

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