a people that has established its valor on the battlefield.

It is time for Americans to think rather carefully of their relations with black Americans, and of their duty to those men who were brought here originally against their wills, and who are now among the oldest stocks in the country.

The 239,000 colored soldiers who are going back to the South will insist upon the treatment which the law guarantees to American citizens. They will demand, and they have a right of demand due process of law. They will refuse to submit tamely to lynchings, burnings, or massacres. They will not be driven into hiding everytime a gang of law browed, white ruffians finds itself in the spirit of the mob.

America has these millions of black people who are more oppressed than millions of European whites from whom the country spends its treasure liberally.

The negro is too often, in the United States, deprived of his economic and political rights; he gets the poorest jobs for the meanest pay. He is denied usually even a suitable place in which to live. The negro is a problem to be solved. The solution requires a reform in the outlook of the white man. He is the one at fault. The country takes its attitude from the south. The south takes its attitude from hatred. The south, which wronged the negro from the first, must learn that the negro is also an American, entitled to rights of an American.

THE PROHIBITION BILL

HOW COMPLETELY the proponents of prohibition are in control of Congress is shown by the vote. The Enforcement bill is adopted by 287 to 101. The bill has votes enough to secure its passage over the veto of the president, with 85 to spare.

For the most part the Congressmen who voted for the bill are men who do not personally favor prohibition. They are men who use alcoholic beverages. Many of them have supplies stored away, if Representative Gallivan is to be relied upon in his statement to this effect.

Why do these Congressmen vote for the bill? Because they want to be re-elected. They are more afraid of the dry than they are of the wet vote.

It would be difficult to arrange an enforcement measure more drastic.

A single privilege remains. A man may keep innocuants in his own dwelling, if it is used only as a dwelling, and serve them in his bona fide guests.

Every sort of fermented intoxicant is included in the prohibition, and sweeping means are provided to prevent the manufacture, transportation or sale.

The senate, it is said, will adopt the House bill without important changes. The members of the Senate have not been dry by habit. They share the opinion of the House that a majority of the people of the country favor prohibition.

The surest way to determine this fact would be to refer the whole question to the people.

THE RISK FROM BALLOONS

EVERY FORCE which man employs for his benefit will sometimes get out of hand, and injure its creators. Whether they fell trees, float in boats, speed in ships, go swiftly in railroad trains, automobiles, aeroplanes or dirigibles some price in life and limb has to be paid.

The storage of water, the transmission of electricity, the use of illuminating gas are sources of disaster. The common household match, the can of kerosene, the bottle of bug killer on the pantry shelf have potentialities for danger.

Yet, by his conquest of nature, man becomes safer in body and limb, and lives longer than he used to live. The Chicago accident, by which a number of persons were killed, and some injured, when a burning balloon crashed into a bank building is a mere part of the toll that men must pay for conquest of the air.

The accident calls for a further consideration of means by which such catastrophes may be prevented. It does not demand a drastic legislation, inspired by terror. The chance that a dirigible in falling from the sky will fall into the interior of a building is much smaller than the chance that somebody will be killed by lightning, which is a very small chance indeed.

The most apparent weakness of the dirigible is the hydrogen gas with which it is filled. Hydrogen is very inflammable. It is contained in the balloon casing, which in turn is above the exhausts from high powered gasoline engines. The proximity of fire and hydrogen does not make for safety.

Helium is a gas almost as light as hydrogen. It has been thoroughly tested in balloons. It is not inflammable. It costs a little more to produce than hydrogen. It might be wise to make a law providing that dirigible balloons must use helium, and not hydrogen gas.

BRITISH COAL MINERS' STRIKE

IT WILL be noted that coal miners' strikes in Great Britain are conducted for a purpose entirely different than any considerable strike of which we have any knowledge as occurring in American industry.

The British miners strike against an increase in the cost of coal to the consumer, which has been ordered by the government. They hope to hasten the nationalization of the mines.

The British labor movement sometime since entered upon a new phase. The fundamental strike is no more over wages

and conditions of labor, but is aimed to procure very fundamental changes in the system of industry.

The British Coal Commission, following its investigation of the demands of the miners, recommended that they receive 35,000,000 in back pay; that underground work be reduced to seven hours a day and in 1921 to six hours a day; that wages be increased two shillings a day; that the miners have a voice in the management; that a penny be collected on each ton of coal, to build model dwellings. The revenue from this would be five millions a year.

