

tions have varied all the way from the guess that he was to be scolded for having exhibited greater concern for the Chinese than for American business interests in China, up to the guess that the recently signed treaty between China and Japan regarding Manchuria (p. 876) has necessitated more explicit oral instructions, or even his complete recall as minister. Secretary Knox was reported on the 12th to have asked for Mr. Crane's resignation. He gave out a statement that Mr. Crane was responsible for canards in Japanese and American papers, to the effect that the United States is preparing to protest against the Chinese-Japanese agreement. Upon being shown this statement, Mr. Crane said it was too serious for off-hand discussion, but promised a newspaper interview on the subject.

+ +

#### President Taft's Journey.

In San Francisco and thereabouts on the 5th, President Taft (p. 969) made several speeches, but none of political importance or significance; and on the 6th he turned into the Yosemite, making occasional speeches on the way. He entered Yosemite Park on the 7th. Leaving on the morning of the 10th he arrived in Los Angeles on the 11th, and spent the 12th there and in Pasadena.

+ +

#### Municipal Politics in New York.

A new factor in the municipal campaign in New York (pp. 961, 967) is the candidacy of William Randolph Hearst. In a World interview on the 5th, Mr. Hearst had said of the two party candidates:

I think that Mr. Bannard is an amiable gentleman personally, but I think he is better fitted by nature and experience to get campaign contributions from the trusts than ballots from the people . . . I believe that Judge Gaynor is a good man and would make a good Mayor, but I am sincerely sorry that Tammany is to be allowed to use his good name as a cloak for another raid upon this pillaged city . . . With all, I am for Judge Gaynor, but not for Tammany. I think the independents should do their best to elect Judge Gaynor and defeat Tammany Hall. To the question, "Will Mr. Hearst run for Mayor himself?" he replied:

I have said that I am not a candidate, and I cannot consent to become a candidate. I am deeply distressed not to be able to comply with every request of the good friends who have stood with me in so many hard fought battles, but I must act on my own convictions and I am convinced that it would not be best for all of us, that it would not be best for our principles for me to be continually a candidate for office.

The following night, the 6th, at a crowded mass meeting in Cooper Union, Sylvester L. Malone moved the nomination of Mr. Hearst, and his motion was enthusiastically adopted. One of the speakers at this meeting was William M. Ivins,

the Republican candidate of four years ago, who said that he had watched Mr. Hearst for four years and had become satisfied that "there is not in the city of New York, with its four and a half million people, a more genuine, a more sincere, a more sober, a more generous gentleman and public spirited citizen." When waited upon by the committee from this meeting and asked to become its candidate, Mr. Hearst responded with a speech, in the course of which he said:

I must say that to my mind the main and only objection to Judge Gaynor is that he is allied in this campaign with the most atrocious array of dirty and damaged political rags and remnants ever exposed for public sale on the bargain counter of Tammany Hall. It is your duty to do your best to defeat that ticket. It is my duty and your duty and the duty of every honest citizen of New York to prevent the infliction of that calamity upon New York City.

On the 8th he agreed to be an independent candidate. As reported by the Chicago Examiner (Hearst) of the 8th, his letter embodied this statement:

Nominate me, if you desire, with the greater part of that fusion ticket behind me and I will run. The candidates nominated on the fusion ticket are worthy of support. The ticket is already in the field. If we nominate another ticket both tickets may be defeated. If we nominate the fusion ticket Tammany will be defeated. And if Tammany is defeated the citizens win, no matter whether Mr. Gaynor is elected or Mr. Bannard is elected, or I am elected. If I am elected I shall go into office with an honest, progressive administration surrounding me, ready to assist in carrying out a beneficial programme. If Mr. Bannard is elected he will be surrounded by an administration which will compel him to take some progressive action. And if Judge Gaynor is elected you can do him no greater service than forcibly to deprive him of the disreputables of Tammany Hall, whom he has chosen for his associates, and to substitute an honest and intelligent body of men ready to aid him in carrying out his progressive ideas—if he still has any . . . Before Judge Gaynor's letter of acceptance I had hoped that he would represent that element of the citizenship. But his letter made clear to all of us that to secure the Tammany nomination he had sacrificed not only his liberty of action but his freedom of thought.

+

Mr. Hearst was nominated on the 11th at a mass meeting at Carnegie Hall, called to order by William M. Ivins (Republican candidate for Mayor four years ago) and presided over by Charles Sprague Smith. Mr. Hearst made his formal speech of acceptance on this occasion. Mr. Ivins made charges of corruption in connection with race-track gambling against Judge Gaynor as a judge, which Gaynor denies.

