



Contents



<i>List of Figures</i>	ix
<i>Preface</i>	xi
<i>Introduction</i>	1
1. “The Beasts”	15
2. Stirring the Political Pot	29
3. Populists Make Their Case and Their Mark	43
4. Statehood and the Path of Reform	55
5. Worker Unrest, Organization, and Confrontations	69
6. Rising Tide	83
7. Finishing Up, Looking Ahead	95
8. Reformers Take Charge	107
9. Making and Selling a Constitution	121
10. New Regime	137
11. Bringing in the Voters	153
12. Radicals at Work	167
13. Drawing the Battle Lines	181
14. Going after Hunt	193
15. Hunt, War, and Wobblies	205
16. Aftermath	219
<i>Concluding Observations</i>	233
<i>Notes</i>	241
<i>Bibliography</i>	303
<i>Index</i>	317



Introduction



On August 3, 1918, a conservative editor of an Arizona newspaper declared: “In no state in the Union has the crusade against big business been waged so unceasingly and unscrupulously as in Arizona . . . From governor down to cross-roads constable it has become the custom to make faces at corporations and threaten to take their scalps.”¹ Now, the editor contended, the tide was turning; the loud-mouth agitator was in retreat, and right-thinking conservatives were about to regain control of the state.

Arizonans had indeed witnessed a gigantic thirty-year struggle. On one side were anti-corporate reformers bent on economic and political change. On the other were leaders of large corporate concerns—especially eastern-owned mining and railroad companies—and their supporters in the business world and the press, as well as some conservative politicians.

Beginning in the mid-1860s, Arizona politicians did all they could to get railroads and large mining companies to invest in the territory. By the 1880s the developmental effort began to pay off—in came the railroads and the capital from the eastern United States and Europe necessary for large-scale deep-mining operations. By the 1890s, however, for many in the territory the once heavily

courted corporations had become outside, eastern “money interests” or “beasts” who exploited the wealth of the sparsely settled area, taking far more out of the local economy than they put in. Arizona’s anti-corporate leaders condemned the giant corporations for mistreating workers, farmers, ranchers, and small business-people and for corrupting the political system. The large enterprises constituted a threat to both democracy and economic opportunity.

Picking up on themes voiced by Populists in the 1890s and Progressives in the first decades of the 1900s, the anti-corporate forces called for changes to ward off corporate control of the political system, increase corporate taxation and regulation, and protect and promote the interests of working people. Their prime targets were the “big four”—two copper companies, the United Verde located in the north and the Copper Queen located in the south; and two railroads, the Santa Fe and the Southern Pacific.

The war on big business took place on two fronts. One was an industrial or economic front in which organizers attempted to unionize the workers and win concessions from managers or owners. These struggles sometimes led to violent conflict between management and workers. Mining strikes and lockouts were common. Unions and management struggled for control, and each sought to enlist the government for its side. On the political level, left-wing unions sought bread-and-butter benefits not only for their members but for the working class in general, as well as a variety of changes that would curb the economic and political power of the large corporations.

Left-wing union leaders, third-party candidates of the Populist and Socialist Parties, and Progressive-labor Democrats—led in the first decades of the twentieth century by George W.P. Hunt—carried much of the reform load. Many of Hunt’s most crucial battles were with members of his own political party. Conservative Democrats labeled him a Socialist. He, in turn, branded them corporate-controlled reactionaries. Many of Hunt’s most prominent opponents among the corporate leaders were personally involved in the activities of the conservative wing of the Democratic Party. Hunt’s Progressive-labor Democrats, however, grew in strength during the 1890s and early 1900s and came to power from 1910 to 1916.

