our own people, and that the system of indirect taxation by which such expenditures must be met bears most heavily upon those least able to contribute. My votes have been cast to the end of encouraging normal production and cheapened distribution, and in contravention to theories of subsidy and privilege. If elected for another term, I shall, as in this term, vote as I have pledged myself to vote—against privilege, for a greater measure of social and economic justice, without partisan or sectional bias. I believe that the great office is a national office, and that our country demands the services of men who find it their highest duty to be national Congressmen.

Campaigning for Deneen in Whispers.

Says the Chicago Record-Herald, slyly, "A vote for Frank H. Funk," the nominee of the Progressive Party for Governor of Illinois, "will be a vote for Edward F. Dunne." Since the Record-Herald wants to elect Deneen, why does it say that such a vote will be a vote for Dunne instead of saying it will be a vote *against* Deneen? Is it merely rhetoric? Or is there a reason for supposing that Republicans opposed to Deneen may be scared back to him by shaking Dunne at them as a mysterious scarecrow? There is certainly nothing against Dunne of a personal nature; he is as estimable a gentleman as Deneen. There is certainly nothing of a political nature; his political record, in every respect, ecclesiastical included, will stand scrutiny better than Deneen's. What, then, is the Record-Herald's reason for being so "dev'lish sly"? Why not stop whispering? Why not speak in plain terms? Why not come out into the open, where the facts about Dunne may try conclusions with insinuations against him?

THE FIRST NATIONAL NEWSPAPER CONFERENCE.

The defensive editorials that have appeared in some of the large newspapers, regarding the conference on the relation of newspapers to public interests, at the Wisconsin University last week, as well as the defensive speeches and papers by professional newspaper men at that conference, fully justify a pointed use of emphasis in quoting from one of the defensive editorials. It appeared in the Record-Herald of July 31st, and is in part as follows, except that the typographical emphasis is ours:

Is there a single newspaper publisher or editor who does not profess moral obligations and public spirit? Does a single newspaper admit that it is destitute of ideals and principles and is a mere money-maker, selling news without regard to its character or effect? There are editors who ought to be in jail and editors whose place is the private asylum, but there are no editors who openly repudiate moral, civic and social obligations.

If the proceedings at the conference, and the newspaper attitude toward them, are trustworthy guides, there is indeed probably no newspaper publisher or editor whose professions and admissions and open repudiations are otherwise than the Record-Herald implies. Far be it from us, however, to raise any question of honesty. Not bad faith but unsophistication, would seem to be the weakness of your proudly professional newspaper man.

He really doesn't seem to know that the great newspaper institutions of modern times are controlled by self-seeking private interests to the detriment of public interests. Seemingly, too, he does his thinking so loosely as to imagine that this indictment is refuted by evidence of the gentlemanly virtues or popular fighting qualities of newspapers that are not so controlled, and by testimony to the good behavior of those that are, when they deal with matters about which the "control" is not concerned. He appears to be incapable also of thinking in the abstract, for he ignores the question of whether in the nature of things the editorial function can be performed faithfully if wholly dependent upon money-making motives.

At the Madison conference there were several specific questions, nearly all of them revolving about one problem—the issue of whether newspapers can be run as a mere "business proposition" if they are to play their due part in social advance.

Hinging upon that central problem were such questions as the truth-telling tendencies of newspapers, their impartiality in news reports, the fidelity of news-gathering agencies, the influence upon journalism of non-journalistic ownerships, and the question of whether commercial journalism can make good in social advance, coupled with two tentative proposals for newspaper reform.

One proposed reform was the endowed newspaper, and another the publicly owned newspaper; neither of them as a substitute for the money-making newspaper, but either or both as affording another than the money-making kind of competition.

The problem seemed easy enough to grasp, and Professor Ross made it easier by a clear-cut analysis, supplemented with a question of his own. "Trained journalists" could easily have answered

his question if they were trained to serve the public interest, but at the conference the question was evaded and by the big newspapers it is ignored. The plain problem, as presented by the program and analyzed by Professor Ross, was whether the business influences of journalism have not encroached upon editorial functions until editorial ethics have been well nigh swamped.

