

ing? If we turn our backs upon the direction in which they go, we shall probably be turning our faces in the direction in which we ought to go.

By that test the course of the progressive voter in New York is plain. Though many genuine progressives oppose Hearst's election, no reactionaries favor it. Though the progressives be not all for him, the reactionaries are all against him. Unless, therefore, the progressive voters of New York are determined to vote against the progressive movement until angels come down to lead it, they belong at this election in the ranks of the followers of Hearst.

---

## EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

---

### THE "INTERESTS" IN MEXICO.

Cullacan, Sinaloa, Mexico, September 7.—It may seem venturesome even to assume the possibility of war between the United States and Mexico. But forewarned is forearmed. Nothing will be lost and something for international peace and national independence may be gained, if the people on both sides of the line are watchful and thoughtful.

+

Public opinion in the United States has taken a course so decidedly hostile to monopoly in all forms, that the captains of the great privilege-holding corporations can have no reasonable hope that under ordinary circumstances they or their money can carry the national election of 1908. But to consider that a peaceable surrender by them of their present power is likely, is to be quite overconfident. At no time in the history of the United States, and seldom in any other country, have the holders of great wealth and privilege yielded without a war.

The plutocrats of the United States, in 1846, provoked an unjust war for the double purpose of despoiling Mexico of a great slave-holding territory, while diverting public attention from the slavery question then being agitated. So in 1895, did the newer interests of monopoly foment the Cuban revolution against Spain, providing the Cubans with money and weapons, while the plutocratic newspapers fairly breathed the spirit of intervention. We do not even know who it was that destroyed the battleship *Maine* at Havana, and thus brought on a war which all efforts until then had failed to precipitate, and which brought subject colonies into the control of the interests, besides, most important, helping to tide over the election of 1900.

The habit of sacrificing nations to themselves is nearly universal among privileged classes threatened with equality. The war in South Africa was fought to acquire a rich subject territory, and save the Jingo power in England. The war in Asia had two objects: to conquer new subject territory, and to save the autocracy of Russia. These wars failed of their greatest objects—the killing of the discontented, and the diverting of public attention from the nation's real enemies. Yet such wars are repeated again and again, and even now the plutocrats of the

United States intend that their nation shall go to war.

+

For years they have visibly been casting about for some suitable country with which to war. Germany offered, but such a nation cannot be despoiled, even if vanquished; Morocco, Venezuela, Santo Domingo, China and Colombia have all been looked over with war in view within three years. But no nation answers the requirements so well as Mexico.

Mexico is contiguous territory. Its government is anti-plutocratic. Above all, while not able to withstand the United States, it can put up a real fight, one that will keep the United States busy until after 1908. Meanwhile, the interests could run things as they please; could buy high per cent. bonds, and could sell embalmed beef to both sides. Afterward, two exhausted nations would be at their mercy: one to be despoiled of Sonora, and the other of its public rights.

+

In a long contest, Mr. Rockefeller has been fairly beaten by President Diaz. Rockefeller's efforts to dominate Mexico have always been met by maneuvers which left him where he began—with the same powers as others have. When Mr. Rockefeller's railroad (the Central) tried to buy the national system, the government bought in ahead of him; when he spoke of acquiring the Mexican oil wells, President Diaz advocated, in a published interview, that they be nationalized. When Mr. Rockefeller contracted to buy the whole oil output, the government proposed to buy his junk line, the Central. At different times, corners and trusts have been established, each time to collapse at the prompt removal of the tariff on the article cornered. And now Mr. Rockefeller is keeping very quiet in Mexico. His feelings, or rather those of his dummies, are very much hurt; and they will not again attempt to do business in such a country as Mexico. Capital will withdraw from the country, we are told, frightened away by the hostile attitude of the unappreciative people and government.

+

Every natural human right is as well guaranteed in Mexico as in the United States, and the vast riches of Mexico are open to all the world. The man in New York has only to ask for what he wants that is Mexico's, and it is his almost for the asking; he need never even see the country in all his life. The sons of the country are not preferred to the man or woman of any land. But the man who takes more than he needs was not even thought of in the simple calculation; and when he appeared on the scene, it was to meet the disapproving watchfulness of an alert government. At every turn the great monopolist, elsewhere always victorious, was quietly checkmated by the man who has never made a million dollars, but has made a nation prosperous and happy. But the interests never give up; they will not relinquish their intention of dominating Mexico. There also must they resort to war, if they are to accomplish their purpose.

+

They have stirred up rumors of revolution, a thing

that for thirty years has been of the past. Probably the riots at the copper camp of Cananea last June were of their making; for the lives of their countrymen are nothing to them, and the copper trust is fully capable of having committed that double treason. Very likely the present insurrection in Cuba, like those fomented in Venezuela by the asphalt trust, comes about through their machinations. How quickly comes the talk of intervention! Did not just such a revolution once take place at Panama?