The Progressive-labor Democrats enjoyed several impressive victories, but the pace of reform had slowed considerably by early 1916. Hunt nearly lost the 1916 gubernatorial election (at the first count, he did lose). The US entry into World War I contributed to the decline of anti-corporate momentum. In Arizona as elsewhere, the war shifted attention from the Progressive agenda and created strong feelings of patriotism and intolerance among the population at large toward those who opposed US involvement in the war or were deemed to be in opposition.² Opponents branded Hunt a disloyal opponent of the war and frequently connected him to the widely feared and detested Industrial Workers

of the World (IWW). In the case of the IWW, corporate mining forces drew upon wartime sentiment to help crush a union they had feared and opposed long before the war because of its radicalism.



This study details the rise, fall, and impact of the anti-corporate reform effort in Arizona. On a broad level, it hopes to further understanding of the Populist-Progressive reform era from roughly 1890–1920.³ The attack on large corporations was a central focus of reform activity during that period. Drawing on the literature, the book's chapters examine questions concerning the objectives of the anti-corporate reformers, how their efforts related to other ongoing reform efforts, the ability of target business interests to protect or promote their interests, and the overall efficacy of such reform efforts. Adding to the list of state studies on the Progressive movement, the study also offers a fresh look at how Progressivism worked out in a lightly populated western territory and state heavily dependent on mining activity and heavily influenced by outside investors.⁴

On still another level, the book seeks to contribute to the literature on Arizona during its formative period, highlighting its Progressive heritage and history of industrial relations.⁵ It aims to make up for the lack of scholarly attention given to Arizona's most prominent Populist, Buckley O'Neill, and even more to George W.P. (Wylie Paul) Hunt, whose views, activities, failures, and achievements are at the heart of this narrative.⁶ Despite having been a Progressive governor of some renown in his time, in contact with reformers and radicals of all types—from the perennial Democratic hopeful William Jennings Bryan to radical labor leader Mother Jones—Hunt has received little attention from scholars.⁷

It is appropriate to note at the outset that Arizona's anti-corporate reformers were deeply influenced by reform activity taking place in other states, especially western ones, as well as nationally.⁸ They did not, however, as some authors have suggested, adopt what reformers from other states were doing out of a sudden desire simply to be fashionable.⁹ Arizonans had giant corporations of their own to deal with and had firsthand knowledge of what the emergence of such enterprises meant to workers, farmers, small businesspeople, and consumers.

Nor were they merely copying others. They were looking for ideas and solutions that had been tried elsewhere, but they were also willing to be among the first to experiment with reforms such as direct democracy. Along with necessity, the newness of the region facilitated a willingness to embrace new ideas because there was less tradition and fewer entrenched institutions. To offset corporate control of the political system, Arizonans were in a mood to experiment with political reform, to be innovative, and, if necessary, to turn to new and promising third political parties.

During this period, Arizona was somewhat unique in other respects. It was torn apart, especially along class lines, with workers and employers dividing into hostile camps. This was revealed most clearly in battles between capital and labor in mining areas. Industrialization was just beginning, and in some respects working conditions were among the worst in the country—the type of conditions out of which one might expect a serious reform effort, if not revolutionary activity, to take place. Reformers hoped to avoid the clash by improving wages and ameliorating harsh working conditions. Radicals shared these goals but wanted to go further—to replace the capitalist system with something they felt was better, such as the cooperative commonwealth advocated by the Socialists.¹⁰

Arizona was also a place where those not defined as “white Americans” suffered from discrimination that affected nearly every aspect of their lives.¹¹ The territory and state—as with much of the West—restricted the civil and legal rights of Hispanics, Chinese, and other racial minorities (including Native Americans) and excluded them from many of the benefits society offered. Racism in the white-dominated mining labor movement worked against the development of class consciousness and worker solidarity. It also led white union leaders to undertake an energy-draining quest for legislation that restricted immigrant employment, thus distracting them from more far-reaching goals.

The early stages of the reform effort took place at a time when statehood, free silver, Mormonism, woman (equal) suffrage, and moral uplift issues having to do with drinking and gambling captured much of the attention of Arizonans and their political leaders. Later, when George Hunt was governor, capital punishment and prison reform became highly salient topics. During much of the period, the struggles of nonwhites and women of all races for equality also drove Arizona politics. While not directly, or only peripherally, related to the anti-corporate reform effort, these issues and causes had various effects on the development and direction of that effort.