To consider here the first of the questions leading up to the central problem, can any sensible man suppose that newspaper readers are getting from the newspapers all the truth they are entitled to—that is, that the newspapers *profess* to give?

It is no answer to fall back upon human imperfection, as some of the newspaper defenders do. The indictment against newspapers is not for innocent imperfections. What is charged is that, consciously and for a purpose in the service of secretly allied private interests, newspapers systematically deceive their confiding readers. Nor is it any answer to show that *some* newspapers do not deceive consciously, nor to show that all newspapers are truthful in commonplace matters. And the apologists who say that newspapers must tell the truth or die, ignore the fact that they don't die until they get an all-round reputation for falsifying, which is long after they have done the damage they intend to do.

As to impartiality in news reports, news-gathering agencies may no doubt be fairly challenged; but a good many of their sins against impartiality might be charged more fairly to the blue pencil practices of editors. News associations, like news reporters, have to adjust their service to what is wanted by the institutions they serve.

Of the non-journalistic interests of newspaper owners, nothing in this world is more certain than that they are heavy handicaps upon faithful journalism.

Finally, in our opinion, commercial journalism cannot make good, except commercially. And this in the very nature of things; for like produces like. And the more successful newspapers are commercially, the less useful are most of them likely to be with reference to any kind of social advance except the money-making kind.

We are not prepared, however, to adopt either of the two proposed reforms—endowed papers nor publicly owned papers. We shall attempt nothing more than to explain *why* we do not believe that the newspaper, if it is run merely as a business proposition, can "make good" by playing its due part in social advance.

What is social advance?

It is not pioneering, to be sure; but neither is it skulking or lagging behind.

No paper plays its due part in social advance if it stays in the rear until advances are made. To slambang Negro slavery now, is not to play a due part in social advance. That is a social advance which has been accomplished. The same thing is nearly true of woman suffrage, or the Initiative and Referendum. The struggle for them is almost over. To play a due part in social advance means being "on deck during the storm."

The relation of the newspaper to social advance is twofold—editorial and financial.

Editorially, the newspaper has to do with public affairs without reference to private interests. In that respect it is like the Y. M. C. A., which would be an irreverent joke if it were run merely as a business proposition, whether professedly so run or not.

The editorial function is not like the storekeeper's. Storekeepers perform their functions when they give money's worth for money's worth. Not so with the editor. His functions are more like those of the fireman, the policeman, the judge, the juror, the clergyman, the teacher, and often of the sailor, whose services to those who pay them rise above money-making and go beyond money's worth.

We are not including trade papers. They profess to serve the money maker *as* money maker, and there their obligation ends. But the editorial function of the newspaper does not end there. It doesn't even begin there. This obligation is primarily to the public. Newspapers not only admit that it is, but boast of it; and we all adopt their boast—or did until we began to find out what an empty boast it is.

What, then, is the due part of the newspaper *editorially* in matters of social advance? Isn't it to report fairly and lucidly the important facts regarding all manifestations of social advance that tend to excite public interest; and in commenting upon them to do so honestly, intelligently and instructively, whether mistakenly or not?

But those functions cannot be performed without financial support. The newspaper has a *financial* as well as an editorial problem to solve.

How shall it solve its financial problem? Shall it be a business proposition simply, like the storekeeper's business?

The "trained newspaper" man, put on the defensive by the conference at Madison, says Yes.

His audiences said No. And he was unsophisticated enough about his own business to be surprised thus to learn that public opinion is losing confidence in newspapers.

