

Mr. Hearst, as a candidate for the next Democratic nomination for President.

It is inconceivable, almost, that Mr. Hearst should have authorized such an impertinence. Doubtless he would like to be President, or even a presidential candidate, as who would not; but unless he is without all sense of the eternal fitness of things Mr. Hearst must know that no one who leads the life that he notoriously does, can go before the people of this country as a presidential candidate without meeting overwhelming defeat and bringing humiliation and shame upon his party.

Even if that insuperable objection to so much as the mere consideration of Mr. Hearst as a candidate did not exist, his journalistic record in politics would be a bar to his nomination. Thousands of Democratic voters all over the country will not easily forget how, after his New York paper had "boomed" Henry George for first mayor of Greater New York, he suddenly turned it about face and supported Tammany hall with the evident purpose of swinging the George vote over into the Tammany lines. This action so closely resembled treachery to a principle and a candidate that Willis J. Abbot and Arthur McEwen resigned from the staff of the paper, and all George's supporters who knew the facts put Hearst's name upon a black list from which it cannot be without good reason erased.

That act, however, might be pleaded as proof of fidelity to party organization. But not so with Hearst's political performance in the California election last Fall. He used his San Francisco paper then to defeat Franklin K. Lane before the Democratic convention. To this there is no objection except that he opposed Lane for no other reason than that Lane could not be bossed either by Hearst or by the Pacific railroad interests with which

Hearst's paper in California is in collusion. But after Lane had been nominated by the convention, defeating Hearst's candidate overwhelmingly, Hearst's paper joined hands with the Republicans and the railroad ring to defeat him at the polls. That is one of the unforgivable things in party politics. They succeeded, but the vote showed that the man whom they thus conspired against possessed the confidence of the community. He carried San Francisco, where he had served as city solicitor and was well known, by 9,600—an extraordinary result. He carried the Republican city of Sacramento by 2,300. And though he lost in the State, it was by only 2,500. The rest of the ticket, supported by Hearst's paper, was defeated by majorities ranging from 20,000 to 65,000. After the election Mr. Hearst still pursued Lane, endeavoring even to deprive him of the complimentary vote of his party in the legislature for United States Senator. Here again Hearst was disappointed. Lane received the vote of nearly every Democratic member of the two Houses. While it is almost inconceivable that Mr. Hearst should hope to get even a complimentary vote from even one State in the Democratic national convention, the fact that he has thus opposed one of the best and strongest men of the party in California, does raise a fair suspicion that ex-Gov. Budd's impertinence in nominating his client at the Jefferson-Jackson-Lincoln banquet may have been committed under orders from Hearst himself.

It is not pleasant to write in this way of a man whose newspapers have published much that is good, even if along with a great deal that is bad. But if Mr. Hearst is simply grinding an axe of his own, it is better that the radicals of the country should know it, and the amazing act of his lawyer at Columbus calls for plain speaking. It is not so very difficult for a rich and selfish man owning newspapers, to hire good and honest editorial writers, and, while giving them full freedom to write in harmony with

their convictions, be ready at a moment's notice to utilize the popularity which they secure for him, to serve his own personal and indefensible ends. It may be that Mr. Hearst is not that kind of man. But evidence to the contrary accumulates.

The appointment by the Michigan governor of Thomas J. Navin as a member of the prison board of the State, may not commend itself to those righteous people who abhor criminals only after they have got into the penitentiary, but religiously despise them then and thenceforth. For Mr. Navin, once mayor of Adrian, has served a five-years' term in the Michigan State prison for forgery. But what better selection could be made for membership upon a prison board than a man of good character who has endured the prison life? Gov. Bliss is to be heartily commended for this appointment; provided, of course, that it has been made in good faith, and not to reward a copartisan regardless of his character.

THE ISSUE AT WATERBURY.

The facts are generally known: eighty strikers; twelve hundred militiamen called out. Why the need of so much force? Because eight thousand union men in the town, as is commonly reported, were joined with the strikers to prevent non-union men from taking their places. It is further said that thirty thousand people, out of a population of thirty-five thousand, were in sympathy with the strikers. Now it may well be that some of this sympathy "has been due to intimidation, or selfish and cowardly interest, as has been alleged; but no one denies that a large part of the people, in spite of the inconvenience to which they have been subjected, have been in sympathy with the strikers and with the attempt to prevent non-union men from stepping into the strikers' jobs.

