

having pledged himself to support Judge Gaynor's candidacy no matter what ticket he ran on. He supported his statement with a letter from Rudolph Block, one of Mr. Hearst's editorial writers. In response to a request from Judge Gaynor for the facts, Mr. Block had replied in a letter of the 9th:

I cannot tell you how distressed I am over the course that matters have taken. I regret exceedingly to be drawn into the affair, but inasmuch as I was instrumental in bringing about your meeting with Mr. Hearst, and urged you so often on his behalf to run for Mayor, I feel that, since you ask for it and put the matter up to me, you have a right to my testimony. Shortly before Mr. Hearst left for Europe last Summer he asked me to bring you to his house. I think this was the second or third time you had ever seen him. He asked you if you would not run for Mayor in the Fall. You asked him why he did not run himself, and said that if he desired to run or would run you would not get in his way. He answered that, under no circumstances, would he run, and urged you to run. You asked on what ticket. He responded: "I don't care what ticket you run on. I'll support you on any ticket." I suggested then that perhaps Tammany might nominate you. He answered: "It makes no difference what party nominates him, I will support him." And he added: "I am not opposed to Tammany, but to Tammany methods, and when it does right it is entitled to credit." You thanked Mr. Hearst and said that you might go to Europe in August, and that you would think the matter over. He expressed a wish that you would see him in Europe and asked that you let him know your decision after you got back. He said that if you wanted any article favoring or leading to your candidacy to be published in *The American* during his absence I was to see that it went in.

Judge Gaynor adds:

I saw Mr. Hearst in September according to promise. I said to him that a large number of organizations had already declared for me for Mayor, and that I might conclude to run. He said that he had in no way changed his mind, and that he would support me, whatever ticket I ran on, or whoever nominated me.

Mr. Hearst has replied as follows to these statements:

If Judge Gaynor has stated that I promised to support him under any and all circumstances, and upon any and all tickets, he states what is positively untrue. I will try to assume that he is honestly mistaken, but it is difficult for me to do so, as the proposition is so unreasonable and impossible that it bears its refutation on its face.

+

Judge Gaynor accepted his nominations on the 7th in what is described by the dispatches as an unsensational speech in which he said he resigns his place on the bench only to dedicate the next four years of his life to the service of the people

of New York. In a speech on the 11th in Brooklyn he called upon the public to judge him by his past. "If a man always has been known," he said, "as an opponent of corrupt government, you can judge that when he gets to be three score or so years old he is not going to take his orders from any unworthy leaders." Judge Gaynor thereupon challenged Mr. Hearst to meet him in joint debate, saying: "I want fair play above all in this contest. The open enemy I honor, but I despise the enemy that sits back, as an editor or otherwise, pretending to be your friend, when he is only smiling while he buries his dagger in your ribs. So I say, Let us have it out in the open, Mr. Hearst."

+ +

Free Speech in Philadelphia.

Emma Goldman's application, supported by the Free Speech Committee (pp. 963, 967), for an injunction against police interference with her lectures, has come to a hearing before Judges Willson and Audenreid in Philadelphia. She herself was cross-examined at the hearing, and after her testimony was allowed to make a speech supplementary to the lawyer's speech for The Free Speech Committee. The police having opposed her injunction on the ground that her lectures had led to disturbances and that she was a convicted anarchist, she addressed herself to those points. Her speech was not published in the reports of the hearing, but their extracts from it indicate that it was substantially the same as a letter of her's in the Philadelphia Public Ledger, which covered the points in question as follows:

As to what my record may or may not be has nothing to do with the present struggle. But for the benefit of your readers I wish to say this: I have been in the lecture field for 18 years; have spoken in innumerable cities, including Philadelphia, and have never had a single disturbance. The only disturbers were the police, when they attempted to stop meetings and suppress free speech. I may also state that in all these years I have been held for trial but once—1893—and not because of any riot, but for quoting Cardinal Manning, to wit, "Necessity knows no law." My lectures have been published in my magazine, *Mother Earth*, the latter being entered in the United States second class mail. Yet it remained for the police of Philadelphia to suppress me even before I was heard. Does it not seem as if this city has come to a very lamentable state of affairs if the right of free speech is made to depend on the grace and whim of the police department? A convicted anarchist? Were the authorities to know but the history of their own country they would know that some of the greatest anarchists have raised their voice for human justice and liberty right here in America. David Thoreau, the author of "*Walden*," was an anarchist, for it was he who in his famous tract, "*Evil Disobedience*," proclaimed the human truth, to wit; "I am at all times called upon to do only what

