

thusiastic welcome their suggestion will receive.

The Brooklyn Eagle replies with characteristic candor to our criticism of its insinuation (p. 3) that Bryan demoralized the Democratic party in Illinois in 1896. In support of that contention it compared Cleveland's victory in 1892 with Bryan's defeat in 1896 and 1900, but said nothing of the utter break-up of the Democratic party at the intervening Congressional elections of 1894 while Cleveland was President and before Bryan's advent as a national leader. We supplied its very significant omission in that particular. Now observe the amazing effrontery of its reply:

The Eagle said that the Democracy carried Illinois in 1892 and lost it in 1896 and in 1900. In 1892 Cleveland was the candidate. In 1896 and in 1900 Bryan was the candidate. But, ah, says the Public, the Democracy lost Illinois in 1894 when Cleveland was President! Precisely, and when, and because. Altgeld was Governor, and when, and because, Altgeld pardoned anarchist murderers in a manner to show that intellectually he sympathized with them. The Eagle jumped the space between Presidential elections because it was considering those elections alone. We did not refer to State elections between Presidential elections, for we were not considering State elections, but only Presidential ones.

Humbly begging the fluttering Eagle's pardon, it was not considering Presidential elections at all as the issue or question in controversy. It was considering them only as evidence bearing upon that controversy. The gist of the question in hand was its contention that Bryan found a Democratic majority in Illinois when he succeeded Cleveland in the leadership of the Democratic party in 1896, and that under his leadership, and in consequence of it, this majority disappeared. It was in support of that contention that the Eagle pointed to the election returns for Illinois in the Presidential year 1892, and compared them with those of the Presidential years 1896 and 1900. For a very obvious reason, the same reason that tempts attorneys in lawsuits to ignore evidence

that tells against their clients, the Eagle "jumped," to use its own language—"the Eagle jumped the space between Presidential elections." It jumped that space not because those elections were the subject under consideration, but because that space had to be jumped in order to give any force to the evidence it offered. Without "jumping" this most important interval between Presidential elections, it could not hope to deceive its readers as to the matter in controversy. Without that "jump" it could not point to Bryan as the disrupter of the Democratic party.

And now, in its reply to The Public, the Eagle "jumps" again. It "jumps" the point that when Cleveland was elected in 1892, Illinois elected 11 Democratic Congressmen out of a total delegation from the State of 22; whereas, in 1894, while he was head of the party and head of the nation, Illinois elected only 2 Democratic Congressmen. It "jumps" once more when it suppresses the fact that two years later, under Bryan's leadership in 1896, Illinois returned 3 Democratic Congressmen—a gain of 1 over Cleveland's disastrous legacy. In 1900, still under Bryan's leadership, Illinois returned 11 members. What does all this imply but that Cleveland had demoralized the party in Illinois on national issues between 1892 and 1894; and that Bryan began to revive it in 1896, and in 1900 had restored its Congressional membership fully? The Eagle cannot twist itself out of its self-made dilemma by objecting to our bringing into the case pertinent evidence which it chose to leave out. Nor can it escape by calling the Congressional elections in Illinois "State elections." Congressional elections are national elections as well in politics as in law. They are as commonly accepted barometers of national sentiment as Presidential elections are.

As to the Eagle's gratuitous sneer at Altgeld, we shall not be tempted into allowing Mr. Cleveland's Brooklyn organ to shift its

ground. Its mendacious use of an epithet here is only another symptom of its unhappy malady, groverclevelanditis. Victims of that disease are frequently observed to shriek "anarchist!" whenever argument fails them. But there is no question here of Altgeld's views on anarchism. He was not a candidate in 1894. When he did come before the people of Illinois, in 1896 and after that pardon, he polled, notwithstanding his defeat, 47,000 more votes than Cleveland had polled in Illinois four years before. If the Eagle wishes to debate the merits of the Altgeld pardon, it will give us pleasure to accommodate it. Meantime we recommend Altgeld's pardon message as wholesome reading, even if irritating, for jury fixers and corporation judges, their apologists, their newspaper organs, and their beneficiaries in general. But the question here is not Altgeld's pardon. It is whether that pardon accounts for the Democratic collapse at the polls in Illinois in 1894. That is the question the Eagle raises when it explains the reduction from 11 to 2 in the Democratic representation in Congress from Illinois that year by attributing it inferentially to Altgeld's pardon of the anarchists. To that question it is a sufficient answer to say, what is the fact, that the issue in the Congressional elections in Illinois in 1894 was not Altgeld's pardon of the anarchists, but Cleveland's administration. Passing this point, however, with a mere mention, let us ask the Eagle a question. If it believes that it was Altgeld's pardon of the anarchists and not Cleveland's administration, that reduced the Democratic representation of Illinois in Congress from 11 in 1892 to 2 in 1894, then how does it account for the reduction in the Democratic representation from other States? Was it Altgeld's pardon of the anarchists in Illinois, and not Cleveland's administration, that reduced the Democratic representation in Congress from New York, the Eagle's own State, from 20 in 1892 to 5 in 1894? Does that pardon by Altgeld, instead of Cleveland's ad-

ministration, account for the reduction of the Democratic representation from the Eagle's own city of Brooklyn, from 5 in 1892 to 0 in 1894? Was it Altgeld's pardon of the anarchists in Illinois, and not Cleveland's administration, that reduced the Democratic membership in the lower House of Congress from 219 (a plurality of 95) in 1892, to 104 (a minority of 140) in 1894? Dare the Eagle answer these questions frankly?

