

violent shouts of affirmation from more than 1,000 intensely excited listeners interrupted the singer taxer when he flung out the foregoing assertion as a reflection on the patriotism of the audience at the socialistic-single tax debate in West Twelfth Street Turner Hall yesterday afternoon. "Yes, socialism is revolution, isn't it?" cried the speaker when the noise had subsided. Again the remarkable demonstration made the rafters of the big hall to shudder, and for several minutes pandemonium seemed on the verge of breaking into violence. "That's what we want!" "Down with capital!" "Hurrah for the red flag!" were cries that could be distinguished.

No one who was present at that meeting could possibly regard the foregoing as a truthful report. It is absolutely false—false in color and false in fact. Other reports indicated that the debaters were at white heat with one another, whereas in fact there was no asperity beyond what may occur in the excitement of any debate and without more than momentarily ruffling anyone's temper.

The second instance relates to the traction hearing before the city council. At the hearing on the 21st John Z. White, representing the Henry George Association, made an able analysis of the proposed ordinance the council committee is considering (p. 584). In the course of his argument, he referred to the fact, now coming to be understood, that in proposing this ordinance the committee are acting under coercion, the Chicago City Railway Company holding over them threats of endless and appalling litigation and forcing from them an ordinance which the committee do not want but which they are powerless to improve. Recognizing this dilemma of the committee, Mr. White proposed a basis of settlement for them to offer the company as being in the nature of a compromise in which each side gives and takes, instead of one in which the city does the giving and the company the taking. Yet the newspaper readers not present at that hearing might fairly suppose that Mr. White had done nothing before the committee but propose

another franchise; and as to the nature of his offer, brief and intelligible as was the form in which he put it, the newspaper reader might keep on guessing to the day of his death if he went no further for information than the local newspapers. If the matter was worth reporting at all it was worth reporting intelligibly.

The editorial instance appeared in one of the leading Chicago papers of the 22d. It was nominally a discussion of a recent report of a committee of the Chicago Federation of Labor on the causes of hard times. The writer had evidently never seen the report. He evidently knew nothing about it except a few extracts culled by reporters, and a list of the contributors. But this was material enough for a sneering, class-contemptuous editorial, which craftily misrepresented without flat perjury, owlishly assumed to instruct without knowledge, and cynically condemned without fair consideration.

Although newspaper men cannot escape responsibility for such breaches of professional obligation, it is to be noted that they are, nevertheless, not wholly without excuse. The reporter may be excused because no standards are held up to him but the lowest. Does he fail to catch a speaker's meaning and to reduce the speech to the allowed space while preserving its substance? That is because reports that do not fail in that respect do fail to get published. What the city editor wants is something exciting, and the reporter tries to "make good" by culling sensational features without much regard for general subject matter. And all the way up some such lack of journalistic ideal exercises its influence until you come to the editor-in-chief, who in turn is controlled by the counting room, which in turn is controlled by the big merchant who threatens a withdrawal of patronage, or by the piratical capitalist who owns the whole concern, from publisher to office boy,

from editor to cub reporter. This is the season to reform.

Another exemplification of an official tendency to violate the law in the name of the law, is furnished by the police authorities of Paterson, N. J. A meeting was to have been held there a few days ago, similar to that in New York city (p. 563), to protest against the act of Congress under which John Turner (p. 584) is held for deportation—an act which excludes foreigners for "disbelieving in organized government" and makes it a crime for Americans to invite such foreigners to this country. This perfectly lawful meeting was forcibly prevented from assembling. A body of police barred the way to the hall.

One of the speakers advertised to address that meeting was Bolton Hall, a son of the late Rev. John Hall, the distinguished Presbyterian clergyman. Bolton Hall is a lawyer of standing and an author of note. He is withal a man of peace, who respects the law and upholds public order. His account of the lawlessness of the Paterson police is reported by the New York Herald of the 12th as follows:

Mr. Hall protested, saying that the hall had been hired, the meeting all arranged, that it would be orderly and had been advertised. The policeman in charge said he had orders from the chief of police not to allow any meeting and that the chief had his orders from Mayor Hinchliffe. Mr. Hall said he and his party went to see the chief of police at headquarters. He told them no meeting should take place and that the Mayor had ordered it stopped. The Mayor was appealed to. "He was hot," said Mr. Hall. "He refused to let the meeting go on." Mr. Hall wrote a letter to the editor of the Paterson Guardian in regard to the refusal to allow the meeting to be held. In the letter he wrote:—

The meeting was not called to spread Turner's doctrine or in favor of Turner, but to protest against a law which can be easily extended to threaten the liberty of every one, alien or native. This law has been condemned by such papers as the Outlook, the Independent, the Evening Post and the Brooklyn Eagle, and by such men as Senator Hoar, the Rev. Dr. Thomas C. Hall and Carl Schurz. An appeal to the chief of police personally elicited only the information that the Chief was powerless and that we must see the Mayor, which we did. The Mayor was excited and refused to listen to argument or even to reason.