Some of the greatest controversies centered around the initiative and referendum, which allowed voters to directly initiate their own laws—bypassing the legislature—or to vote on laws passed or referred to them by the legislature. These instruments of direct legislation were also considered instruments of direct democracy along with devices such as the recall, which allowed voters to remove an official from office prior to the expiration of his or her term, and direct primaries, which made party nominations open to voters. This entire package of electoral reforms was commonly known as the Oregon System because of the leading role reformers in that state played in their development and implementation.

In Arizona, as in Oregon and elsewhere, the initiative and referendum had their origin in the Populists’ effort to control powerful corporations. Reformers saw the system of representative government as essentially corrupt because of the influence of big business and put their faith in direct rule of the people.¹² The

drive for reform in the early 1900s led to a fierce philosophical debate between advocates of direct versus representative democracy. Politically, the direct route was valued by some groups and opposed by others because of what it might mean in terms of public policy. For anti-corporate reformers the initiative, referendum, and recall were essential to safeguard against corporate control. They were even willing to risk losing statehood if it did not come with these safeguards.

While much of what happened in Arizona resembled developments elsewhere during this period, the Arizona story has its own distinctive qualities. What we find in Arizona is an anti-corporate reform effort in which organized labor, third political parties, Populists, Socialists, Hunt Democrats, and a few highly intransigent corporations played leading roles.

In much of the country, farm groups led the drive for public control of corporations in the fifty years prior to World War I.¹³ In Arizona and other parts of the West heavily dependent on mining activity, however, organized labor played a more prominent role in this cause. In particular, the left-leaning Western Federation of Miners (WFM), which took the case of the miners and others who worked in and around the mines directly to mine managers and owners, has to be regarded as a leading driving force for political reform in the region.¹⁴

This study examines the WFM's involvement in the Arizona context and finds that it played a similar role there. Attention is also given, however, to the important but largely neglected contribution of the Arizona State Federation of Labor to the struggle. Socialist activists, it is suggested, had considerable influence in both the WFM and the state federation, steering them toward achieving broad goals and objectives and toward consideration of their members' special needs.

Also of concern in this study is the radical IWW, an organization that went in an even more militant direction, prompting government repression. Members of the IWW, also known as Wobblies, were both anti-political and anti-capitalist. They shunned working through the political system and placed their faith in a strain of anarchism known as anarcho-syndicalism, which called for workers to seize direct control of industry. They actively infiltrated and sought to take over existing unions, including those associated with the WFM. In pursuing their objectives, some of the leaders did not outlaw violence or sabotage.¹⁵ The IWW receives special treatment in later chapters, where, drawing upon largely unexamined archival information, considerable attention is given to government surveillance and repression of this organization starting with the US entry into World War I and the forced deportation of workers from Bisbee, Arizona, in 1917.

Overall, the evaluation of labor's involvement takes the examination into the struggle for union recognition on the industrial front, the role unions played in pushing for political and economic reform, and the numerous struggles within the labor movement that complicated and, to some extent, stymied the reform effort.

Third political parties, which came from the left, were an important element in the anti-corporate campaign in Arizona. Attachment to the Republican and Democratic Parties was relatively weak in Arizona and other western states during this period, in part because of the underdeveloped nature of major party organizations and in part because of their general failure to address the problems that concerned western voters.¹⁶ To some extent, the small size of the population in the region also made major party ties somewhat less meaningful because it was relatively easy for citizens to get to know candidates personally and to judge them as individuals. The small population also encouraged third parties because only a relatively few voters had to be won over to bring about an electoral victory.¹⁷

The role of third parties in Arizona was not simply a transient one of emerging during the initial stages of a major party realignment process, only to fade away when one or both major parties made the necessary adjustments.¹⁸ Arizona was a place where third political parties played particularly meaningful roles as agents of change in building the anti-corporate agenda. At the same time, however, the people who shaped the actual reforms were members of two major parties, especially the Democratic Party, who held gubernatorial offices or were members of the legislative assemblies or Constitutional Conventions.

