

ers whose harsh toil heaps up wealth for others.

On what extinguishment of high hope have these marvelous achievements been builded.

The century's sun sets in gloom of poverty, the blaze of wealth, the glorious light of achievement, the lurid glare of war.

But hope is eternal and the race ever renews itself. And only justice will satisfy the universal craving for justice. When civilization wears shabby in one land, men in some far country with red blood in their veins are ready to take what was best of it and give it new significance. Yesterday it was America where social justice meant most; to-day it is New Zealand; to-morrow it may be Russia. Every toilsome step won lifts the whole race towards its goal, liberty, equality, fraternity.

From the gray chill a faint flush steals over the sky, instinct of the great light that shall irradiate the heaven and set the earth aglow.

A new century dawns.—John Stone Pardee, in the Red Wing (Minn.) Argus.

"CLEVELAND, BRYAN, THE SOUTH AND 'THE PUBLIC.'"

Extracts from an editorial with the above title, which appeared in the Times, of Greenville, Miss, for Jan. 5.

In concluding a contention that "the low ebb of vitality" to which the party has been brought is chargeable to Cleveland instead of Bryan (by which token we infer the compliment to Cleveland of having occasioned Bryan's successive defeats), The Public says, "it is not Bryanism that has brought the democratic party so low in voting strength, but Clevelandism. Bryanism has given the party that democratic tone of which the slave power formerly and Cleveland latterly divested it; and as the fight goes on Bryanism will give it voting strength also." This paper also declares that "true democrats" want none of "the pro slavery doctrines and victories that preceded the civil war."

Their tone [the tone of the extracts from The Public quoted in the Times] is in thorough harmony with Mr. Bryan's repeatedly expressed sentiments, and as absolutely antithetical to the policies and doctrines of the old-school southern statesmen—those who won the "victories that preceded the civil war." They are produced simply as pointing once more to the chasm fixed by training, environment and habit of mind between the theories and senti-

ments of Bryan and the theories and sentiments naturally and historically a part of the south. This gulf is as great as that which separated Dives and Lazarus, but it was bridged in a moment of enthusiastic emotionalism by a few leaders who subordinated everything to their devotion to a wild-cat scheme of finance and their hatred of the best friend, north of Mason and Dixon's line, possessed by the south since the civil war.

But what is meant by "that democratic tone," of which the slave power and Cleveland filched the party and which Bryanism has restored? What is meant by "pro slavery doctrines and victories?" What is the nature of the "inspiration" which "the new democracy," as molded and led by Bryan, draws from Lincoln?

The "pro slavery doctrines and victories" were the doctrine of states rights and the victories which for 60 years gave the democratic party, mainly under southern leadership, control of the government. "That democratic tone," and the "inspiration" from Lincoln of the "democratic democracy" are readily comprehended by the careful reader of Mr. Bryan's speeches in his last campaign. The explanation is in the keynote to all his discussions; the same old "fraternity and equality;" the same old "all men are created equal;" the same old "consent of the governed."

Possibly Mr. Bryan is yet unprepared to go to the extreme of preaching universal social equality, but this is but a step removed from universal political equality. Equality, social and political, is the logical end to which must come all who accept, the abstraction of an "equal" creation; and with Mr. Bryan and his school this is little less than a religion. The Times has never once criticised Mr. Bryan on the score of his excessively "democratic tone." He is no more responsible for his feelings than were Lovejoy, Everitt, Phillips, Garrison, Higginson and the others of that host of abolition idealists with whose sentiments his mind works in natural and automatic harmony.

Surely The Public is correct. There is, indeed, a vast difference between the tone of the old democracy, for which the southern "slave power" and Cleveland stood, and that of the new, as led by Bryan and interpreted by his organs. The difference being so patent, and so radical in a hundred ways, the Times can but marvel at the choice made for the southern people by their leaders, and express a belief in its ultimate repudiation by "the rank and file."

DR. LYMAN ABBOTT ON THE SINGLE TAX.

An extract from a lecture on "Industrial Democracy," delivered in Brooklyn, N. Y., December 13, as reported in the Brooklyn Daily Eagle.

I have already pointed out the distinction between the natural rights of property, that is the property which man acquires by his labor, and the artificial rights of property or property in the natural resources and natural forces which are conferred upon him by the social organism. It is proposed by a certain class of reformers that the whole people shall resume their possession of the natural resources and the natural forces and shall become the landlord of the individual members. This plan is infelicitously called a single tax. It ought not to be so-called, when in fact it is a plan for the abolition of all taxation on the assumption that if the people get possession of what is their rightful property there will be no need of any taxation. Let me try to state this matter clearly, simply correcting some popular misapprehensions, for I meet continually men whose opinion is that the single tax proposes to put all taxes on real estate. This is not the proposition at all. It does not even approximate the proposition. The proposition is this: The air, water, land and the products of the land, coal, oil and the juices of the earth, God created and gave them to humanity. They belong to the human race.