And why shouldn't it lose confidence? The facts are against reposing confidence in newspapers. So are business methods. The exclusively business proposition with reference to the newspaper implies that newspapers shall be established only by means of speculative investments, and when established shall be regarded primarily as money-making concerns. This conception of a newspaper *financially*, is utterly at variance with the boastfully proclaimed and once accepted ideal of the newspaper *editorially*. It means that the editorial function is to do the conventionally honest things that may be profitable, and to leave undone all things that are likely to be unprofitable.

In no other way can the newspaper hope to survive simply as a business proposition. But in no such way can it play its due part in social advance.

Although we take no positive position with reference to an alternative to the exclusively business proposition, we may suggest, as was repeatedly urged by advocates of these reforms at the Madison conference, that the total abolition of money-making newspapers is not a necessary, nor probably a desirable, alternative.

The fact remains, however, that *if* the newspaper is to play its due part in social advance, the money-making type of newspaper must be confronted somehow with a species of competition which will make for social righteousness in the performance of editorial functions.

As mere money-making institutions, newspapers are bound sooner or later to deserve the distinction which that delightful mediaeval traveler, Sir John Mandeville, quaintly gave the bedouin Arabs, when he said that "they are right felonious and foul and of a cursed nature." There are few great newspapers that do not already deserve this distinction. And not alone those of the so-called yellow press; for worse by far than disreputable *yellow* newspapers, are reputable *black* ones.

Of the true character of dominant newspaper agencies in the reputable field, we repeat that your happy-go-lucky optimist of a newspaper man has no notion whatever, unless he is a boastful liar, which he confessedly does not intend to be.

He does his daily "stunt" for daily pay. He is proud of his occupation if his own personal pay be good. He is happy in bohemian associations, and ambitious of professional promotion. Loyal to "the policy" of the paper whose owners think they "feed him," and say so in the inner recesses of clubs where he is not admitted but hopes to be some time, he writes what he has learned to know is "wanted," and then he talks abroad of newspapers with the sanctimonious imbecility of a corporation lawyer defending a bench of corporation judges.

Tell him that he writes under instruction, and he replies with the innocent face of a child (or of an habitual joker) that never in all his long newspaper service has he been instructed to write anything he didn't wish to write. As if instructions were necessary for any but "untrained" newspaper men!

Tell him that advertisers control the newspaper press, and with the same innocence (actual or assumed) he assures you that no advertiser, however big, dares to give orders to *his* paper. As if orders were necessary with reference to the common interests of any large advertising class! Such interests, for example, as profit from hunger-wages in the department stores and their terrible consequences to American womanhood.

Tell him that great financial interests rule the newspaper press to the public injury, and he reminds you patronizingly of the indispensable service of newspapers to civilization; and out of the depths of his wisdom as an expert he enlightens you with assurances that lying newspapers are dying newspapers. As if he really thought you were accusing all successful newspapers of lying about all things all the time!

Working and "worked" newspaper men are probably the poorest witnesses to the evils of a newspaper system endowed—*endowed* is the right word—by big advertisers and big privilege-grabbers. The best witnesses are those newspaper readers who contrast what they hear or see, with the newspaper reports of it; or who study newspaper reports of what they know to be true in matters that vitally concern big interests.

Let us cite a mild example in connection with the newspaper conference of last week—the same pioneer conference that has surprised some very nice and unsophisticated gentlemen of the "trained-newspaper-man" variety, into a suspicion that newspaper readers are losing faith in news reports just as they long ago lost faith in editorials.

Mr. George H. Dunlop of Los Angeles told the conference of a successful journalistic experiment

in his city—the publication by the city of a local newspaper of its own. We should say that his was an excellent contribution to the conference, the best of all in that it was the only description of an actual experiment that was or could be submitted; but as we publish it entire in this week's Public, our readers may judge of its quality for themselves.