The time frame here covers the years commonly associated with the Populist and Progressive movements. Scholars have debated whether these were two different movements or essentially the same movement.¹⁹ In the chronology offered here, the anti-corporate reform effort is depicted as beginning as part of the Populist movement in the 1890s and continuing as part of the Progressive movement in the first two decades of the twentieth century. The anti-corporate reform effort connected separate and larger movements that may have been considerably different in other respects.

Scholars now commonly agree that, in the Mountain West, Populism was far more than a movement to encourage silver mining. Rather, it was a movement that took issue with the concentration of economic power and rejected much of the new industrial order beginning to take hold in the region.²⁰ The movement's essentially anti-corporate message, well illustrated by the Arizona Populist Party of Buckey O'Neill of Rough Rider fame, was the same message later expressed by Socialists and the Hunt Democrats. The following chapters explore connections among Populists, Socialists, and Hunt Democrats in terms of programs offered, electoral support, and—though much more needs to be learned—to a limited extent the movement of political activists. The discussion, while emphasizing their agreement, also discloses differences among the reform-minded parties that propelled them in different directions on some policy matters.

Scholars have occasionally referred to the role Socialists played in the Progressive era. Michael McGerr has concluded, for example, that reformers in general were influenced by Socialism far more than they would have liked to

admit.²¹ Socialists were radicals in the sense that they wanted to replace the capitalist system with something they thought was better. They had in mind a cooperative commonwealth. They differed greatly, however, on the issue of how and when capitalism should be replaced. Those in the party's larger right wing called for working gradually through the political system to arrive at this goal. In the short run, they supported a variety of reform measures, including those to alleviate existing working conditions and impose greater controls on corporate economic and political power. Socialists in the party's left wing, on the other hand, called for immediate revolutionary action and focused their efforts on direct action on the industrial front.

When it came to reform measures, there was a thin line between right-wing Socialists and left-wing self-identified Progressives who were not Socialists. They favored many of the same reform objectives and measures. Beyond this, both groups were repelled by unchecked economic individualism and corporate greed.²² The primary difference between the two groups was that whereas the Socialists wanted ultimately to replace the capitalist system, the left-wing Progressives were unwilling to go that far—they only wanted ameliorative reforms. Socialists sought the triumph of the working class, while left-wing Progressives sought to avoid class conflict in pursuit of the public interest. George Hunt in these respects typified a left-wing Progressive.

Socialists draw special attention in these pages because they not only helped to set the agenda through political party activity, including that of the highly significant though short-lived Labor Party, but also because they played leading roles in the reform-driven labor movement and gave George Hunt crucial electoral support. In addition, Socialists engaged in a host of reform-oriented activities and largely ignored small causes, such as blowing the whistle on brutal railroad police, who are part of the larger story.²³

Contrary to the suggestion made in some of the literature, Socialists in Arizona were far from isolated, wandering in the wilderness, during this period of reform.²⁴ Socialists, though nonbelievers in the liberal tradition of individualism and limited government, were centrally involved in what was happening in Arizona—largely because Arizonans were heading away from that tradition and much of what the Socialists were calling for enjoyed popular support. In assessing their impact, however, Socialists did not attract a lot of votes; the results in this area were often disappointing. Rather, their impact came as agenda builders undertaking a variety of political activities through various organizations, among which unions were the most important. In sum, Socialists were deeply involved in the ongoing political debate and had an important impact on the political culture of the state.