+

Two days before this meeting, Judge Gaynor gave out a statement charging Mr. Hearst with

having pledged himself to support Judge Gaynor's candidacy no matter what ticket he ran on. He supported his statement with a letter from Rudolph Block, one of Mr. Hearst's editorial writers. In response to a request from Judge Gaynor for the facts, Mr. Block had replied in a letter of the 9th:

I cannot tell you how distressed I am over the course that matters have taken. I regret exceedingly to be drawn into the affair, but inasmuch as I was instrumental in bringing about your meeting with Mr. Hearst, and urged you so often on his behalf to run for Mayor, I feel that, since you ask for it and put the matter up to me, you have a right to my testimony. Shortly before Mr. Hearst left for Europe last Summer he asked me to bring you to his house. I think this was the second or third time you had ever seen him. He asked you if you would not run for Mayor in the Fall. You asked him why he did not run himself, and said that if he desired to run or would run you would not get in his way. He answered that, under no circumstances, would he run, and urged you to run. You asked on what ticket. He responded: "I don't care what ticket you run on. I'll support you on any ticket." I suggested then that perhaps Tammany might nominate you. He answered: "It makes no difference what party nominates him, I will support him." And he added: "I am not opposed to Tammany, but to Tammany methods, and when it does right it is entitled to credit." You thanked Mr. Hearst and said that you might go to Europe in August, and that you would think the matter over. He expressed a wish that you would see him in Europe and asked that you let him know your decision after you got back. He said that if you wanted any article favoring or leading to your candidacy to be published in *The American* during his absence I was to see that it went in.

Judge Gaynor adds:

I saw Mr. Hearst in September according to promise. I said to him that a large number of organizations had already declared for me for Mayor, and that I might conclude to run. He said that he had in no way changed his mind, and that he would support me, whatever ticket I ran on, or whoever nominated me.

Mr. Hearst has replied as follows to these statements:

If Judge Gaynor has stated that I promised to support him under any and all circumstances, and upon any and all tickets, he states what is positively untrue. I will try to assume that he is honestly mistaken, but it is difficult for me to do so, as the proposition is so unreasonable and impossible that it bears its refutation on its face.

+

Judge Gaynor accepted his nominations on the 7th in what is described by the dispatches as an unsensational speech in which he said he resigns his place on the bench only to dedicate the next four years of his life to the service of the people

of New York. In a speech on the 11th in Brooklyn he called upon the public to judge him by his past. "If a man always has been known," he said, "as an opponent of corrupt government, you can judge that when he gets to be three score or so years old he is not going to take his orders from any unworthy leaders." Judge Gaynor thereupon challenged Mr. Hearst to meet him in joint debate, saying: "I want fair play above all in this contest. The open enemy I honor, but I despise the enemy that sits back, as an editor or otherwise, pretending to be your friend, when he is only smiling while he buries his dagger in your ribs. So I say, Let us have it out in the open, Mr. Hearst."

+ +

#### Free Speech in Philadelphia.

Emma Goldman's application, supported by the Free Speech Committee (pp. 963, 967), for an injunction against police interference with her lectures, has come to a hearing before Judges Willson and Audenreid in Philadelphia. She herself was cross-examined at the hearing, and after her testimony was allowed to make a speech supplementary to the lawyer's speech for The Free Speech Committee. The police having opposed her injunction on the ground that her lectures had led to disturbances and that she was a convicted anarchist, she addressed herself to those points. Her speech was not published in the reports of the hearing, but their extracts from it indicate that it was substantially the same as a letter of her's in the Philadelphia Public Ledger, which covered the points in question as follows:

As to what my record may or may not be has nothing to do with the present struggle. But for the benefit of your readers I wish to say this: I have been in the lecture field for 18 years; have spoken in innumerable cities, including Philadelphia, and have never had a single disturbance. The only disturbers were the police, when they attempted to stop meetings and suppress free speech. I may also state that in all these years I have been held for trial but once—1893—and not because of any riot, but for quoting Cardinal Manning, to wit, "Necessity knows no law." My lectures have been published in my magazine, *Mother Earth*, the latter being entered in the United States second class mail. Yet it remained for the police of Philadelphia to suppress me even before I was heard. Does it not seem as if this city has come to a very lamentable state of affairs if the right of free speech is made to depend on the grace and whim of the police department? A convicted anarchist? Were the authorities to know but the history of their own country they would know that some of the greatest anarchists have raised their voice for human justice and liberty right here in America. David Thoreau, the author of "Walden," was an anarchist, for it was he who in his famous tract, "Evil Disobedience," proclaimed the human truth, to wit; "I am at all times called upon to do only what