

with the competitive method of living." They may learn much more of like import, but this is enough to justify their inference—those of them that have read any of George's books—that the editorial writer who filled two-thirds of a column of the Los Angeles Times with that stuff, was either an irresponsible ignoramus or just a hired liar of the garden variety.

* * *

Jane Addams on Police Despotism.

The response of Miss Jane Addams of Hull House, to the more than usually bitter attacks upon social settlements in connection with the Averbuch affair in Chicago (vol. x, pp. 1226, 1232), rises to the needs of the time. It appears in "Charities and the Commons," and it stands as a well founded indictment of police practices that have had the effect of impressing upon our immigrant population a conviction that there is little difference between American liberty and Russian autocracy except the name. The specifications of Miss Addams's calm indictment will come as a surprise to readers who have depended for their news of the Averbuch affair upon newspaper falsifications. All the more should they command attention. One of her statements and comments should be spread far and wide until every body with an American soul realizes its significance. It is this:

There are many hundreds of adherents in the colony [Russian Jews] to the theory that the boy [Averbuch] was obscurely induced to go to the Chief's house by a man in the employ of the Russian government. Certainly nothing could happen which would so well serve the purpose of the Russian government, and the American public is taking it in exactly the way which makes it most valuable to the Russians. Would it not provoke to ironic laughter that very Nemesis which presides over the destinies of nations, if the most autocratic government yet remaining in civilization should succeed in pulling back into its own autocratic methods the youngest and most daring experiment in democratic government which the world has ever seen?

* * *

Police Oppression.

Close upon the heels of the Grady bill (p. 102) against the "sweating" and "mugging" of unconvicted prisoners, as the police call the process, comes a gratifying decision of the Supreme Court of New York sustaining an action for damages against the head of the police force. "Where members of a city police department," so the reported syllabus reads, "seized relator after he had been bailed for an offense and before trial, and carried him to the police station, and there com-

pelled him to submit to be photographed, measured, etc., for the Bertillon system, such conduct constituted a gross violation of relator's right to personal security, and entitled him to sue every person concerned therein for damages." It is true that in this case the prisoner had been released on bail. But the only difference in the personal rights of an accused person awaiting trial on bail and one unable to give bail, is the detention; and the fact that in one case the police detain the prisoner to await trial, and in the other he is in the constructive custody of bondsmen, can make no difference whatever as to his rights in any other respect. It would be a queer state of affairs if rich persons accused of crime were legally exempt from "rogues' gallery" exactions, and the poor and friendless so accused were not.

* * *

Mr. Taft and the Sphinxes.

It is whispered about New York that Mr. Taft made a bad impression before the Sphinx Club, which is an association of allied publishers, advertisers and advertising agents, mostly Republicans. At its April dinner the subject of subsidized journalism had been selected, and in view of his brilliant "get-away" with the bumptious bankers at the Economic Club (vol. x, p. 1111), Mr. Bryan was chosen for the affirmative. Unfortunately, Mr. Bryan could not be in New York at a convenient time, and Mr. Taft was invited instead. The audience was in numbers inferior only to that of the Economic Club when Mr. Bryan addressed it; but the occasion was infinitely inferior in interest. Mr. Taft glued his eyes to a manuscript, departing from its carefully carved phrases not even for an instant. But that wasn't the worst of it. Instead of speaking frankly on subsidized journalism, as it was known Mr. Bryan would have done, or upon any other live subject, Mr. Taft regaled his audience with a discussion of encyclopedic origin upon periodical literature—a subject on which almost any of his hearers, says one of them, "could have given him cards and spades." The effect was unmistakable. Even his friends made no concealment of their profound disappointment. It was what theatrical folk call a "frost," but might better be called a "gloom." And the toastmaster accentuated the gloom by calling for a show of hands on the question of voting for Mr. Taft for President, getting a favorable response of less than 25 per cent. Our correspondent contrasts with this dispiriting affair the appearance of Mr. Bryan before New York audiences exactly similar to this one, except