I think is right and not what the state thinks is right." Thoreau went to prison for refusing to pay taxes. Ralph Waldo Emerson was an anarchist, and with his essay on "Self-reliance," has contributed to the wealth of anarchistic literature. John Brown, Wendell Phillips, Lloyd Garrison and scores of others were anarchists, inasmuch as they opposed the abuse of power. Yes, they were dreamers of a state of society wherein each man shall have the greatest scope and opportunity for self-development; a society wherein the individual shall learn to appreciate his relation to his fellows and the value of mutual assistance and voluntary co-operation. A dangerous theory? Yes, but dangerous to those who would fetter the human mind and gag the human voice; dangerous to those who always have opposed every truth for social progress and individual well-being. As to myself, I came here not to enter into a fist fight with the police. I came here to get forth my ideas, and I absolutely deny the right of any official to stop me from speaking. True, the police represent an iron wall of physical power and ignorance worn with age, but then I represent a truth and a never-to-be-destroyed longing for liberty. The club may be a mighty weapon, but it sinks into insignificance before human reason and human integrity. Therefore, I shall speak in Philadelphia.

Also in the Ledger there appeared, over the signature of Weda C. Addicks, a letter from one of the dispersed attendants at the Goldman meeting which is valuable for the point of view:

I went to the hall the night Miss Goldman was to have lectured, and was shocked at the sight that met my eyes at the entrance, and inside of the place of meeting. Everywhere I looked were policemen. I am not an Anarchist; I went to hear and learn what Miss Goldman calls anarchism. If any one can claim to be an American, I can. My ancestors were among the very first settlers of Old Plymouth Colony; I am a direct descendant of John Alden; my people have fought in all the wars waged by our country for freedom. So you cannot accuse me of being one of "the foreigners" some Americans are so fond of despising. A policeman has meant no more to me in the past than a lamp-post. In the hall I found myself surrounded by them; their clubs were not more terrible than their faces of flint and steel. It was the first time in my life I was conscious of tyranny. It was the first time in my life as an American woman I felt outraged, instead of protected, by the government of my country.

+

Another point raised by the authorities for opposing Miss Goldman's application for an injunction against the police is that she is not a citizen of the United States and that only citizens have the Constitutional guarantee of free speech. No decision of the court is yet reported.

+ +

Commission Government Movement in Illinois.

A permanent organization for commission government in the cities of Illinois was organized at Peoria on the 29th at a municipal conference

which unanimously adopted resolutions stating that "experience has demonstrated the practicability, economy and business-like method in public affairs under the commission plan of government, which plan more directly fixes responsibility on those in charge of municipal affairs, and through the initiative, referendum and recall provision thereof brings the administration closer to the people." The organization demands that form of municipal government for Illinois. The mayors or other authorized representatives of the following cities attached their names to the resolutions:

Peoria, Springfield, Quincy, Galesburg, Rockford, Ottawa, Rock Island, Freeport, Moline, Champaign, Decatur, Monmouth, Joliet, Streator, Jacksonville, Cairo, Carbondale, East St. Louis, Dixon, Danville.

+ +

Mayor Johnson's Campaign.

For the fifth time Tom L. Johnson is a candidate for Mayor of Cleveland (p. 898) after having served four consecutive terms. The active campaign is to open in the big tent on the 14th, with Newton D. Baker, Peter Witt, and Mayor Johnson himself as principal speakers. The traction issue being now out of the way, the taxation issue, overshadowed by the other for several years, now comes to the front. As stated by The Townsman, the Cleveland municipal weekly (p. 958), the real issue is—

the issue of the unjust imposition and distribution of taxes. The laborer's cottage paying more than its share, and the boulevard mansion paying less than its share. The little grocery store paying all that it can stand and the house of big business and the public service corporations paying little or none. All the other evils of our political system fade into insignificance when compared with the evil of unjust taxation.

+ +

Cleveland Traction Settlement.

The traction question in Cleveland (p. 966) is locally regarded as settled. On the 4th the company acknowledged receipt of Judge Tayler's statement (p. 967), and notified the Mayor and the Council that they would "gladly meet the Judge's conditions and proceed immediately upon the lines indicated by him;" and on the same day the Mayor and the Council accepted Judge Tayler's conditions without reservation. Judge Tayler formally agreed on the 6th to act as arbitrator on valuation of the Company's property, and maximum fare to be allowed in the proposed ordinance, and to serve on the committee to draft provisions for the ordinance to secure the city's rights and for taking over and licensing a new company after eight years. This does not actually settle the question; but it does settle the mode of settlement, and the end of the controversy is locally regarded as at hand, with a complete victory for Mayor Johnson's long agitation for security to investors with reasonable profit, and full control for the city pending legis-