

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

he continues to serve it as a thoughtful and watchful citizen who peculiarly deserves the title of "Man-not-afraid." In his Yale address he disclosed a good deal of social philosophy that would be distinguished for "scatter," were that vice distinctive in these days of induction worship; and he was not as careful as he might have been, and as we are sure he would wish to be, about some of his facts. His "scatter" was quite altruistic, however, and by no means wholly devoid of good sense; for he urged his youthful hearers to find the good in such discordant things as socialism, anarchism, the single tax idea, etc., and advised them "at any rate to go at them all open-mindedly and work with the good they found in each."

It would be interesting to know why Mr. Kent clings to the perverted meaning of "laissez faire," which implies that legal privilege must be let alone. Manifestly the true meaning of the principle is to abolish legal privilege and then let things alone—in other words, to remove artificial economic obstructions and let nature take her course. Even more interesting would it be to know what Mr. Kent alluded to when he said that in parts of Russia land tenures are adjusted on the single tax basis. Probably this allusion was to some of the Russian communes where a primitive land communism persists. But primitive land communism is no more like the single tax than a locomotive is like a baby's go-cart. Locomotives and go-carts move upon wheels, but there the resemblance ends; primitive communism and the single tax recognize equality of right to the soil, but there their resemblance ends. Evidently Mr. Kent has not thought enough of the single tax, of anarchism, or of socialism to warrant his talking out in meeting very often about any of them. But he does aim to be fair, and that is much. His admonition to the students to avoid fear of names, was excellent; and there was courage as well as wisdom and fairness in

his condemnation of the current ignorant and malevolent attacks upon anarchism as a propaganda of high crimes. Crude, also, as is his conception of the single tax idea, he nevertheless exhibited a tolerant disposition by acknowledging that equal rights to the earth are inherent rights, even though he did tack on the questioning proviso of the University cult, "if there are any such things as inherent rights."

But there are worse failings in the active public men of our time than crudity of thought, and Mr. Kent is singularly free from most of them. However crude and superficial he may in some respects have been in his somewhat immature Yale address to minds not altogether mature nor exactly well informed, his face is turned in the right direction. He looks toward the rising sun of democracy, and for that attitude much of defective-detail may be forgiven. It is with great satisfaction that we quote his opening sentence:

There is no more tiresome platitude urged by those who expound government than that democracy is on trial. Besides being a platitude, it is a falsehood. For democracy is no more on trial than the law of gravitation. It is the ultimate truth. And just as the child may come to grief in his experiments with the law of gravitation, so we may come to grief in trying, in our unripeness, to practice democracy. It is we who are on trial, and not the only theory of government that can long subsist.

There is more sound social philosophy in that compact paragraph of Mr. Kent's than in a whole college course of what sometimes passes for sociology.

THE NEW YORK PLATFORM.

Judge Parker's platform, adopted by the New York convention this week, is a marvel; it says so little in such few words. Bourke Cockran calls it "a string of platitudes." But that is not wholly just, for each platitude is a gem after its own kind. Not a solitary one could excite hostility in the most discordant company. Abounding in generalities and abhorring specifications, its im-

portant words are weasel words which may mean anything you want or nothing at all, as you please. One writer describes its brevity well as the brevity not of wit but of dodge.

Nothing is so significant of poverty as to policies of the Democratic party in New York, as Judge Parker's teeter-totter platform. Its true inwardness is more than hinted at by Mr. Bryan when he refers to it as an attempt to work "a confidence game upon the public."

Perhaps a brief consideration of the planks seriatum of this "razzle-dazzle" platform may be worth while.

The first plank is refreshingly brave in stating what nobody denies:

1. This is a government of laws, not of men; one law for Presidents, cabinets, and people; no usurpation; no executive encroachment upon the legislative or judicial departments.

Excellent. But with whom will that declaration raise a political issue? Who has usurped, and how? Who has encroached, and when? While men of all parties agree to the principle, all might not agree as to the application of the principle to specific controversies. But no specific controversies are named.

Next.

2. We must keep inviolate the pledges of our treaties; we must renew and reinvigorate within ourselves that respect for law and that love of liberty and of peace which the spirit of military domination tends inevitably to weaken and destroy.

Precisely. Likewise we must be good and true and beautiful in our lives. But who denies any of it? Where is the issue?

Next.

3. Unsteady national policies and a restless spirit of adventure engender alarms that check our commercial growth. Let us have peace, to the end that business confidence may be restored, and that our people may again in tranquillity enjoy the gains of their toil.

"Restless spirit of adventure" is probably a veiled allusion to Roosevelt; but you can't make an issue of that. Roosevelt's own party would agree to the sentiment; but they would see nothing in it condemnatory either of them-