

nomena of "good times" and the immediate precursors of business disasters and long drawn out industrial depressions. But the same speculative advertisers' message carries all unconsciously a still more sinister warning: "This mighty tide of landless men seeking the manless land is sweeping westward like a billowy sea and pouring through the mountain passes to settle the vast regions beyond." A grand figure that, of the westward march of the race. But listen further: "Land is rising rapidly everywhere in this country, and this final grand advance will not stop until the level of European land prices is reached; there will never be another crop of cheap land; hereafter the man born landless will die landless." Comment could not heighten the color that makes that brilliant picture grewsome. What a picture it is of keener individual misery and deeper social degradation yet to come!

* * *

The Decline and Fall of the Lawyer.

John H. Wigmore, a distinguished law professor, justly rebukes his professional brethren for their abandonment of public spirit, by declaring that their feet "have been in the trough of clientage while public professional calls of duty have gone unheeded." The descent of the American bar as a whole within the past forty years, from the highest plane of devotion to public interests to the lowest depths of cent-per-cent commercialism, is one of the saddest facts of our time.

* * *

THE HEARST CAMPAIGN IN NEW YORK.

In the whole history of American politics it would probably be impossible to parallel the case of William Randolph Hearst as candidate for governor of the State of New York. Self-sought and self-secured, his nomination is the highest kind of tribute to his political acumen and skill.

If any other man in the United States could have accomplished a result so improbable when it was undertaken, he is not yet known to political fame. And not only was the achievement improbable, but the methods by which it was accomplished would have been described three months before as altogether impracticable.

*

In saying this, we do not ignore the strong political position in which Mr. Hearst was placed by the municipal election in the city of New York a year ago. He had come to the front as a

volunteer to lead a bolting movement against that natural affiliation of predatory interests that makes puppets of both political parties, and which the Hearst papers so aptly call "the plunderbund." To all appearances his leadership on this occasion was disinterested. There was little prospect of a successful outcome, and nothing apparently but a hopelessly losing cause to fight for; yet he responded to a call for leadership, and made the fight not only devotedly and vigorously but with such success that he was almost awarded the office of mayor and is generally conceded to have been entitled to it. It was withheld from him, however, by the parties in power. He did not even get a legal hearing upon the evidence of fraud he offered to produce. This excited a degree of personal interest and sympathy which would have assured his election as mayor if again a candidate; and that interest and sympathy extended over the State, creating a sentiment which, together with the growing resentment at the Republican party over the notorious exposures of politico-business graft, seemed to assure his election as governor if nominated by the Democratic party.

This nomination, however, was apparently beyond his reach; but in the most original and amazing manner he reached out for it, and now it is his.

The method Mr. Hearst adopted to accomplish his purpose turned upon the organization of a third party. Abandoning as merely local and ephemeral the Municipal Ownership League, under the banner of which he had run for mayor, he organized the Independence League of the State. While the spine and marrow of this organization consists of Mr. Hearst himself and his personal employes, it is composed on the whole of a lusty body of genuinely disinterested and thoughtful citizens of progressive tendencies, heretofore affiliated some of them with one of the old parties and some with the other. All of them are honestly resentful of old party methods and sincerely determined to build up a new party to put both the old parties down and overwhelm the "plunderbund."

*

When this new party, the Independence League, met in State convention, Mr. Hearst's employes had long been active in promoting the election of Hearst delegates to the Democratic convention. It was evident that a nomination by that convention was contemplated by Hearst himself; and that he had either made or accepted overtures from Mr. Murphy (whose political prestige was

on the wane and with it his profitable contracts) to secure the support of Tammany Hall, no political observer any longer doubts, his subsequent verbal fling at Murphy to the contrary notwithstanding. Yet Mr. Hearst heartily acceded to the demands of his enthusiastic third party followers to make no fusion. Under these circumstances the Independence League nominated him for governor; and, firmly set against fusion, they defiantly filled out the rest of the ticket, partly with Democrats and partly with Republicans.

