

in this particular instance. But it is of great importance as a standard for testing Hearstism in general. Readers of his periodicals may now know that their photographic reproductions of documents are no better proof of genuineness than their copies in printers' type would be.



Hearst and Roosevelt.

There appeared recently in the New York Sun, and with credit to the Sun in Hearst's Chicago Examiner of September 29, 1911, a statement over the signature of "William Randolph Hearst," in which Mr. Hearst appears to have said:

Mr. Roosevelt says that if I will tell him exactly what letters I have he himself will make them public. If Mr. Roosevelt wishes to make any letters public, why does he limit the publication to the letters that I possess? Why not give the public the benefit of all the letters he possesses on this interesting subject?

In this extract and its context there is a plain implication that Mr. Hearst possesses letters of Mr. Roosevelt's which Mr. Roosevelt is concealing, and which if made public would reflect upon Mr. Roosevelt's innocence. It is now "up to" Mr. Hearst to make those letters public before the Senate committee of which Senator Clapp is chairman; for Mr. Roosevelt has testified under oath before that committee that he has produced all the correspondence in question that with diligent search he can find in his files or of which he has any memory. What he has produced appears to add nothing to the case against him. Mr. Roosevelt, therefore, has either perjurally concealed or curiously forgotten incriminating letters, or else Mr. Hearst's insinuations are false. Which? The burden is on Mr. Hearst to help the Senate committee decide that question.



The "Quid Pro Quo."

When Mr. Morgan testifies that his huge contributions to Presidential campaign funds were made without promise of return in any way, he is to be believed: no man of his sophistication would exact such promises. When he testifies that they were made without expectation on his part of any return, he must be regarded as speaking in the narrow sense of something specific by way of return: a fortune maker of his mentality and knowledge of the world would have to be very impersonal to make big campaign contributions without some thoughts amounting to expectations in general. But when Mr. Morgan says that his business combinations never in fact got any return for their rich campaign contributions, he

raises an important question. The notorious Tennessee coal and iron company affair*—what was that Presidential indulgence a return for?



Senator Dixon and Campaign Funds.

It was a sorry figure that Senator Dixon, as Mr. Roosevelt's campaign manager, cut before the Senate committee which is investigating campaign contributions. Instead of frankly answering questions regarding Roosevelt's campaign contributions, and leaving the committee to ignore the other candidates at its and their peril, he adopted the "you're another" policy. "You are investigating Roosevelt only!" was the turn of his complaint. But if Mr. Roosevelt's skirts are really clear, what harm would that do him? Wouldn't it put him in the advantageous position of having proved his innocence while his opponents dared not go through the ordeal? The course Mr. Dixon did pursue could have had no other tendency than to create an impression that Roosevelt is sunk as deep as anybody in campaign-fund mire. This is unfortunate for a candidate who poses as immaculate—not relatively but absolutely.



Yet Senator Dixon made one contribution to the inquiry which is of genuine value. He produced documentary evidence of a campaign of newspaper bribery, instituted in behalf of Mr. Taft's candidacy, which ought to react with stunning effect. An advertising house, which has the Standard Oil trust among its customers and also the Republican national committee, is doing the bribing. Its manager has admitted this since Senator Dixon's disclosure. He denies that the Standard Oil or the Tobacco trust has anything to do with the matter, but he confesses that the Republican national committee pays the bribery bills. The bribery consists, as disclosed by Senator Dixon, in offering to foreign-language newspapers large sums of money—\$1,000 in the particular instance regarding which Senator Dixon unearthed the documentary evidence, upon this contract:

The undersigned, publisher of....., a newspaper issued in....., hereby agrees to publish in every issue from..... up to and including the last issue before the next Presidential election, any articles or cuts on the editorial page which you will furnish, or any articles which we supply to be printed in the language of our paper, not less than one column in length each time. Further: The undersigned agree, that no article or

*See The Public, vol. xi, pp. 651, 678, 679, 866, 913; vol. xii, pp. 51, 59, 193, 194, 208, 209, 227, 252; vol. xiii, pp. 267, 588, 589; vol. xiv, pp. 443, 515, 819.