George Hunt, a central actor in the story of anti-corporate reform, was born in 1859 in Huntsville, Missouri, a place named after his grandfather who was

one of the area's early settlers. The family had Confederate ties and lost its slaveholding plantation as a result of the Civil War. Hunt was raised in poverty and received very little formal education. He left Missouri at age nineteen and headed west to prospect for gold. After spending some time wandering about, he arrived in Arizona in 1881 and settled in Globe. He worked his way up through several low-paid jobs—dishwasher, mine mucker, store clerk—to become a moderately successful businessperson as the head of a merchandising and banking firm, the Old Dominion Commercial Company.

His upbringing and experiences influenced his political views, as did various events and the people around him. Raised a Baptist, he did not drink and was more than willing to attack saloon interests, something unexpected for a representative of a wide-open mining town. His few months as a miner in Globe brought his first exposure to miners and prompted a lifelong sympathy for their difficulties. As a child he had failed a class because he had no textbook. Several decades later, free texts for schoolchildren became a prominent theme in his campaigns for governor and one of his proudest accomplishments after he was elected.²⁵

Throughout his political career, Hunt often referred to his experience as a businessperson in bringing efficiency, economy, and sound management to government. Over the years his political views were strengthened or changed by new experiences; as the result of events such as the Pullman Strike in 1893–1894 and labor disturbances in Clifton, Arizona, in 1915–1916; and his association with a wide range of reformers. Mulford Winsor, a longtime ally and confidant, played a leading role in developing Hunt's Progressive views. Winsor was more of an intellectual and a student of government than Hunt, and he often drafted Hunt's public papers and speeches.²⁶

More broadly and perhaps more fundamentally, as research by Daniel Justin Herman indicates, his mother and his wife had a major influence on Hunt's thinking, encouraging him in a Progressive direction. These two important women in his life—Sarah Hunt, his mother, and Duett Hunt, who became his wife in 1904—had much to do with such matters as his opposition to drinking and gambling and his concern for the downtrodden.²⁷

This study does not offer an extended discussion of the roots of George Hunt's beliefs. It views him simply as a relatively prosperous middle-class businessman caught up in Progressivism, a term that to him had a positive connotation synonymous with "modern" or "enlightened." He was not an original thinker but someone who sought out ideas he could use to help remedy problems he found salient. He gathered in and weighed new ideas that were springing up everywhere, regardless of their source. The core of Hunt's "modern thoughts" centered on reigning in the power of corporations by changing the electoral mechanisms of the political system, increasing corporate taxation and regulation, and improv-

ing the lives of working people. Caught up in the new wave of Progressive thinking, he also sought the abolition of the death penalty and the implementation of more humane and enlightened practices regarding prison administration. He became a nationally known leader in the prison reform and anti-capital punishment causes.

In this study, Hunt stands generally as a mainstream middle-class Progressive reformer along the lines outlined recently by Michael McGerr and Shelton Stromquist.²⁸ Yet in several respects he was outside the mainstream. He frequently referred to himself as a Progressive; yet the Hunt Progressives are more accurately described as “Progressive labor Democrats”—they differed from Progressives in other places and from members of the Bull Moose Progressive Party in Arizona in the extent to which they aligned with, and were supported by, a left-leaning labor movement.²⁹ Hunt stands out in being, perhaps more than anything else, pro-labor. Hunt’s Progressivism was not, as George E. Mowry suggested about California Progressives, a stuffy middle-class movement whose members were more comfortable with large corporations than with unions; instead, it had a strong working-class base and strong union involvement.³⁰ Like the Populists, Socialists, and radical labor leaders, Hunt was upset not just about corporations’ power and influence but also about what they had done to the working class. He wanted to even things up, to more equitably distribute benefits between rich and poor.