That defiance was to Mr. Hearst like burning the bridges behind him if he were still hopeful of the Democratic nomination. The Democratic party could not be expected to swallow whole a third party ticket composed partly of Republicans; and no third party as hopeful as the Independence League could be expected to tolerate the withdrawal of any of their chosen candidates, in favor of the ticket of one of the old parties with which their convention had voted to decline a fusion. With the nomination of a full ticket by the Independence League, all possibility of fusion seemed at an end.

But fusion has nevertheless been made. Those who have to define it may give it another name, but the new name does not alter the thing itself. Contrary to all rational predictions, the Democratic party has nominated Hearst and his Democratic associate candidates of the Independence League, while his Republican associates have withdrawn in favor of the Democratic nominees of the Democratic convention. At the election, therefore, two Hearst tickets will appear upon the official ballot—the Democratic ticket nominated by convention, and the ticket of the Independence League nominated by petition. They will be one ticket under two names, for on both the nominees are identical. Such a brilliant outcome of such apparently impracticable political maneuvering is enough to make the heads of politicians of all parties swim with amazement. That an old and powerful party should yield to such tactics was in itself unheard of; that a vigorous new party should yield was a thing undreamed of.

+

But the fact of Hearst's nomination rather than the amazing manner of it is what now concerns the citizens of New York.

With characteristic shrewdness the Republicans have nominated the one man, in Mr. Hughes, whose spectacular work in the insurance investigation commends him to the uninformed reform element of New York as a reformer. No matter if

he did go so far and no farther, just far enough to expose one clique of respectable miscreants and not another; no matter if in his official action he would be so hampered, after the manner of Roosevelt's, as to make him unable to more than play at ridding the body politic of its worst parasitical growths; nevertheless, he wears the toga of reform, and his name is one for the Republican party to conjure with. Between this man, therefore, and Mr. Hearst, the voters of New York must make their choice.

There are many difficulties in the way of this choice, to men who see in Mr. Hughes at the best a stalking horse for plutocracy, yet recognize in Mr. Hearst a political self-seeker who, though he often leads good causes, seldom if ever prefers his cause to himself.

The weakness of Mr. Hearst in this respect must be conceded. He has done work and good work for causes in which we are all interested. Without his aid the municipal ownership movement in Chicago, for instance, would have been killed off long ago. But it has become notorious that he never works faithfully for a cause, whether philanthropic or political, unless his own portrait is stamped upon it. Whatever tends to promote his own ambitions he helps; but whatever promises no reward of that kind he is apt to wither with neglect or to kill by direct attack. If he wants a man, he reaches out for him and puts him into his pocket if the man consents; if the man does not consent, he knocks him out of the way and goes on to the next one he wants.

When James G. Maguire was the Democratic candidate for governor of California, Mr. Hearst compassed his defeat because he could not use him for personal purposes. He did the same thing and for the same reason with Franklin K. Lane when Mr. Lane was the Democratic candidate for governor of California. Yet both Mr. Maguire and Mr. Lane stood for the same causes for which Mr. Hearst professed to stand.

In New York, after vigorously promoting the organization of the labor movement in local politics, which had Henry George for its standard bearer as candidate for mayor, the Hearst papers abandoned the movement at the point of its highest effectiveness. Going over to the support of Tammany Hall in that contest, these papers made a virulent onslaught upon Mr. George for no other apparent reason than that Mr. George's popularity might cross the path of Mr. Hearst's personal ambitions.

In Chicago his help in the election of Mayor Dunne in the municipal ownership campaign was

indispensable and generously and effectively given; but since Mayor Dunne's refusal to be a Hearst bond-servant in politics and official administration, though he has recognized Mr. Hearst's reasonable claims, perhaps too generously, Mr. Hearst's newspapers have been silent when their help was most needed and obstructive when opportunity offered; and this to the extent even of jeopardizing the municipal ownership policy.

