

real reason for Mr. Crane's recall, we suspect, is the fact that he does not look on China through a Blucher's eyes. In fact his original appointment was what the cockney would call "a bloomin' error."

+

Since the Crane elevator concern has tremendous business interests the world over, it was easy to infer that its head would be agreeable to Big Business exploitation in the Far East, and to assume that Charles R. Crane was its head. Mr. Taft having picked him out for so responsible a post as minister to China, how could the Interests which trust Mr. Taft doubt Mr. Crane's availability for their purposes? Everything was therefore satisfactory to the Interests. But Mr. Crane began to speak in public, as Mr. Taft had told him to. And as Mr. Taft had also told him, he gave it "to them red hot"; that is, he spoke for cordial relations instead of plunder. At first this seemed like part of the play. But by and by the Interests discovered that Mr. Crane not only spoke for fair treatment but actually meant it. Then they began to "sit up and take notice."

+

The Interests, when their suspicions were once aroused, were not long in sizing up Charles R. Crane as totally unfit for the delicate duties of minister to China. And so he is—for their duties. But for the legitimate duties of a minister from a democratic republic, no better man could have been found. His appointment is the solitary redeeming fact, so far, of the Taft administration. However, Mr. Crane was clearly unfit for a plutocratic mission, and he had to be "pulled out" some way or other. Mr. Knox found the way. President Taft might now consider his collection complete (p. 985), having capped off his adoption of the "worthies" Aldrich, Ballinger, Cannon, Stephenson, Tawney, Smith and Smoot, with his rejection of the "unworthy" Crane.

+ +

### The New York Election.

Quite naturally our comments on the New York election (p. 994) have pleased some of our New York readers and disturbed others. This was to be expected, and no explanation is necessary with reference to the two candidates for mayor—Mr. Bannard and Judge Gaynor. But one correspondent makes the point that we ought to distinguish between Judge Gaynor and the candidates on the ticket with him.

+

The reason given is that Judge Gaynor's candi-

datorial associates are bad men, whereas Mr. Bannard's are good men. It should be observed, however, that Judge Gaynor vouches for the two city candidates on the ticket with him. Other information in which we have confidence is to the effect that the entire Tammany ticket, while vulnerable in some respects, is on the whole the best in personnel ever before nominated in New York. We are particularly assured from this source, a correspondent whom we highly respect both for good intentions and good judgment, that the Tammany candidate for president of the Borough of Manhattan has been grossly maligned by selfish interests, and is in fact the superior candidate for that office.

+

Let us say, however, that we cannot and do not undertake to discuss the qualities of municipal candidates, except as they are representative of general municipal tendencies. The talk about "good men" and "bad men" in the personal sense, no longer appeals to us as of any political value. One may be a good man in his home and a bad man in politics; a good man in his personal relations and a bad man in his political purposes. One of the philosophical writers of the nineteenth century observed that "good men" were apt to make bad kings, and "bad men" good kings. Whether he was right we do not know; he probably was. But his words paraphrased to fit "good man" and "bad man" candidates in New York would be absolutely right. From the first "good man" official in that city down to the latest of note, Mr. Jerome, they have been with hardly an exception, if indeed with a single exception, worse officials than their contemporaries of the tribe of Tammany. "Good man" in New York politics usually means a respectable man and nothing more—one who belongs either to a "good" club or a "good" church or both, and keeps out of the penitentiary. The principal use of "good men" in New York politics is as stalking horses for Big Business to get legalized plunder through. When "bad men" serve its purpose better, Big Business is for "bad men." And really we need not confine these definitions to New York.

