

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

described by his enemies to have been. It was not his "yellow" newspapers; if "yellow" means rottenness in public affairs, the Hearst papers are the least "yellow" among the great newspapers of New York, Chicago and San Francisco. It was not the personal dissipations and delinquencies of his earlier life; they now belong to a past which is buried beneath a wholesome family life, and only ghouls would dig them up. The fatal weakness in Mr. Hearst's campaign was his inability to rally the whole-hearted support of the men who profoundly believe in the progressive cause into the leadership of which he had sprung. Some of them refused altogether to support him, while most of those who did support him fell into line with much questioning and many misgivings. And the reason that the former dropped out of line and the latter were not whole-heartedly in line, was because they all felt, and justly felt, that Mr. Hearst was not working for a cause but was making a cause work for him.

✱

The evidence had been furnished by Mr. Hearst himself. From the moment that he conceived the possibility of becoming a Presidential candidate, he devoted all the power of his papers primarily to promoting that selfish candidacy by building up himself and knocking down possible competitors; and only secondarily (often not even secondarily) to promoting the cause he had nominally espoused. We have already told of this characteristic of the man (p. 627) with reference to some conditions ante-dating and to some post-dating his serious Presidential aspirations. The same characteristics governed him even down to the casting of the vote last Tuesday. In Illinois, for instance, where Bryan made a just and courageous fight against the Sullivan gas combine in the Democratic party, readers of the local Hearst papers would hardly have known that this was Bryan's fight at all; they would have thought it a Hearst fight, although the Hearst papers had in fact been but recently back of Sullivan and his combine. To Bryan's friends the attitude of the Hearst papers toward Bryan was of small concern in so far as Bryan's personal fortunes are concerned, but it was extremely significant as an indication of the character of Hearst's leadership. It was things like this that chilled progressive sentiment in New York. When progressive men were told that their candidate had thrust himself upon them, that his candidacy was for himself and his ambitions and not for the cause of progressive democracy, that he was a "man on horse-back" looming above the horizon of proletarian discontent, they were silent.

They had to be silent. There was nothing for them to say in reply. Not a single notable instance of impersonal devotion to their cause were they able to cite. Whether in politics, in religion, in education, in economics, in the philanthropic relief of distress, it was all the same. Mr. Hearst had pasted his own portrait on all those of his acts that might otherwise have been accounted impersonal or disinterested, and toward everything to which his portrait could not be attached he had turned a cold shoulder.

✱

When we speak of the progressive sentiment which Mr. Hearst failed to rally whole-heartedly, we make no allusion to the cambric-handkerchief reformers of which Mr. Richard Watson Gilder is a type. These reformers are never on the battle line and never will be. Whenever the fight grows hot and the heavy guns of plutocracy open fire, they find some good reason for going to the rear or over to the enemy. If the leader of the radical side toward which they have academic inclinations be a man of assailable personal character, like Hearst, they think it better in the interest of good morals to postpone the battle than to fight it under his leadership. If he be a man of unassailable personal character but "off" on the money question, like Bryan, then sound economics becomes their first consideration. If both his personal character and his economics are unassailable, as in the case of Henry George, then "society must be saved" against his "insane" followers who are so much more dangerous than their leader. And so it goes. Anything to escape the battle. Anything to keep the cambric-handkerchief neat and clean, no matter how foul the shirt bosom under the dickey may be. To these dilettanté warriors we are not alluding. They would have been against Hearst anyhow, since the Interests were against him. Our allusion is to the men who believe in progressive democracy and are willing to go down the firing line for it even if they don't like their general in command nor his tactics; to the men who seeing the foulness of plutocracy in politics, are willing to work at cleaning it out, though they soil their own reputations in the process, and to work elbow to elbow or face to back with men engaged in the same disagreeable but highly useful service—yes, and without inquiring too closely whether their leaders and associates in the work are doing it because it is foul or in spite of its being foul. These are the kind of men whose whole-hearted support would in all probability have elected Mr. Hearst. He did not get their support because they distrusted him. They feared he would selfishly

lead them into a blind alley and sacrifice their cause. They knew he had not done heretofore what he promises to do hereafter: "serve in the lead or in the ranks just exactly as the people desire and as earnestly and loyally in one place as the other."