Ambitious of the Presidency, Mr. Hearst has displayed the narrowest of dispositions toward men whom he has thought of as competitors. When Tom L. Johnson as candidate for governor of Ohio was fighting in that State the same predatory interests which he himself professes to be fighting in New York, his papers were silent lest peradventure Johnson might cross his Presidential path. When Bryan was given a farewell reception at Chicago a year ago, the Hearst papers were short of space for reporting the event; and this was true also of his San Francisco paper with reference to Bryan's farewell reception there. As Mr. Bryan's name, speeches and doings are liberally enough reported in the general press, neither he nor his friends have had any necessity for complaining of the Hearst papers. But the fact that these papers are studiously silent or curt about Bryan discloses an interesting angle in Mr. Hearst's disposition toward public men of his own party and leaders in his own avowed causes, whom he regards as political competitors.

And as he has no compunction about pushing aside men of importance who stand for causes for which he also professes to stand, but who refuse to enter his personal service or who seem to be in his way, neither has he any delicacy about bargaining for personal ends with corrupt politicians who resist the causes he advocates but for ends of their own are willing to promote his personal ambitions. Two years ago, for instance, he was in political partnership with Roger C. Sullivan for Hearst delegates from Illinois to the national convention, and lest he might lose his delegates he was content to let Sullivan disgrace the party with mob domination and gavel rule. And at the present moment he is apparently committed in New York by bargain with Tammany Hall, which he stood ready to fight if it had denied him its support, to restore that office-brokerage association to political life in the local politics of Manhattan.

In these circumstances it is no wonder that many men who believe in the things for which Mr. Hearst professes to stand hesitate to support him at the polls.

If the question before the progressive voters

of New York were Hearst's personality and nothing more, we should recoil from advising a single voter to support him. But that is not the only question nor the most important one.

Under our election methods it is impossible to vote against Hearst without voting against the rising anti-plutocratic movement of which in the State of New York at the coming election he, whether worthily or unworthily, is the candidatorial representative. In his victory, that movement would be regarded as having advanced; in his defeat it would be regarded as having receded. Unfortunate enough it may be that he has secured the place of nominal leadership; but more unfortunate still would it be if on account of his leadership the movement itself should be deserted by its friends.

If elected governor, Mr. Hearst could be depended upon to perform the duties of the office as well at least as they have been performed from the day of Governor Hill (Democrat) to the day of Governor Higgins (Republican). Nor is there any reason to fear that he would be treacherous to the dominant principles to which he professes allegiance. He has neither the incentive nor the disposition to betray them for money; and he could not betray them to promote his ambitions, for all hope for his ambitions would be paralyzed by his official and notorious betrayal of his principal cause. Something may be gained by his election; much might be lost by his defeat.

+

We are in the midst of a great popular revolt against the power and the depredations of privilege. We must choose between reaction and progress. It would be nicer, of course, if progressive issues were clear cut and the candidates of progressive movements hewed to the line of principle. But things human never shape themselves nor allow themselves to be shaped so neatly. Popular uprisings are always in a good deal of a muddle. In no party and under no leadership at such times can all progressive voters find statements of principles to which they can wholly assent, or leaders whom they can heartily follow. The best they can do is to support the party, however dubious its declarations, and the candidates, however objectionable they and their methods may be, that go approximately in the direction of progress instead of the other way.

And what is the test of this when the fury of the struggle is on? There may be many tests, but there is one which never fails. It may be inferred from the answer to the question, On which side are the intelligent adversaries of progress gather-

ing? If we turn our backs upon the direction in which they go, we shall probably be turning our faces in the direction in which we ought to go.

By that test the course of the progressive voter in New York is plain. Though many genuine progressives oppose Hearst's election, no reactionaries favor it. Though the progressives be not all for him, the reactionaries are all against him. Unless, therefore, the progressive voters of New York are determined to vote against the progressive movement until angels come down to lead it, they belong at this election in the ranks of the followers of Hearst.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

THE "INTERESTS" IN MEXICO.