An organization of owners and miners was recommended to consider nationalization.

The coal mining industry employs more than a million men who, with their families, constitute about one-ninth of the population of Great Britain.

CHICAGO RACE RIOTS

THE CHICAGO race riots are a duplicate of the Washington race riots. Neither incident has been subjected apparently to such a study as might serve to find the reasons why such things happen.

It is suggested that the negroes, having done their part in the war are inclined to demand fairer treatment. This may be conceded.

But what sort of whites engage in these riots? Are they Americans, or immigrants who have recently come to this soil? Did they speak English, or only foreign languages? What sort of work do they do? Are they a class of men in economic competition with the negroes, in the lowest grades of employment?

It would be easier to find a remedy for crimes if the class of people who commit them were better known.

There are some 8,000,000 negroes in America, not here by their own wish, with whom it is necessary that the white people should live in amity.

Fortunately it is white people who promptly suppress these race riots, and it is white people who will see that an equal justice is meted to whites and blacks.

The whites, being the superior race have a superior duty to be tolerant and generous to those who neither in numbers nor in influence are able to defend themselves against white aggression.

THE LATEST PLOT AGAINST THE PRESIDENT

MEN REMEMBER rather better the vivid and important things that have just happened than they do distant and long elapsed events, of which they know only through history. Everybody remembers that famous imputation of gross ignorance expressed in the language, "He doesn't know that Abraham Lincoln is dead."

Whether Senator Brandegee of Connecticut and Senator Lodge of Massachusetts are possessed this special information does not appear, but they have achieved a more massive and more truly comprehensive ignorance.

In the afternoon papers on July 3, and in the morning newspapers of July 4, the text of the treaty for the defense of France was printed verbatim.

Just three weeks later Harvey's Weekly printed the text of the treaty, in the belief that it was doing something new, and for the information of its readers added that "to the best of our knowledge it has not been published in this country."

Two days before the weekly was issued Mr. Hay, Republican chairman of the national committee, sent out a letter in which he asked them to "see the editorial published by Col. George Harvey relative to the proposed Franco-American treaty."

The New York World is authority for the statement that the night before the editorial appeared, Lodge, Knox, Brandegee and Borah met and planned an attack upon the President.

The morning after Brandegee called the attention of the Senate to the Harvey editorial, and said:

"HERE IS THE THUNDERER, THE LONDON TIMES OF JULY 4 AND THE WHOLE COVENANT IS HERE; EVERY BRITISHER KNOWS ABOUT IT AS WELL AS THEIR OWN, BUT WE DO NOT KNOW ABOUT IT AND CANNOT."

And Senator Lodge with solemn senatorial pomposity issued and the following extra, on news then more than 21 days familiar to all newspaper readers among the American people:

When the Senator from Connecticut showed me this article before the assembling of the Senate, it seemed to me inconceivable that the fourth article should be there. I supposed the editor, Col. Harvey, was very accurate and careful, but it seemed to me simply inconceivable. I saw a copy of the London Times containing the fourth article from the White Book which was laid before the House of Commons, but I could not get a copy in private hands. However, I afterward found a copy of the French paper Figaro. It is a Paris paper under the date of July 2, and carried on its front page this article, headed "Guarantee of Peace."

This is an excellent example of the myticism which antebellum statesmen so often surround their activities. Talking about White Books, and Thunderers, and Paris Figaros, to present an appearance of knowing everything, these senatorial birds did not even know that the facts they were proclaiming had been printed in every newspaper in their own country.

The operation in which Brandegee and Lodge are caught is well known to poker players. It is called four flushing.

The President ought to be grateful because those who plot against him do it so magnificently separated from the world of common sense.

Col. Harvey is the same publisher who declared that America did not win the war, though General Pershing had reported the war won, (a report also printed in every American newspaper), when the American dough boys severed the German line of communication beyond Argonne forest.

Think of a great editor solemnly telling his readers that the French treaty is new, three weeks after it has been printed in every American newspaper.

Think of Lodge and Brandegee, who pose as authorities on foreign affairs, solemnly and ridiculously quoting from the British White Book, the London Times and the Paris Figaro, the terms of an important State paper, as being for the first time made known, when there was in the whole of the United States no newspaper reader from a bootblack to a millionaire who had not three weeks earlier read every last word of that important state paper in his own favorite newspaper.

