

not by any means bring protectionists and free traders together. What separates them is not the principle, but their radically different ways of applying the principle. Free traders contend that the only thing that can be trusted to determine as to any trade whether or not it benefits both parties, is the mutual agreement of the parties themselves. But protectionists go upon the theory that traders cannot be trusted to decide whether their trades are mutually beneficial, and that therefore government must interfere. In a word, protection is paternalistic while free trade is individualistic.

The Pall Mall Gazette has queer notions about economic phenomena. It is quoted as having said, apropos of the recent action of Parliament in the land value taxation bill (vol. vi, p. 793), that all taxation, according to the free trade fiscal theory, falls eventually upon the consumer, and then to have made the following sapient comment:

The consumer of land values is, of course, the tenant.

Tenants will be pleased to know this, for they have been under the impression that it is the landlords who do the consuming of the food, clothing, etc., that go to make up the item of land value in the distribution of products.

Judge Grosscup's efforts to manage some of the most important legislative affairs of the city of Chicago through the Federal courts have encountered a merited rebuke from the Federal Court of Appeals to which an extraordinary decision of his in this matter was carried for review. We had occasion last Summer (vol. vi, p. 242) to criticise Judge Grosscup's apparent policy in connection with the Chicago traction question. At that time we referred to the indications that some of the traction litigation in his court appeared to have been brought there by collusion, nominally to conserve traction property for the benefit of New York

creditors, but really for the purpose of securing the aid of a national court in forcing the city to extend the terms of local traction franchises. Judge Grosscup's action in connection with this subject has certainly been interesting. He has talked more like a traction manager than a judicial conservator of assets; and judicially he has gone to the extent of issuing injunctions forbidding legal proceedings in the State courts in a collateral controversy. It was from this decision that the appeal in question was taken, and we are glad to be able to say that the higher court has not only reversed Judge Grosscup, but in respect to the contention in his behalf that he is endeavoring to make a complete street cars system for Chicago, has administered this rebuke:

Without question the combination of all the railways under one management and control is an imperial scheme, possibly conducive to the public welfare, possibly beneficial to the three companies interested, and possibly lifting the Union Traction out of its insolvent condition; but the property was not taken by the court to carry out grand schemes founded on supposed future benefits. It has the property simply to conserve it in the interests of creditors, caring for it, indeed, with due regard to public interests, because it is impressed with a public service. But a scheme like that proposed should be entered upon and carried out by those interested and whose money is at stake, and should not be imposed upon them unwillingly through the action of the court.

Judge Grosscup announces in a newspaper interview that he will instruct his receivers to appeal. That is doubtless not an improper thing to do. But were he to take the hint of the court above him, no just private interest would suffer and the traction question in Chicago would be greatly simplified.

In saying last week (p. 19) that Frank Stephens and Samuel Milliken were "attendants" at the Emma Goldman meeting which the police of Philadelphia arbitrarily suppressed, we did not mean that they were attendants in the more common sense of serving the meeting in any capacity, but that they were in attendance

with the design of becoming auditors. They were not promoters of the meeting. They were simply private citizens, who, attracted by the advertisements of the meeting, were attempting peaceably to enter the hall. Following is Mr. Milliken's account of the exasperating affair:

Desiring to hear Miss Goldman, we tried to enter the hall, but found policemen barring the way. We did not attempt to force a passage, but courteously inquired for the lieutenant in charge. We were pushed back to the middle of the pavement, where we again made inquiry for the lieutenant. We were then pushed into the street, and upon repeating our inquiry were seized and taken to the police station. We had no connection with the meeting, nor with anarchism, we being single taxers of long standing. The people of Philadelphia have been described as "Corrupt and Contented." If they can calmly stand such outrageous violations of the rights of free speech and peaceable assemblage, their Liberty Bell should be sold for junk.

A complaisant police magistrate imposed \$5 fines upon Stephens, Milliken, and three others similarly related to the affair, and from his decision an appeal has been taken.

Americans who are jealous of the good old American doctrine of free speech and free assembly will be glad to know that this outrage at Philadelphia is not to be passed over in silence. Besides the pending legal proceedings, free speech societies are organizing, and on the 17th a large meeting was held at Odd Fellows' Temple, Philadelphia, to protest against the tyrannical action of the police authorities. This meeting was presided over by George Brown, and the principal speakers were Hugh O. Pentecost and George Gluyas Mercer. Resolutions were adopted which we reproduce:

Whereas, On April 10, 1904, a public meeting was called to listen to an address by Miss Emma Goldman in Odd Fellows' Hall, Philadelphia, her subject being "The Tragedy of Woman's Emancipation;" and, whereas, the police, acting under orders from the Director of Public Safety, forcibly prevented an exercise of the rights of peaceable assemblage and free speech, arresting five men who attempted peaceably to enter the hall. Resolved, That this meeting

of citizens of Philadelphia denounces this lawlessness of officials sworn to protect citizens in their rights. Especially does it condemn Mayor Weaver and Director Smith, principals in this wrong. Resolved, That this meeting requests its managers to reengage Miss Goldman to deliver in this hall the prohibited lecture. Let the lawlessness of the Mayor and his Director be further tested and exposed. The rights of free speech and peaceable assemblage must not be surrendered.