Cullacan, Sinaloa, Mexico, September 7.—It may seem venturesome even to assume the possibility of war between the United States and Mexico. But forewarned is forearmed. Nothing will be lost and something for international peace and national independence may be gained, if the people on both sides of the line are watchful and thoughtful.

+

Public opinion in the United States has taken a course so decidedly hostile to monopoly in all forms, that the captains of the great privilege-holding corporations can have no reasonable hope that under ordinary circumstances they or their money can carry the national election of 1908. But to consider that a peaceable surrender by them of their present power is likely, is to be quite overconfident. At no time in the history of the United States, and seldom in any other country, have the holders of great wealth and privilege yielded without a war.

The plutocrats of the United States, in 1846, provoked an unjust war for the double purpose of despoiling Mexico of a great slave-holding territory, while diverting public attention from the slavery question then being agitated. So in 1895, did the newer interests of monopoly foment the Cuban revolution against Spain, providing the Cubans with money and weapons, while the plutocratic newspapers fairly breathed the spirit of intervention. We do not even know who it was that destroyed the battleship *Maine* at Havana, and thus brought on a war which all efforts until then had failed to precipitate, and which brought subject colonies into the control of the Interests, besides, most important, helping to tide over the election of 1900.

The habit of sacrificing nations to themselves is nearly universal among privileged classes threatened with equality. The war in South Africa was fought to acquire a rich subject territory, and save the Jingo power in England. The war in Asia had two objects: to conquer new subject territory, and to save the autocracy of Russia. These wars failed of their greatest objects—the killing of the discontented, and the diverting of public attention from the nation's real enemies. Yet such wars are repeated again and again, and even now the plutocrats of the

United States intend that their nation shall go to war.

+

For years they have visibly been casting about for some suitable country with which to war. Germany offered, but such a nation cannot be despoiled, even if vanquished; Morocco, Venezuela, Santo Domingo, China and Colombia have all been looked over with war in view within three years. But no nation answers the requirements so well as Mexico.

Mexico is contiguous territory. Its government is anti-plutocratic. Above all, while not able to withstand the United States, it can put up a real fight, one that will keep the United States busy until after 1908. Meanwhile, the Interests could run things as they please; could buy high per cent. bonds, and could sell embalmed beef to both sides. Afterward, two exhausted nations would be at their mercy: one to be despoiled of Sonora, and the other of its public rights.

+

In a long contest, Mr. Rockefeller has been fairly beaten by President Diaz. Rockefeller's efforts to dominate Mexico have always been met by maneuvers which left him where he began—with the same powers as others have. When Mr. Rockefeller's railroad (the Central) tried to buy the national system, the government bought in ahead of him; when he spoke of acquiring the Mexican oil wells, President Diaz advocated, in a published interview, that they be nationalized. When Mr. Rockefeller contracted to buy the whole oil output, the government proposed to buy his junk line, the Central. At different times, corners and trusts have been established, each time to collapse at the prompt removal of the tariff on the article cornered. And now Mr. Rockefeller is keeping very quiet in Mexico. His feelings, or rather those of his dummies, are very much hurt; and they will not again attempt to do business in such a country as Mexico. Capital will withdraw from the country, we are told, frightened away by the hostile attitude of the unappreciative people and government.

+

Every natural human right is as well guaranteed in Mexico as in the United States, and the vast riches of Mexico are open to all the world. The man in New York has only to ask for what he wants that is Mexico's, and it is his almost for the asking; he need never even see the country in all his life. The sons of the country are not preferred to the man or woman of any land. But the man who takes more than he needs was not even thought of in the simple calculation; and when he appeared on the scene, it was to meet the disapproving watchfulness of an alert government. At every turn the great monopolist, elsewhere always victorious, was quietly checkmated by the man who has never made a million dollars, but has made a nation prosperous and happy. But the Interests never give up; they will not relinquish their intention of dominating Mexico. There also must they resort to war, if they are to accomplish their purpose.

+

They have stirred up rumors of revolution, a thing