Mr. Dunlop referred incidentally to the possibilities of a municipally owned daily paper, making his approval unmistakable. His reservations were only those of a man who, while able to speak from actual experience of a publicly owned weekly, could speak of a publicly owned daily only in theory except as a successful weekly might cast a side light upon the subject. He was firm, however, in favoring daily newspapers covering the entire field of journalism and owned and published by cities in competition with the privately owned papers. Yet the Chicago Tribune and other Chicago papers of August 2, reported Mr. Dunlop in such manner as to carry an impression to their readers quite different from those he advanced and was understood by his audience to have expressed.

For convenience of comparison, we publish each statement in full, and in parallel columns, the typographical emphasis being our own:

Dunlop's Own Words.

We come now, very briefly, to a theoretical consideration of the question, **Do we need a municipally owned daily newspaper covering the entire field of journalism** —telegraphic news, home and foreign, local news of all kinds, accidents, crimes, sports, etc., etc.? I am free to say that I do not believe the affirmative answer to this question can be given with the same unhesitating positiveness with which the question of the weekly municipal paper for municipal affairs can be answered; but, nevertheless, I still believe that **this** second **question should also be answered in the affirmative.** [Here follows an extended argument for the publicly owned daily, concluding as follows]: Give us a high grade, publicly owned, daily newspaper, distributed free to every home in the city, and much that is bad in the other newspapers will cease to be profitable and will disappear.

The Chicago Tribune's Report.

Madison, Wis., Aug. 1.—The Municipal News, owned by Los Angeles, Cal., was described before the national newspaper conference to-day by Geo. H. Dunlop of the municipal newspaper commission. He expressed the opinion that such a publicly owned newspaper is an inevitable necessity generally and that the day is coming when it will arrive. **Mr. Dunlop did not believe, however, that there is need for a municipally owned daily newspaper covering the entire field of journalism. Its peculiar province, he said, should be municipal affairs, and it need not be published oftener than weekly.** "Give us a high grade, publicly owned daily newspaper, distributed free to every home in the city, and much that is bad in the other newspapers will cease to be profitable and will disappear," he said.

We do not intend to imply that "one swallow makes a summer." If this were a singular instance, it would be negligible—except to Mr. Dunlop, whom it places in a false position. But the instance is not singular; it is typical—and a modest specimen into the bargain.

Neither do we insist that this instance is of anything worse than an innocent error. But if it be an innocent error, isn't the fact significantly curious that the error happens to favor the money-making theory of journalism? A correct quotation from Mr. Dunlop is immediately preceded with a paragraph advising the hasty reader that the quotation means the reverse of what it says. May not "newspaper training" have had something to do with that perversion?

That newspaper men are as yet unawake to the moral significance of twisted reporting (or editing) is not remarkable. Newspapers haven't developed a system of ethics with moral fiber in it. They haven't developed an ethical system even up to the level of good manners. So true is this that well bred young men who go to learn newspaper work—and not only of the "yellow" kind, either—are startled during their apprenticeship into wondering whether one can be a newspaper man and a gentleman too. So true is it, that well bred men who find employment on a gentlemen's newspaper, as some of them now and then do, are prone to boast of the all-round aristocratic morality of their particular paper; as if this were proof of the virtue of journalism in general!

But an awakening has set in, even among "trained newspaper men."

It was something for some of them to learn—as those who observed the audiences at Madison volunteered the admission that they did learn—that public opinion is losing confidence in the editorial integrity of money-making journalism. It will be more, much more, when the working force on newspapers allow themselves to see and faithfully to report, at newspaper conferences if other avenues are closed, what goes on back of the scenes in their own vocation.

What are the influences that set "the policy" of their papers—to which they are so complacently loyal in editorial, in cartoon, in joke, and in the discoloration of news—is a branch of journalistic detective enterprise to which the workers on great newspapers may well give attention, since they boast of so profound an innocence on the subject.

Let us hope, and with reason, that when the

next national newspaper conference meets, some time next year and at the Madison University, it will be participated in by newspaper men of public spirit and moral stamina as well as professional "training," and be reported and commented upon in a candid spirit by the newspapers of civic pretensions.

Let us hope, and with reason, that an awakening among newspaper men, corresponding to that among newspaper readers, will meanwhile have taken place.