+

In spite of all the rumors, there is no country so tranquil as Mexico. Not a single one of the great powers of Europe is in a state of internal peace so well cemented as that of Mexico, unless we count Great Britain and Germany as exceptions. Yet Mexico has practically no standing army. There are only about 25,000 men. But present indications seem to point this way: that if at any time it should be possible to stir up some kind of a revolution in Mexico, or even a pretended revolution, the trusts of the United States may be depended upon to do it. If possible, the revolution will be "anti-foreign," and hiring ruffians, the riff-raff of the cities, will be hired with oily money to murder a few American citizens (no matter about them, of course), and stir up as big a disturbance as they can. Of course, this will be considered ground for an immediate invasion from the United States, and thus will follow a war that will not terminate until North America is depleted of brave men. But, no matter for the fallen independence of one nation, or the forgotten republic of the other; no matter for the lost men and broken homes; no matter—to the interests—for the thousands who die upon parching battlefields defending the lost flags.

+

If there are men in Mexico so low as to answer the call for treason which floats across the river, then we may expect that within one or two years some disturbances will be arranged to take place which may be so magnified as to serve as a pretext for intervention. But if there are men in either country who guess the truth, and love freedom, they will not fail to keep a vigilant watch, and give warning of all that may occur; and with them, the peace and liberties of America will be safe.

BUELL BUTTERFIELD.

---

## NEWS NARRATIVE

---

To use the reference figures of this Department for obtaining continuous news narratives:

Observe the reference figures in any article; turn back to the page they indicate and find there the next preceding article on the same subject; observe the reference figures in that article, and turn back as before; continue until you come to the earliest article on the subject; then retrace your course through the indicated pages, reading each article in chronological order, and you will have a continuous news narrative of the subject from its historical beginnings to date.

---

Week ending Wednesday, October 3.

---

The Nomination of William Randolph Hearst.

Strictly in accordance with expectations earlier in the day (pp. 607-08), the Democratic convention of

New York, in session at Buffalo, nominated at a late hour in the evening of the 26th, William Randolph Hearst for governor, Mr. Hearst being the gubernatorial candidate already of the Independence League. The candidates against Mr. Hearst were Congressman William Sulzer, whose vote was 124, and John A. Dix, whose vote was 17. Mr. Hearst's vote was 309, and he was declared the nominee on the first ballot. In consequence of the unit rule, he received the entire vote of New York county, under the leadership of Tammany Hall.

+

Two other candidates of the Independence League were nominated with Mr. Hearst: Lewis Stuyvesant Chanler for lieutenant governor, and John S. Whalen for secretary of state. For the remainder of the ticket the convention named regular party Democrats instead of Independent League candidates. They were Martin H. Glynn for comptroller, instead of C. H. W. Auel; Julius Hauser for state treasurer, instead of George A. Fuller; William S. Jackson for attorney general, instead of John Ford; and Frederick W. Skene for state engineer and surveyor, instead of Frank L. Getman. But on the 29th (Messrs. Auel, Fuller, Ford and Getman having meanwhile resigned from the League ticket) the executive committee of the Independence League substituted for theirs the names of the Democratic candidates—Messrs. Glynn, Hauser, Jackson, and Skene. In doing so this committee adopted the following resolution:

The Independence League convention met on September 11 and received a communication from Democrats stating that the rank and file of the Democratic party, which believe in the purpose of the Independence League, would undoubtedly have control of their convention and would desire to co-operate with the Independence League in its efforts to restore the action of the government to the principles of Jefferson and Lincoln. The Independence League proceeded with its nominations, but declared by resolution a willingness to co-operate with Democrats if the Democratic masses should succeed in securing control of their convention in the interests of good government. The Democratic convention assembled on September 25 and conspicuously repudiated corporation influences and agents that had hitherto controlled its politics and its actions. The Democratic convention nominated for the first places on its ticket the candidates of the Independence League. Under such circumstances, and with these guarantees of good faith, the executive committee of the Independence League is prepared to carry out the instructions of its convention and make common cause with the Democratic party in the interest of good government.

It was thereupon decided by the committee that it proceed to nominate by petition William Randolph Hearst for governor, Lewis Stuyvesant Chanler for lieutenant governor, John S. Whalen for secretary of state, Martin H. Glynn for comptroller, Julius Hauser for treasurer, Frank W. Skene for engineer and surveyor, and William S. Jackson for attorney general, as the candidates of the Independence League. There will consequently be at the New York election this fall two State tickets bearing the same names,—the Democratic and the Independence League. Should the latter poll 10,000 votes it will become a legally recognized political party of the State.