Hunt, unlike many Progressive leaders, did not favor nonpartisan approaches to governing. He favored, for example, a primary system closed to party members. Beyond this, he built what his detractors could with considerable justification label a political machine—something that would have appalled Progressive leaders such as Robert La Follette of Wisconsin.³¹ When it came to partisanship, Hunt was an unwavering Democrat. The most desirable Democrats, from Hunt’s point of view, were Progressive ones. He eagerly assumed the task of doing what he could to ensure the nomination of ideologically compatible Democrats friendly to his agenda. Hunt also, however, professed a willingness to close ranks behind nearly anyone who won a Democratic primary on the theory that it was highly unlikely that “matters would be improved by the election of a Republican.”³²

In fairness, the Democratic Party as Hunt saw it had a noble mission—one that transcended the partisan interest in bringing the triumph of what he called “militant Progressive Democracy.” To him this meant, in part, “that this country, its institutions, its resources and its rewards for industry belong to the people whose labor makes them possible.” It also involved “the faithful application” of the principle of “equal rights to all and special privileges to none.”³³ Hunt was a Progressive in terms of his objectives, if not his means, and he took on old-time conservatives in his party whom he felt fronted for special interests. In this

respect, the conflict took the shape it did in Illinois, for example—new-thinking reformers versus old-time entrenched politicians.³⁴

To some extent, Hunt also differed from other Progressives by mixing a western or pioneer outlook with the Progressive ethos, one well reflected in the declaration of one of his fellow reformers: “Arizona is what we make it!”³⁵ Like the pioneers settling the West, the Hunt reformers felt they had the opportunity to start from scratch, to create a type of paradise on earth.³⁶ Initially at least, they were optimistic that this could be done, that they could control the future and, indeed, show the way for the rest of the country (something they felt they had done in writing the state’s constitution in 1910).

Though they often spoke in terms of popular control of government, the Hunt Democrats did not seek democracy in terms of expanding the scope of participation when it came to including women and Hispanics of both genders. To some extent, this may have reflected racism and sexism, but it also reflected the priority of the goal of reducing the influence of large corporations. Reformers who shaped the constitution were content with an electorate that consisted largely of working-class Euro-American males. This group, they felt, would be essentially anti-corporate (they were not so sure about women and Hispanics) and relatively easy to mobilize in checking corporate influence through a system tailored to citizen action—one with many elected officials serving short terms and one providing for direct primaries and the initiative, recall, and referendum.

Hunt and other Progressive-labor Democrats may have actually believed in woman suffrage. At one time at least, Hunt felt suffrage would bring needed labor and other reforms. Still, uncertainty over how women would vote and other political considerations kept him from doing much of anything to encourage the cause. Woman suffrage finally came through an initiative campaign in the early days of statehood. Hispanic participation was intentionally limited by the Hunt Democrats through their adoption of a literacy test. The Hunt regime also largely reflected the sentiments of a labor movement determined to protect white miners from Hispanic competition.³⁷ Still, as subsequent chapters illustrate, early in the second decade of the twentieth century, Hispanic miners assumed a far more aggressive stance against their corporate employers, becoming much more of a force in organized labor and much more willing to back candidates such as George W.P. Hunt. They, in effect, became leading forces in the anti-corporate movement.

Historians describe businesspeople as playing varying roles in regard to Progressive reform, ranging from targeted villains who tried but failed in their efforts to fight off change to insiders who shaped and benefited from the policies supposedly directed at them.³⁸ Yet it is difficult to identify a single “business interest.” Often, it was a case of one business interest against another. In Arizona as elsewhere, in areas such as rail rate regulation, various business groups could

and did support anti-corporate reform (though fearful of going too far and discouraging development).

The main focus here is not on business leaders *per se* but rather on the leaders of a group of large railroad and mining corporations who indeed were targeted by reformers and did what they could to protect and promote their economic interests. Much of the literature covering the struggle in Arizona has focused on Phelps Dodge. The discussion in this book extends the inquiry to the thoughts and activities of a larger group of corporate leaders and lobbyists, most of whom have been given little recognition. In the culture in which they operated in Arizona as elsewhere, simply buying off public officials had its place for corporate executives as an expedient way of doing business.³⁹ One finds numerous examples in Arizona of railroad and mining company lobbyists offering bribes and other inducements to lawmakers in return for their help on legislation. Here as elsewhere, the discovery of political corruption growing out of the close ties between politicians and large business interests fed the reform drive.⁴⁰

