

has done an unjust thing. We are not especially concerned about it, because the more the autocratic character of army life over private soldiers is disclosed and the less army degradation comes to be regarded as real degradation, the better. But here is an interesting case. Such members of the battalion as knew of the alleged crime could have been forced to testify as witnesses; but what the President demanded was that they should trot up to headquarters and volunteer tales which, if volunteered by one commissioned officer with reference to another not under his command, would have brought him into contempt. And because some members of the battalion who may have known did not tell, President Roosevelt dismisses the whole battalion in disgrace. These Negroes are to be congratulated upon being put out of the man-killing trade, but President Roosevelt is hardly to be congratulated upon his ideas of fair play as exemplified in this case.

* *

Charles E. Hughes.

Of the ability and personal cleanliness of the governor-elect of New York, Charles E. Hughes, we suppose that no one has had any serious question. It was said of him in the heat of the campaign that he was a corporation lawyer, and when he replied that he had not been employed by corporations except in particular cases, as with other clients, he was described as having been "a corporation lawyer by retail instead of wholesale." This was not a fair characterization. The term "corporation lawyer" in the opprobrious sense applies not to general practitioners who have corporations among their clients and do their work professionally; it applies to lawyers who sell themselves to corporations by the year for the purpose not merely of protecting them in their legal rights, as even a criminal may properly be protected in his legal rights, but of advising them in their policy of depredation, as a criminal might be advised in the commission of crime. Mr. Hughes does not appear to have been that kind of corporation lawyer. He has been accused also of abandoning his investigation into the insurance frauds at the point at which Cortelyou and Bliss, the Republican collectors of some of this insurance loot, were in jeopardy. In answer to that accusation it is urged that, without bad faith and bad professional practice, he could not have asked either of these men what they did with the money, the investigation being into the acts of the insurance companies and not into the disposition the receivers of their unlawful contributions made of the money. It is enough, perhaps, for us to say

that our opposition to the Hughes candidacy was not to Mr. Hughes personally, but to the Interests which his candidacy represented.

*

We did not believe, nor do we now believe, that any governor nominated and elected as Mr. Hughes has been, can successfully cope with the Interests that elected him. He is in the position of a moderate teetotaler nominated and elected by saloon interests. He could hardly command the confidence of the progressive democrats of any party, and he would invite destruction at the behest of the Interests of his own party, were he to adopt a policy in any wise seriously hostile to plutocracy. It may be that Mr. Hughes has the genius for giving successful political battle to the classes that have made him their political leader, but we must register a doubt. Nevertheless, that doubt is not final. Mr. Hughes is on record as distinguishing clearly between monopoly values and labor values in connection with public utilities. The opportunity is now open to him to give concrete and official expression to that talismanic difference. Should he do so he may kill plutocracy in its very temple. But whether he will do so remains to be seen. It is one thing for a man to lay down that distinction as a principle in a particular proceeding he is conducting as a lawyer; it is another thing for the same man to act upon it straightforwardly as a high public official against the allied financial interests that have put him in office and that control the nerve centers of his political party.

* * *

WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST.

In his post-election address, the defeated candidate for Governor of New York, William Randolph Hearst, makes this declaration:

I am enlisted in this fight against the control of government by the trusts and corrupt corporations, and I will fight it out to the end. But I will serve in the lead or in the ranks, just exactly as the people desire and as earnestly and loyally in one place as in the other. The people have decided to retain the Republican party in power. I will make my fight in the ranks, therefore, and as a private citizen do my best to promote the interests of my fellow citizens.

Had Mr. Hearst acted upon that principle from the beginning of his public career, he would doubtless now be the governor-elect of New York, and the cause he has ably led in that State would be at this moment hailed as a triumphant instead of a defeated cause.

*

Mr. Hearst's fatal weakness was not what it is