He was told that the Constitution guaranteed the right of peaceable assemblage, but he merely laughed. Offers of guarantees as to the order of the meeting and as to the character of the speakers were ignored. It was explained that neither Turner nor the proposed speakers advocated violence, but the Mayor replied that he knew that "You people disbelieve in government and if you had your way we would not be running things." The latter statement was undeniably true. In my opinion neither the people of Paterson nor even the Mayor, much less the Federal authorities, can be afraid of Turner's disbelief in government. What they are afraid of is the organization of labor so ably represented by Turner.

Persecution for opinions' sake takes different forms in different places and times. Missouri at the present time furnishes an interesting instance of expulsion from civil office for no other reason than that the official has written a novel in which certain politicians in power think they see themselves as others see them, and don't like the portraits. Speed Mosby is the victim. He is deputy clerk of the Missouri Supreme Court and has been for many years. Nothing is alleged against his ability or fidelity. But in "Ben Blunt," a novel he has recently published, he sketches several political types. There is nothing personal, it appears, in these sketches. They are just types. But the politicians don't like the types—not when made visible to the naked eye of the citizen. Yet they appropriate the descriptions to themselves instinctively, and vent their indignation upon the unhappy because too perceptive author. "Ben Blunt" ought to be good reading for people who wish to see portraits of Missouri politicians which are so deftly sketched as to be easily recognized without a label, by the subjects themselves.

Archbishop Quigley, of Chicago, stands in a slippery place if he advocates, as he is reported to have done at a meeting of the Roman Catholic Woman's League in Chicago last week, that the State furnish the Roman Catholic church a fund for the maintenance of Roman Catholic schools. His argument, as reported, is that—

The State must provide schools for the minority as well as for the majority.

The State should divide the public school system and maintain a separate system for the minority—separate in the sense of religious teaching. The two systems could be under one control, but in the Catholic division Catholic principles should be taught. This would give the minority an equal chance with the majority. This would be just and equitable, but not satisfactory to the Protestants. The cry all over is for non-sectarian education. The Catholic schools are recognized by the State, but they are not supported by the State because non-Catholics believe that it would be dangerous for the State to support them.

We can conceive of nothing better calculated than this to revive in the United States the almost obsolete hatred once vigorously entertained by non-Catholics for Catholics. Moreover, the demand is utterly indefensible from any point of view but that of medieval European ecclesiasticism. The only defense of the public school system is that the State should provide opportunities for secular education, in order that all may have the ordinary educational benefits. Religious education is another matter. If the public school officials try to proselyte Catholic children through unfair teachers or unfair books, that is good ground of complaint. Any fair-minded non-Catholic will acknowledge it as such, and will volunteer his influence to correct the wrong—provided he is not thereby placed in a false position by demands of Catholic dignitaries for public money for church uses. But religious teaching is wholly a private matter. To make it a public matter with reference to one kind of religious teaching would make it so with reference to all kinds. Consequently if one division of the public school system were given over to Catholic teaching it could be logically insisted that the other should be divided up into sub-divisions of Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Methodists, Baptists, Disciples, Christian Scientists and the rest, and also agnostics and atheists.

A jury composed wholly of women sat in a Chicago court of record last week. It was impaneled by Judge Honore. The question

turned upon the separation of a little child from its mother, a friendless widow. So extreme was the mother's poverty, she could not bring up the child properly. But with all her poverty the mother-love was intense. She testified she could not live without her child. A jury of men was in the box. At this point Judge Honore invited a jury of women to sit and advise the jury of men. The jury of women promptly decided that the mother must not be separated from her child. Nor were they at a loss for method. If the child is dependent, they said, so is the mother. Both are dependent. Then let them go together to an institution where they need not be separated. It was a Solomonic verdict, one the jury of men would probably never have reached. But the man jury had to adopt it formally before it could have legal effect. Women are competent to advise male juries, it seems; but God forbid that any woman be allowed to serve on a real jury, while the duty of home-making calls for her at afternoon teas or the domestic washtub.

In memory of David Kennison, the last surviving member of that party of anarchists who threw the tea into Boston harbor a century and a quarter ago, a memorial stone was erected last week in Chicago. How true it is that the mobs of one generation become the heroes of another—provided the purpose they did the mobbing for "wins out."

If only three members of Congress paid railway fare to Washington to attend the special session of Congress, though all drew mileage at about four times the actual cost, who were the others? Baker was one, but who were the other two? Congressman Hepburn ought to have their names, so that he may insult them on the floor, as he did Baker, for refusing railway passes.

Is it "Alton B." Parker that the Wall street Democrats are put-