+

No further explanation of our reasons for refraining from discussing the personal merits of candidates for offices other than that of mayor at the pending New York election, is necessary. The election there is between the candidates for mayor. New York's attitude and New York's tendency as to questions of progressive democracy will be in-

fluenced by that choice, and only in minor degree if at all by minor choices. Mr. Bannard is the representative of the menacing Big Business interests, which seek to plunder the city enormously without penitentiary risks. Judge Gaynor represents—yes, Tammany Hall, if you please; but the elements in Tammany Hall which are hostile to the elements that give it its bad name. And though Gaynor were representing all that is bad in Tammany Hall, yet he would represent a constituency no worse in motive and infinitely less menacing to public rights and less expensive as a burden on the public, than the Big Business constituency which Mr. Bannard represents. But Judge Gaynor does not represent the bad in Tammany Hall. He has for years been identified with the right side of the dominant issue in New York affairs—municipal ownership and control of municipal property. If New York elects Bannard, the Interests will have another subway watermelon to cut. If New York elects Gaynor, his record is the guarantee that he will prevent another rape of the city, whether or not he succeeds in carrying out his own long cherished and freely expressed policy of municipal ownership.

+

And now a word as to the Hearst diversion. We expressed ourselves fully upon Mr. Hearst when he was a candidate for Governor (vol. ix, p. 627), and have no modifications to make of that estimate. We approved his support by progressive Democrats, as we should do now if the reason for it existed. Our reason was that although many progressive Democrats opposed him, no reactionaries favored him. To vote against him was to vote against the progressive movement. He stood as the only nominal leader of progressive Democracy in that campaign; and while we deplored the necessity, we advocated his election. It was a Hobson's choice. Not so with the present campaign in New York, in which Mr. Hearst opposes Judge Gaynor for accepting the support of Murphy, the Tammany leader—the very thing that Hearst himself did in his campaign for Governor.

+

Hearst's appearance in this campaign is in perfect keeping with his character as we gave it three years ago—"a political self-seeker who, though he often leads good causes, seldom if ever prefers his cause to himself." As far back as in the campaign in California when James G. Maguire—a progressive Democrat—was the Democratic candidate for Governor, Hearst's papers treacherously opposed him because Maguire would not become Hearst's

tool. When Franklin K. Lane—another progressive Democrat—was the Democratic candidate for Governor of California, Hearst's papers treacherously opposed him for the same reason. In New York in 1897, Hearst's papers urged forward Henry George as an independent candidate for mayor; but when he entered the field, Hearst made peace with Tammany Hall, and his papers not only supported the Tammany candidate but they maligned George up to the hour of his death. Let Tom L. Johnson might cross his path for the Presidency—an office that Johnson has not sought and would not take, for he has a better task—Hearst's papers gave no help to Johnson in his fight against the Interests in a gubernatorial campaign in Ohio. When Hearst was playing for the Democratic nomination for President in 1900, he made a combine with Roger Sullivan of Chicago to capture a State convention. Hearst's representative demanded of Mayor Dunne at the beginning of his administration in Chicago, complete control of the police force; and because Dunne would not appoint the Hearst nominee, the Hearst papers whipsawed his administration to the end. Isn't Mr. Hearst's position in the present New York campaign in perfect keeping with that record? Judge Gaynor is a progressive Democrat. Mr. Hearst urges him to become a candidate for mayor, promising him the support of the Hearst papers, no matter who nominates him—even Tammany Hall. Gaynor takes Hearst at his word, and the nomination comes. Tammany, forced by its progressive elements and public opinion, joins in the nomination. Hearst warns him not to accept Tammany's nomination,—a course which would have assured his defeat. And when Gaynor does accept it, Hearst becomes an independent candidate under the leadership of the Republican candidate of four years ago. Whether this will result in Gaynor's defeat or not, remains to be seen. Manifestly it can have no other object.

+ +

#### Judge Anderson's Free Press Decisions.

A Federal Judge at Indianapolis has made a decision in one of the Roosevelt-Panama libel cases (pp. 205, 242, 253, 339), which harks back to the law of the land, from which the judicial tendency to depart has of late years been so pronounced. He reiterates two principles which in these days of imperialistic concentration of power are of the utmost importance to freedom of the press. One is the right and duty of newspapers to report facts about public officials and public affairs, and to draw inferences therefrom; the other is the guarantee that newspapers charged with