When it came to labor relations, some mine owners, as Richard Peterson has suggested in regard to bonanza mining kings in the West, were willing to respond to union demands (up to a point at least) to avoid interruptions in production.⁴¹ Others, though, took a harder line—refusing to bargain over anything and relying on local police, sheriffs, state and federal troops, and the courts to protect their properties and managerial prerogatives. The same can be said of railroad executives. They were particularly devoted enemies of radical unions, such as those affiliated with the WFM and the IWW.⁴²

During the period under review, corporate leaders active in Arizona were seriously worried about worker unrest, class conflict, Populists' and Socialists' potential voting strength, mob rule through direct democracy, and the danger that having Hunt in office posed to their financial well-being and freedom of operation. They cracked down decisively on early manifestations of labor unrest but were slower to react in a unified fashion to the political manifestations of the anti-corporate movement. They took some time to mobilize their forces—they were accustomed to acting independently and appeared to have been caught off-guard.

Some may well have underestimated the forces against them or have overestimated their ability to control the situation. Once aroused, though, corporate leaders and their supporters acted as if they were engaged in a holy war against Socialism. Corporate leaders stoutly defended their entrepreneurial freedom and managerial rights and demonstrated a sense of self-importance as agents of economic prosperity. They saw themselves as the key to economic development. Their strength stemmed largely from the inclination of many others to see them in the same light. They also had considerable resources to draw upon in combat with the reformers and were not reluctant to use them.

The bottom-line question is, who won? In Arizona, for a time at least, the corporations, for all their reputed power, were clearly unable to prevent the adoption of policies they opposed.⁴³ Some gains came in the early 1900s during the last few years of territorial status, but the 1910 Arizona Constitution represented the first substantial victory for the anti-corporate forces. Hunt helped produce this result by serving as president of the Constitutional Convention. His election as governor in 1911 and again in 1914 resulted in additional breakthroughs on corporate taxation, labor protection, and enlarging the role of government in education and other areas. On several occasions, anti-corporate reformers enjoyed considerable success when they took their case directly to the voters through the initiative process—a process they had provided for in the constitution. The corporations recovered somewhat—they found the courts useful in reversing reforms, especially those relating to labor, and, more broadly, were able to counterpunch and create or take advantage of a more favorable political climate to punish their political enemies and suppress labor, sometimes forcibly.

The reform effort in Arizona, as elsewhere, is open to the charge that it failed to achieve as much as it might have, that it made only piecemeal ameliorative reforms and missed out on the opportunity to make fundamental changes in the capitalist economy. Yet this was the failure of the radicals—the left-wing Socialists and Wobblies, who also took the brunt of the punishment—not of Progressive labor reformers such as Hunt, who accepted growth and the corporate system but simply wanted to subject the corporations to greater controls and extend the benefits the wealthy were enjoying from existing arrangements to working people.⁴⁴ For the Progressive labor Democrats, the drive for change was tempered by an equally strong commitment to economic development.

In sum, the Progressive movement in Arizona, as reflected in the anti-corporate movement, was far more effective in bringing about changes opposed by a business elite than is portrayed in various studies of developments in other states. The movement in Arizona had shortcomings—especially when it came to the rights of minorities and, to some extent, of women—but it did aim for and produce more working-class benefits, corporate taxation and regulation, labor protection, and democracy. On balance, the movement gave Arizonans a greater opportunity to control their government and their jobs.⁴⁵