✱

But it is not too late for Mr. Hearst to reform himself and his personal advisers. It is not too late for him to save his life by giving his life, to achieve leadership by indifference to leadership. Let him prove by a consistent policy in New York, in Chicago, in Boston, wherever he controls a center of influence, that in all sincerity he has now come to regard leadership as incidental to the people's cause, and their cause no longer as merely incidental to his own leadership. This will be an easy thing for him to do. And having done it, whether he becomes Governor of his State or President of the Republic will be of little consequence either to the people or to him. As a mere personal consideration, his fame will be greater and brighter and more enduring; even the political prize he has coveted and vainly reaches out for may fall into his lap, a testimonial rather than a prize. Personal considerations aside, he will have the satisfaction, infinitely more ennobling than personal honors, of having disinterestedly and for the good of all, given voice and might to the democratic thought of his countrymen.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

CLEVELAND TRACTION.

Cleveland, Nov. 5.—While the traction fight in Cleveland (pp. 702, 723, 726) is not yet at an end, the situation is so far advanced that there seems little danger of much longer delay of a complete victory for the city in this struggle which Mayor Johnson has led for nearly six years.

✱

Should the decision in a case now pending in the Supreme Court of the United States be in favor of the "Concon," the fight will go on; but if that decision is in favor of the city, the Cleveland monopoly must collapse as did the Chicago traction monopoly when it lost its 99-year case.

In the lower Federal courts, the "Concon" lost its case, Mayor Johnson being fully sustained. An appeal to the Supreme Court was taken, and there the case has rested awaiting its turn. Recently Mayor Johnson has proceeded to dispossess the "Concon" of its occupation of a street whereon its franchise had, under the decision of the lower Federal courts, completely expired. Thereupon the "Concon" applied for a restraining order, but it made out so strong a case of emergency that the Supreme Court not only granted the restraining order but advanced

the case, setting it down for the 8th for final argument.

This was not agreeable to the "Concon" people. They wanted the restraining order, but they also wanted delay. Contrary to their wishes, therefore, their whole contention must soon be so decided by the highest court of the land that if they lose they lose everything, and if they win they only win a chance to lose later on.

✱

Meanwhile the "Threefer" line is in operation. Two cars are making regular half-hour trips over about seven miles of street. The first car on its first trip had Mayor Johnson for motorman. This line is on ground that has been won by the city over the dead bodies of many a "Concon" injunction. It begins at the western limits of the city south of Detroit street, and turning north touches Detroit street about a mile from the Public Square. Here it is stopped by a "Concon" injunction (temporary) forbidding its use of 600 feet of Detroit street. When that injunction shall have been removed the line will be in complete operation from the southern limits to the Public Square; for, beyond the 600 feet in question, the street to the Square is "free territory."

Even as it is, these cars serve the needs of a considerable population for short distances. The average number of fares is about 60 each way, which at the 3-cent fare yields about \$3.60 per round trip. This is normal traffic, the period of curiosity having passed. The cars seat 48, and as empty seats are usually found throughout the trip, it is evident that a considerable number of the passengers get on and off—that is, take short rides. As to earning capacity, the cars are now yielding a net profit of from \$10 to \$15 a day each.

The "Concon" papers speak of this road as running "from nowhere to nowhere." The Cleveland Press retorts that they run "from the city limits to an injunction."

To facilitate payments of fare at 3 cents, aluminum car fare tickets are offered for sale and in change. They are round in shape, and as they have a hole in the middle they are used extensively as souvenir watch charms.

Construction of "Threefer" lines is in progress in other parts of the city, and new cars are coming in from the Eastern shops as fast as they can be made and shipped.

L. F. P.

✱ ✱ ✱

MUNICIPAL OWNERSHIP IN CANADA.

Winnipeg, Manitoba, Oct. 27.—The influx of immigrants into Manitoba and the new Provinces to the west and north of it, with its resultant "boom" in land values, has had an unmistakable tendency to divert the thoughts of people here from a thorough consideration of public questions; and the zeal to make money from the rapidly increasing value of the land is the all-absorbing topic. But the increase in population makes more public utilities necessary, and the movement for public ownership being abroad, the tendency here is toward having these utilities publicly owned and operated. For example, the city of Winnipeg is now planning the construction of a power plant. This plant is to be built and operated by the