Not all the Philadelphia papers take sides with the Russianistic police of that city in this matter. The Record, the North American, and the Public Ledger are united in condemning the dangerous outrage. Says the Record, for example, "the police in Philadelphia will find full employment at all times in dealing with actual law-breakers without themselves being employed to break the law under pretense of preventing unintended crime."

When John Turner, the English anarchist whose case under the deportation law is pending in the United States Supreme Court (p. 26) spoke to a Chicago audience on the 17th, his sentiments were so lofty, his language so promotive of peace and good will, that the Chicago papers were at a loss for blood-curdling material. One of them impudently twisted Turner's meanings to serve its own malignant purposes; while others hinted that he has usually been violent in his speeches but on this occasion had played in a peaceable role because there were disguised policemen in the hall. The truth is that Turner's speeches have always been of a kind to make for peace and order; any impression to the contrary has been manufactured by the non-yellow sensational press. Whatever we may think of the soundness of anarchistic philosophy, it does not involve disorder; and the attempts to prohibit thinking and speaking about it are as lawless in their purpose as the worst thing that is charged to anarchists. To kill free thought and free speech should rank in every free country in the highest grade of crime. There is encouragement in the

fact, in circumstances like these, that such a man as George Gluyas Mercer, who spoke at the protest meeting in Philadelphia, and such a man as Western Starr, who presided at the Turner meeting in Chicago, are ranging themselves publicly, and at the risk of professional sacrifice, in favor of free speech, free thought and unmolested assemblage in behalf of men and women whose opinions they do not accept. It is easy to sacrifice for freedom to propagate one's own pet views; it is a different matter to stand up for an equal right for opposing views.

Some editorial criticism has recently been made by a writer who charges the managing men on newspapers, not those on "yellow journals" alone, with publishing false news. One of the critics protests that—

editors of large newspapers do not order "fakes," but take pains to keep them out. They are sensitive to the reputation of their papers for truthfulness; they have the caution that goes with responsibility, the experience that enables them to discriminate with a precision that would be absolutely impossible to an inexperienced critic, who would go wrong ten times to the veteran's once. Newspapers run as adjuncts to stock jobbing operations form an insignificant percentage of the press of the country. Deliberate lying in news reports for the purpose of misrepresentation is not the practice of newspapers of standing.

This is both true and untrue; true in a minor sense, untrue in a major sense.

It is true that as a rule responsible editors do not order "fakes" and do try to keep them out of their papers. Nevertheless, the "spirit of the office" in every newspaper is such as to encourage "faking" by reporters and correspondents. When the reporter learns that only "interesting news stories" are acceptable, he is apt to take pains to make his news "interesting" whether the facts warrant it or not. When he learns that news stories so told as to harmonize with "the policy of the paper" yield laurels to the writer, while the unvarnished truth is put

to shame, he is apt to fall into the habit of writing up (or down) to "the policy of the paper." And in this tendency he is not discouraged provided he "turns in good copy." Again, it is true that only a few newspapers are run as adjuncts to stock-jobbing operations. But the more important fact is also true, that most newspapers can be influenced by subtle and secret though well known coercive methods to respond to the demands of stock-jobbing whenever occasion requires. How many of the Chicago papers, for instance, could escape the ramifying "business" influences of the Chicago banks, if any stock-jobbing scheme in which the Chicago banks are interested were at stake? Yet only one Chicago paper is actually run by a banker. Deliberate lying in news reports for the purpose of misrepresentation is indeed not the practice of newspapers of standing. But it is the history of most newspapers of present standing—and every newspaper man of experience knows it—that they do promote policies and objects surreptitiously by means of fanciful descriptions, ingenious insinuations, and deliberate suppressions. There are very few newspapers in the United States that can be depended upon in emergencies to direct their course by journalistic considerations—not even by the low ideals of the business office; much less by the higher but less profitable ones, it may be, of the editorial chair. When great interests are at stake, almost any newspaper in the country must yield to influences entirely alien to the primary obligations which every newspaper owes to its readers.

One of the best citizens of Chicago is William Kent (a man of rich endowments, not only as to private fortune but also as to private character and public spirit), who recently delivered an uplifting lecture on civic duties before the City Government Club of Yale University. Mr. Kent once served the city of Chicago courageously and efficiently as an alderman, and