We challenge The Brooklyn Eagle to face its readers squarely with a publication of the plain facts, and all of them, "jumping" none, together with a repetition of its assurance that Bryan took over a healthy Democratic party in 1896 and ruined it. Let it accompany such a statement and assurance with a table showing the Democratic membership of Congress resulting from the elections of 1892, 1894 and 1896, and even the most unsophisticated of its own confiding readers, other than those who are actually down with groverclevelanditis, will readily see that Cleveland began his administration with a strong and healthy party in March, 1893; that he had completely demoralized it when the Congressional elections of 1894 came off; and that Bryan recovered very much of the lost ground in Congress at the elections of 1896. If, in addition to the Congressional returns, the Eagle also compares the popular vote for President in 1892 with that of 1896, it will remind its readers that in spite of his defeat Bryan polled nearly 1,000,000 more votes in 1896 than Cleveland polled in 1892; and that Bryan's vote was a larger percentage than Cleveland's of the total vote cast. But the Eagle will do nothing of the kind. Having groverclevelanditis in malignant form it will elect in the future as in the past to "jump" all the facts that go against its case.

It is a significant fact that all the political spoilsmen of Chicago condemn the referendum vote in favor of electing instead of appointing the school board, on the

ground that it would make party spoils of school-board seats! The school book pirates object on the same grounds.

Emma Goldman was advertised to lecture on the 9th at a public hall in Philadelphia, rented for the purpose, on the subject of "The Tragedy of Woman's Emancipation." An orderly crowd gathered, seeking ingress into the hall. It was an absolutely peaceable and lawful assemblage. But the "Director of Public Safety," for no other reason than that somebody had told him the speaker was an "anarchist," and absolutely without proof of any possible, much less probable, lawlessness of word or act in connection with the meeting, ordered the police to prevent its being held. Accordingly the lecturer and the attendants were forbidden to enter their own premises, which they had hired for this occasion. Two attendants, Frank Stephens and Samuel Milliken, insisted, though without violent behavior, upon entering the hall. They were thereupon arrested and imprisoned. When so flagrant an invasion of one of the simplest rights of citizenship can be perpetrated by the officials of an American city, with the approval of the local press and "our best citizens," it is gratifying in the highest degree to be able to quote such sound American sentiment so eloquently and courageously expressed as appears in an extract from Mr. George Gluyas Mercer's speech before the magistrate in behalf of these prisoners for liberty's sake. Mr. Mercer is that rare bird, a leading lawyer who dares to defend free institutions against anarchistic official attacks. He said:

Yesterday's newspapers announced a meeting at Odd Fellows' Temple to be addressed by Emma Goldman on "The Tragedy of Woman's Emancipation"—certainly a peaceful topic. Those who attempted to attend the meeting, among the number being my clients, were met at the door by policemen, who ordered them away, saying that the authorities would not permit the meeting. According to the primary meaning of the word an anarchist is one who advocates a social theory of absolute individual liberty and who believes in the beautiful

ideal of the self-government of man without the necessity of any forceful enforcement of the law. I have never seen Emma Goldman, have never heard her speak, and have no belief in the present practicability of her political ideal; but, if I rightly understand her position, she is the peaceful advocate of a state of society in which government, as we understand it, would be unnecessary. In one of this morning's newspapers I read her statement that she had always been permitted to speak on this topic in the city of New York. As a citizen of Philadelphia, who was born here and have lived here all my life, I hang my head with shame to think that this woman, when she comes to the city where the Declaration of Independence was made, is denied the right of free speech on another topic simply because she is known to believe in anarchy in its higher and better sense. In its secondary signification the word anarchist means one who promotes disorder, who overturns by violence constitutional forms of government, and who interferes with the individual rights of man. In this second class we find the policemen who made the arrests last night; above them the lieutenant of this district by whose orders the arrests were made; above him the Director of Public Safety who ordered the lieutenant to deny the right of free speech and to prevent the holding of a peaceful meeting; and above the Director the Mayor of Philadelphia, who has done more, by this one act, to promote anarchy in its worst sense than all the speeches of Emma Goldman could have done in years. Certainly, this high handed outrage of the Police Department of Philadelphia shows that here, in this American city, is anarchy in a sense as bad as it could possibly exist in Russia; namely, a state of society in which the functions of government are performed badly or not at all, and in which there is no capable supreme power.

In connection with the question of municipal ownership and operation of municipal monopolies we are glad to be able to direct attention to a judicial opinion of the highest character in support of our contention that the distinguishing test between public function and private business is the source of power to act. If, in the nature of things, that power is in the individual as to any business, then such business is a private business; but if, in the nature of things, power to act must be derived from the government, with reference to any business, then such business is a public function. An individual needs no authority from government to