Let us hope, and with reason, that the spirit of boastfully claiming for money-making newspapers a public virtue they manifestly do not possess and possibly cannot in the nature of things acquire, will by that time have given way to something like the inward *conviction* which religionists hold to be the absolutely necessary pre-requisite to genuine *conversion*.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

POLITICAL DISINTEGRATIONS.

Boston, Mass.

Perhaps the impressions of one who has felt that Colonel Roosevelt was a necessity of his time, a moving force for radicalism in his party, and on the whole to be preferred either to Mr. Taft or a conservative Democrat, may have some interest for the readers of The Public. Wilson is for me an entirely satisfactory candidate, and Mr. Bryan seems to me to occupy the greatest post of any public man in the United States, to be entitled to the warmest gratitude of his party and the country.

Most of the former Roosevelt men whom I meet here in Boston, in New York and elsewhere, are now for Wilson; and some of these men by no means feel that Roosevelt even now is solely a self-seeker. An extremely radical Bostonian who did what he could to have Roosevelt nominated at Chicago, told me the other day that he was for Wilson because Roosevelt had again declared himself a protectionist. A New Yorker of my acquaintance who has been an enthusiastic Roosevelt man, and who still believes Roosevelt far more patriot than self-seeker, went to Baltimore in the interest of Wilson, and is today his active supporter. I met a Republican from Florida a few days ago, once a strong Roosevelt man, and still a believer in the Colonel's essential honesty of purpose, who expects to vote for Wilson. A Socialist friend writes me from St. Louis in answer to my expression of satisfaction with the nomination of Wilson, declaring his pleasure over the result at Baltimore, though with the natural qualifying expression of distrust for both old parties. I met at breakfast on the eve of the Baltimore convention a New Yorker whose name is familiar to most of your readers, a business man, man of letters and active worker in the better kind of politics, who was warmly urging Wilson's nomination, and who, although an old friend of Roosevelt's and long associated with him in various activities, made in a few words the ablest and most temperate arraignment of the Colonel I have ever heard. This is the sort of thing I encounter wherever I go, and as a matter of fact, I have found but two or three of my acquaintances among Roosevelt men who still stand by the Colonel.

As to Massachusetts, if Foss is renominated, as he should be, he will almost certainly be re-elected, and I find few who have any fear that Wilson will not carry the State by at least a handsome plurality. Pellettier's criticism of the courts was in the main more than justified, for they undoubtedly attempted to crush the street car strike by indiscriminate severity in which was reflected the current conservative view as to the rights of wage earners. But Pellettier's criticism would have come from him with a better grace had it not been the almost immediate accompaniment of his announced ambition for the gubernatorial nomination. It is doubtful whether he would bring strength to the State and national ticket, while Foss would undoubtedly run well on his record, and help Wilson.

EDWARD L. VALLANDIGHAM.

NEWS NARRATIVE

The figures in brackets at the ends of paragraphs refer to volumes and pages of The Public for earlier information on the same subject.

Week ending Tuesday, August 6, 1912.

The Roosevelt Party.

Delegates to the national third party convention, organized under the leadership of ex-President Roosevelt, assembled at Chicago on the 5th. [See current volume, page 728.]

Senator Dixon called the convention to order. He introduced ex-Senator Albert J. Beveridge of Indiana as temporary chairman, and Mr. Beveridge was placed in the chair without opposition. After Mr. Beveridge had taken the chair and delivered his address, committees were appointed and the convention adjourned for the day. On the 6th, a large portion of the day was spent in listening to the address of Theodore Roosevelt, who was introduced by the chairman as "the guest of the convention." He was received with enthusiastic demonstrations lasting an hour. At the close of his address the report of the committee on credentials was adopted without opposition. The temporary officers were then unanimously made permanent, and the convention adjourned to the 7th.

A race question arose in the committee on credentials on the 5th relative to the admission of