The single taxer says, going back to the original conception of land which the Hebrew Scriptures stated belonged to God and which the feudal system said belonged to the king, let it be understood that land and its contents belong to the whole community. It belongs to the whole community because no man produced it, because it was created by the Creator and belonged to the Creator. Let the community then act as the landlord and let it rent to every man his land at a valuation dependent upon the value of the land in its raw condition. The single tax theory is that land belongs to the people, that land is raw material. Before a spade has been put into the soil or before a pick has touched the land, it has a natural valuation, whether it be in towns, suburbs or country. It shall be rented to him that has it or leases it for a rental equal to a low interest on the natural value of the land. But there are other things that belong to the people. A great strip of road, 100 feet wide or so, running from New York to Buffalo, belonged to the people until

they gave it to the New York Central railroad. The state grants franchises and has, therefore, the right to act as landlord for the railroad. I shall not carry this out further than simply to say this: Mr. Thomas G. Shearman, in his book entitled "Natural Taxation," which, though less popular, is much more scientific than Henry George's "Progress and Poverty," has given figures to show a plan whereby all expenses of the government, economically administered, would be raised from the land and the franchises and that there would be no need of taxation properly so-called. The latest advocate of the single tax, and his advocacy is qualified, not absolute, is Charles Francis Adams, who says that the single tax is an enormous improvement and reduces taxation to a systematic and scientific basis. Would not the carrying out of this plan amount to a confiscation of land values? If we carried it out, it would amount no doubt to such a change in values as would be disastrous to some land owners, but it would not be carried out instantly, but would come into effect little by little. Industry and ownership would adjust themselves to the new conditions exactly as life has adjusted itself to the utilization of steam and electricity. Personally, I do not believe that the practical injustice that would grow out of any adoption of the single tax that would be possible in America would be so great as the injury that has come to individuals from the readjustment of industry, adapting itself to new industrial conditions.

HOW IT LOOKS FROM THE PHILIPPINES.

The following is a letter written November 22, 1900, by a United States army surgeon who is now stationed on one of the most southerly islands of the Philippine group. The letter was received by Speed Mosby, of Jefferson City, Mo., January 11, 1901, who is a friend of the writer, and who for obvious reasons withholds his name.

The news of Mr. Bryan's defeat reached us yesterday. A Japanese steamer, driven out of her course by the storm which has prevailed in this part of the world for the past three days, passed up the coast on her way from Sydney to Yokohama, and the captain obliged us by signaling this bit of news while passing.

This news did not surprise me in the least, but it came as a very sore disappointment. The good people who are always right, according to Cardinal Wiseman, have been so tricked by the "full dinner pail" argument, and so blinded by the glit-

tering idea of "imperialism" that in the words of Scripture, "they know not what they do." Poor people! Poor fools! They deserve very little sympathy for the misery they are bringing upon themselves and their children. But, oh, how sad it is, to witness this history-worn spectacle of a great nation of free men, deliberately undermining its happiness and liberty. Unfortunate people are they, who can be so deluded by party leaders who view their wrongs and misfortunes through the neck of a champagne bottle. If the voters were deluded, they are to be pitied; if their eyes were opened to a clear perception of the main issue of this great political campaign, they deserve to be eternally damned by God and cursed by their posterity for all time to come.

How an American citizen could justify himself in voting for imperialism is beyond my comprehension. The republican policy is so plainly incompatible with our professed form of government, that if persisted in, it needs no seer to prophesy the downfall of the republic. I am neither a politician nor a statesman, but as a physician I imagine this defeat a strong symptom of our early decline as a free country. In fact, I believe all our pretensions are but a delusive show, like paint on the cheeks of a harlot, covering the outward body with a pretense of virtuous beauty, while below the surface all is villainy and corruption.

It is certainly a great farce for us to pretend to be free, when a great political party can afford to make fun of the declaration of independence. There was a time when the citizens of the United States merited the singular blessings vouchsafed them by Providence. The grand old men who founded the republic were neither fools nor fogies, as they have been called by the hypocritical republican press. And yet in this year of our Lord a great party (numerically great, I mean) can afford to scoff at the immortal work of those men, and tell the public that their teachings are worthless and old-fashioned, and find millions to cheer them to the echo, and vote for them in the bargain. Verily, the time is ripe for the beginning of scattered tyranny and oppression. Will the people allow it? I do not believe they will be able to prevent it. Already the spirit of the mailed fist is dominant, and I am positive, if the plans of this autocratic administration are carried out, a few years will find us groan-

ing under a military yoke as complete and despotic as that of Germany or Russia.

It is high time for the people to remember that their fancied liberties are not as secure as they might be. This sick nation of ours needs careful treatment and good nursing. The people can cure any political disease if they will go about it in the right way. If I were the attending physician I believe I should prescribe a good dose of Marat pills, or perhaps a Robespierre. But these things will all come in good time, if necessary. For the present we must wait and hope for better days, and join in the mournful howl of the multitude—vox populi, etc.—and work!

You will pardon me, I hope, for having expressed myself at such length, and in such a crude way; but I felt it necessary to express my feelings to some one, and consequently selected you for the victim, knowing that I should at least be sure of your sympathy. I am so disgusted with the whole business that I feel like settling in Borneo, Siam, or some other free and enlightened country, and never coming back to the states. I am very busy at present, getting off my annual requisitions, returns, reports and a thousand and one other things connected with army red tape. The insurgents are more active than ever before, all statements to the contrary notwithstanding. This war will last for years, if I am not greatly mistaken, and in the end we will have gained nothing but an immense national debt and a country where white men cannot live; also a big regular army, which is, of course, a part of the scheme.

KITCHENER'S IRON HAND.

A dispatch to the New York Sun, dated Ottawa, January 5. Published in the Sun of January 7.

The Canadian troops in South Africa, according to recent reports, are evidently not much in sympathy with the harsh measures now being enforced against the Boers by Lord Kitchener. In a letter from Belfast, South Africa, Lieut. Morrison, of Ottawa, editor of the Ottawa Citizen, who is with the Canadian artillery there and has been recently mentioned in dispatches for gallant conduct in action, describes the march through Steilpoort valley, north of Belfast. He says:

"Bright and early we marched off. The Canadians, as usual, were in the advance guard, with the Five lancers and two pompoms. Col. King commanded the advance and Gen. Smith-