Do Harvey, Lodge and Brandegee know that Abraham Lincoln is dead? Do they know that the war is over? Do they know that the world is tired of war, and that it wants to make a treaty providing against future wars? Fellow Americans, let us at the earliest opportunity get ourselves Senators who ride in trolley cars, use telephones and read the newspapers, and who know what the people want.

WAR DECLARED BY CHALONER ON ALIENISTS

Announces Series of Lectures That Will Last Five Years.

WANTS NATIONAL LAW ON LUNACY

Statutes on Insanity in Most of States Rotten, Says He.

New York, July 29. — John Armstrong Chaloner, restored on Saturday by a Supreme Court order to the full status of a sane person, removed any doubts as to what he will do next by declaring war yesterday on the Lunacy Trust. The capitalists are his own. He spoke them, but his emphasis left no question as to their presence.

His assumption of the attitude of belligerency was a ceremony. His witnesses were reporters from every New York morning paper, and his intentions were pledged in copious draughts of ice water.

In brief, here is the plan of campaign. On Sunday evening, Nov. 9, at 7:45 o'clock, Mr. Chaloner will open a series of lectures at Cooper Union Hall, to which the public will be invited free gratis. He will continue the series for five months, speaking once or twice a month. The lectures will be published in his own name and distributed where they will do most good.

For five years Mr. Chaloner purposes waging war in the United States on the Lunacy Trust. He will devote to it both his time and his money. The matter is no inconsiderable item since, he said yesterday, he has an income of \$112,000 a year, against which there are outstanding about \$70,000 in judgments for lawyers' bills.

By the end of five years Mr. Chaloner expects the Lunacy Trust to have been reduced to the present condition of the German nation to employ his own illustration. Then he will enter upon a two-year war against the Lunacy Trust of Europe. He thinks only two years will be required for Europe because the results already obtained in the United States will have their effect abroad.

"The Lunacy Trust here is rich and entrenched," he told the reporters, whom he habitually addressed as "Gentlemen of the Fourth Estate." "It is one thousand million dollars in assets running up against me. But I now declare war on it, on the 27th day of July, 1919, and my financial, mental and physical resources will be devoted to that cause. I want a national lunacy law. I want a law whereby lunacy proceedings are instituted, the object of them shall receive formal notice thereof, and shall be permitted to be present at a jury trial. Any other practice is a violation of his constitutional rights."

"I am like Edmund Dantes in 'Monte Cristo'—I have dug my way out after twenty years. But I now declare war on the conditions which imprisoned me."

"The alleged alienists employed by lunacy proceedings are a menace to society. There are some honest ones, but I haven't found them."

"The lunacy laws of this State, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri and New England are rotten. In the South there are fewer rich men, and it hasn't paid to organize a Lunacy Trust there. The men of the financial and medical professions who are at the head of the Lunacy Trust are no better than the head hunters of Borneo and the Celebes Islands."

EX-PREMIER SAYS ERZBERGER IS DISTORTING TRUTH

Paris, July 28.—"A distortion of the truth" was the characterization applied today by Alexandre Ribot to the recent statement by Matthias Erzberger, the German finance minister, declaring that Great Britain and France had peace overtures to Germany through the Vatican in 1917, which Germany rejected. M. Ribot, who was French premier and foreign minister at the time in question, made this declaration in a statement to Marcel Huith of the Echo de Paris. The former premier explained the occurrence as follows: "Pope Benedict in August, 1917, suggested proposals to serve as a basis for overtures to Germany. France and Great Britain both decided to decline the proposals. The political acknowledgment was made to the Pope, but nothing more. The British minister to the Vatican, in his own name, pointed out that the proposals did not contain sufficient guarantees for Belgium. Cardinal Gasparri, the papal Secretary of State, M. Ribot continued, asked upon this acknowledgment many questions for explanations on the subject of Belgium. It was an attempt to start a conversation, M. Ribot declared, but the British government cut it off short, and the British minister went no farther."

HAMMERSTEIN IS IN HOSPITAL SERIOUSLY ILL

New York, July 28.—Oscar Hammerstein is a patient in the Lenox Hill hospital, 177th street and Park avenue. It was learned last night, and he is very seriously ill. He is suffering from diabetes and a complication of diseases. He was taken to the hospital Saturday last night. The hospital authorities said his condition was critical.

A year ago Mr. Hammerstein was a patient in the same hospital because of the same trouble. He was confined to the hospital five weeks. Afterward he said he never felt better in his life.