The discussion starting in the following chapter focuses on the territory's economic development from the 1860s through the 1880s and on problems that development created. Spurred on by the promotional efforts of a governing elite, railroads and large-scale mining enterprises emerged on the scene; but soon thereafter so, too, did problems regarding corporate taxation and regulation, the

conditions and rights of labor, and the integrity of the political system—a system already on shaky ground. Chapter 2 analyzes the operation of the political party system and the leading problems and major policy issues in the territory in the late 1880s and early 1890s. Setting the stage for the Populist movement, it looks at how the two major parties responded or failed to respond to issues emerging in the territory and at the impact of crisis conditions in the economy. The effects of the Pullman Strike in Arizona in setting the stage for Populism and anti-corporate sentiment are given particular attention. This chapter also remarks on Hunt's early legislative career and involvement with the issues of the time. Chapter 3 looks more directly at the Populist movement. The principal concern is with the program, development, and impact of the Arizona Populist Party, the most visible spokesperson for which at the territorial level was Buckey O'Neill.

Chapters 4–7 take us from the late 1890s through the early 1900s—a period in which the territory continued to grow, statehood became more of an issue, territorial politics became more divisive, the legislature floundered over a variety of reform matters, workers began to organize, and radical political activity surfaced. Both anti-corporate and corporate forces opposed a proposal that Arizona and New Mexico be joined in a single state. They found plenty of territorial issues to quarrel about, however, particularly when it came to the taxation of mines and railroads, the regulation of railroad rates, labor protection, suffrage, drinking, and gambling. Labor-management tension—another spillover from development—intensified during this period, especially in mining areas where the Western Federation of Miners was active.

Chapter 4 looks at the campaign against joint statehood and at a variety of issues still bubbling over from the Populist period. Chapter 5 examines labor union development and activity during this period and the worker strikes involving the eight-hour law passed by the territorial legislature. Chapter 6 details the early rise of the Socialist Party in Arizona. The new party carried on the Populist cause, adding its own refinements, and enjoyed an initial surge propelled in part by championing the cause of labor and advocating the initiative and referendum. As chapter 7 indicates, the rise of organized labor and Socialist Party activity prompted the Democrats to embrace an anti-corporate stance; but the territorial legislature under the Democrats had a mixed record in regard to reform in its final years (1907–1909).

The next four chapters, covering the period 1910–1914, look at the rise and accomplishments of the George W.P. Hunt-led regime, the electorate's disposition toward reform, and, at another level, the supportive activities of left-leaning third parties and unions. Chapter 8 indicates the important role the short-lived, WFM-backed, Socialist-led Labor Party played in the election of reform-minded delegates to the Constitutional Convention. It also highlights the importance of direct democracy—the initiative, referendum, recall, and a

host of other popular rule reforms—as an issue in that election. Chapter 9 looks at the Arizona Constitutional Convention over which Hunt was the presiding officer and which the Progressive-labor Democrats dominated. It looks at the debate at the convention, what was produced, and the nature of the campaign to secure voter approval of the proposed constitution. The next chapter turns to the election of the state's first officials and the flurry of legislative and administrative activity that implemented much of the anti-corporate program—though not without resistance. As chapter 11 indicates, to a considerable extent, the reform sentiment evidenced in the legislature and the work of various commissions was also evidenced by the voters in 1912 and 1914. The Socialists' contribution to the cause during this period of achievement is assessed in chapter 12.

The last set of chapters, covering the years 1915–1920, focuses on the shift in sentiment against Hunt, reform, and radicalism. While there had always been corporate resistance to the anti-corporate surge, this resistance crystallized in 1915 following Hunt's defense of striking Mexican workers and became evident in a recall effort against him and in his defeat (though later reversed) in seeking reelection as governor in 1916. Chapter 13 looks at the problems Hunt faced in the legislature in 1915, in the courts, and on the labor front—especially in dealing with a strike at Clifton-Morenci. The next chapter is devoted to the effort to drive Hunt from power and, more broadly, to roll back the tide of anti-corporate reform. As chapter 15 illustrates, the anti-reform elements gained considerable strength under wartime conditions, leading to the repression of radical forces and discouraging government experimentation. Chapter 16 details how this state of affairs generally extended into the 1920s. A concluding note offers final thoughts on the nature, impact, and decline of the anti-corporate movement.