We should like to ask the New York Commercial Advertiser to state what it thinks may be the cause of this queer state of affairs. Let us see again clearly what the queer state

of affairs is: simply this—a large number of people go so far as to aid and abet a certain set of men in keeping other men, who are willing, from working. Put boldly thus, this fact, common enough nowadays, has made the blood of indignation boil in many a well-meaning breast. It is not surprising that this strange attitude should astound people, especially such as are imbued with the democratic spirit. But we should like to ask the Commercial Advertiser to give its candid views as to the question, Why so many people seem willing to stand against the “freedom to work?”

In a recent article on the Waterbury issue the editor closed with these words:

Is local sentiment throughout the land, willing and intimidated, on the side of the cause of the labor union sustained by riot and violence, and against individual freedom and the right to work? If it is, and the constant necessity of calling upon the militia to uphold law and order seems to indicate that it is, something needs to be done to restore public sentiment to a healthy condition, to revive from one end of the land to the other the old American spirit, the old American sense of justice and right and of fair play for every man.

Why should public sentiment be against “the old American spirit”? For, with a proviso, we agree with the above writer that indications point that way. We do not think that public sentiment sustains riot and violence; but there is little doubt that public sentiment is strongly opposed to the so-called “scab,” that is, in plain terms, to the non-union man who is willing to take the union man’s job. We believe that a large majority of the American people have a “sort of feeling” that the non-union man has no right to the union man’s job, and sympathize with every effort, short of absolute violence, to prevent his doing so.

Such being the case, we agree with the Commercial Advertiser that “something needs to be done to restore public sentiment to a healthy condition.” What this something should be, certainly depends upon what is the cause of the sentiment. So, again, we ask why the sentiment exists. And we venture to assert that among all social questions there is

no more important “why” that we can ask.

It seems to us that it behooves anyone who has an earnest thought on the subject to give it utterance; and it is for this reason that we have asked the Commercial Advertiser what it thinks may be the cause. Our own belief is as follows:

In the first place, we do not believe that the public sentiment is due to any loss of the old American spirit of fair play. We believe that the belief in fair play is as strong as ever. We believe that it is due to a feeling—or perhaps we had better call it a subconscious conviction—that “free competition” among workmen to-day does not really bring fair play. People feel that the dispossessed union man has not enough chance for other employment or for self-employment to make his competition for the job in any true sense free and fair. They feel that it is a squabble for place, with lack of free space, and that if the outs get in, the ins go down. Furthermore, they feel that the advantage to those who get in over their fellows is perhaps a lowering of general conditions for all.

But in the second place, and to go farther back, we believe that these feelings, or sub-conscious reasonings, are due to actual conditions, the evils of which we have just hinted at. The free competition of laborers is no longer, to say the least, as fair as it once was in America; for the reason that there is no longer the same opportunity of self-employment. And this is due to the fact that while population has increased, natural opportunities have become more and more confined within the possession of private owners.

If our analysis of the cause of sympathy for strikers be correct, clearly the proper means to adopt for restoring public sentiment to a healthy condition is to go to the root of the matter, and attempt really to equalize opportunity. The only sane method of accomplishing this that we have ever seen advanced, is that of taxation. Lay a proper tax upon natural opportunities that have been monopolized and are yet not used. Do this in the interest “of justice and right

and fair play for every man,” and then there will be no warrant for the warping of public sentiment against any man who is willing to work.

J. H. DILLARD.

DEMOCRACY AND MONOPOLY.

I.

Man is not a creator; he is an exchanger, a converter. He originates nothing; he simply changes the form of things. He can create neither air, nor land, nor water, nor anything that is contained within them. He can, however, change the form and utility of matter by a million devices and contrivances of his hand and brain. He can convert the trees of the forest and the minerals of the earth into such forms as to make them serve uncountable uses for himself and fellows. Out of water he can draw forth steam power and out of the air electricity; quarries he can convert into stately palaces, immense bridges, great cities; the wool of the sheep he can convert into the clothing of his kind, and by the application of his labor to the soil he can supply the food of the entire community. In short, he can give value to, or put to profitable use, through conversion or exchange, almost every conceivable element of matter which he can get within his grasp.

But it is only through conversion or exchange that he can do these things. Alone and singly men can do but little. By working in unison with his fellows, man accomplishes almost superhuman tasks; alone, unaided, he accomplishes little or nothing. The best that man alone and unaided can do is to keep himself alive.

In modern civilization, however, all are aided, to a degree, directly or indirectly. It is only in the savage state that man must depend entirely upon himself. Then he must feed and clothe and house himself directly, and, unlike the more civilized being, he cannot buy his bread ready baked, nor his meat prepared for use. He can accumulate nothing and he can exchange nothing. The modern being, through a system of cooperation with his fellows, can exchange his labor (or the result of his labor) for the result of other labor; but the savage or primitive man must consume the result of