

ERNEST CROSBY ON HEARST.

A Letter to the New York Times, Published in the Times of October 28, 1906.

Many of the reasons given by Mr. Hearst's opponents for his rejection remind me of an old familiar story. When some scandalmongers informed President Lincoln that Gen. Grant was drinking too much whisky he asked them to find out the brand for him, so that he might supply it to the other Generals. It is undoubtedly true that if Grant had been all that Hearst is said to be ten times over, neither Lincoln nor any other Northerner would for that reason have gone over to the Southern side, however beautiful the domestic life of Gen. Lee had been shown to be in comparison.

The fact is now, as it was then, that there is an issue which overshadows the leaders on either side. There is a world-wide movement in operation today taking various forms in different places, but having everywhere one fundamental characteristic—namely, that it starts from the assumption that the economic game of life is not being played "fair," and that it is necessary to assure equal opportunities for all in that game. Its object is the abolition of special privilege and tribute-exacting monopoly. It does not question the right of merit to its full reward, but it condemns the speculative and aleatory concomitants of the private usurpation of all kinds of unearned increment, based on monopoly, which have turned the business world into a glorified Monte Carlo, inflating the rewards of success infinitely beyond deserts and placing a premium upon fraud, chicanery, and greed.

Does this issue enter into the present campaign in New York State, and on which side is Mr. Hughes, and on which is his adversary? I think there can be only one answer to these queries. The question of corporate monopoly is presented to the voter in New York this year much more clearly than it has ever been presented before, and Mr. Hearst is the assailant, and Mr. Hughes, from the very necessity of the case, the defender. There are no holders of special privileges in the United States who are not on the side of Mr. Hughes, and Mr. Hughes has not uttered a word in this campaign which can cause them uneasiness. On the other hand, they are all frightened out of their wits at the mere mention of Mr. Hearst's name, and, be it noticed, he has threatened them with nothing but the enforcement of the law.

They have good reason to fear their own laws. Every time the probe has been inserted (in the insurance companies, in the railways, in Standard Oil, in the Beef Trust) the rottenness of the business system has been uncovered, judged even by its own low standards of decency. I confess I should like to see Mr. Hearst get "at" them. I should like to see him safely ensconced in their Richmond, and I have no more doubt than they have of his sincerity. Their enmity is the best proof that he is not insincere. And on this point I have a little private information.

A gentleman who has been closely associated with Mr. Hearst and is not supporting him in this campaign—a man of unquestioned integrity—has assured me that there can be no doubt whatever of the sincerity of the candidate of the Independence League in his democratic professions. Ten years ago, he

added, Mr. Hearst told an intimate friend that he intended to start a cheap paper in New York and to secure the largest circulation possible for it, in order that he might spread these democratic views of his. This programme he has carried out with marvelous perseverance and success, and he was elected Mayor of New York last year on a mere personal ticket—a stupendous performance.

Mr. Hearst's "whisky" may be a most deplorable thing, but it does not seem to be inconsistent with phenomenal ability, and I cannot help feeling for it some of the leniency which Lincoln accorded to the favorite beverage of Gen. Grant. Hearst's faults, too, have been grossly exaggerated. The Journal is not half so bad a paper as it is painted, and in some respects its tone is higher than that of most other dailies. Mr. Hearst's corporations bear no resemblance to those which are a danger to the Commonwealth, for they are not based on special privilege and lay tribute upon no public necessity.

Then, as Mr. Hearst's faults have been magnified, those of Mr. Hughes have been altogether overlooked. He is a corporation lawyer who attacked a particular corporation because he was retained to do so. If he had been retained on the other side he would have defended it with equal enthusiasm. As soon as the investigation led into the coffers of the Republican party he was called off, and this nomination looks very much like his reward. That he differs in any essential respect from Mr. Higgins, Mr. Odell, and Mr. Black, et id omne genus, there is not the slightest reason for supposing, and there is not a word in his speeches which shows that he has any insight whatever into the real problems which confront the world. Mr. Ivins meant business last year, but of course he has been set aside, for he would have been a thorn in the side of monopoly. It is possible that if Mr. Hughes edited a newspaper it would be less yellow than Mr. Hearst's, but we are not to vote for editors. We are to vote for a policy for the State of New York, and I shall take special pleasure in casting my ballot for the candidate of the Independence League.

ERNEST H. CROSBY.

October 24, 1906.

* * *

WHO MADE HEARST POSSIBLE?

A Letter Written by the Rev. R. Heber Newton, D.D., Under Date of October 20, to the New York Times.

As Published in the Times of October 23, 1906.

Mr. Gilder's letter in yesterday's Times concerning Mr. Hearst forms very pathetic reading. His distress is one which hosts of our citizens are sharing. All that he says seems to me, for one, undoubtedly true. And it is said with dignity and self-restraint—which is more than can be affirmed of much of the present denunciation of Mr. Hearst. Despite the hysteria into which grave journals are now falling—as they have fallen more than once in times past when the pillars of society have seemed to shake, from the days of that famous campaign of the great-hearted and pure-souled reformer Henry George—despite this hysteria, the bulk of the charges against Mr. Hearst which these papers make are also too sadly true.

All that Collier's Weekly, in its four articles on