

meaning of the word "villainy" in the quotation, and meaning its very opposite, gleefully exclaim: "The *villainy* you teach me I will execute, and it shall go hard but I will better the instruction."

The white man who claims that the Negro cannot and should not try to imitate the white civilization, and who says that the Negro consciousness is a different consciousness from ours, is simply making the claim that the Negro is slightly different from human. For what are the distinctively white qualities and virtues if they are not those very qualities which we call human?

A friend in discussing the matter with the writer said that what was wanted to solve the problem was a psychological inquiry into the Negro consciousness, and that all action in the premises should await and be based on that. This is a promising theory, but a little reflection shows that its promise is altogether false.

The only Negro consciousness that has value for democracy is the Negro self-consciousness. And the moment you present the Negro with a chart of his consciousness, he takes up a certain attitude toward it which is unpredictable—which was necessarily not in the consciousness as originally analysed—and your labor is in vain as far as its original intention was concerned. But if you could reduce the Negro to an analysable resultant of hereditary and social forces you are using a method which is just as valid if applied to the white man. In your reduction of the Negro to the sub-spiritual, you reduce the white to the sub-spiritual; you place both races on the plane of what is philosophically known as naturalism, on the plane where efficiency, survival, and not love, is the final good.

The Negro answer to such a reduction is Mr. Washington's doctrine of *laissez faire* democracy, the piling up of Negro fortunes, the aggressive business enterprise of Negro business men, the creation of Negro capitalist and Negro proletariat, and the duplication in Negro circles of our own whole round of industrial troubles.

That this is no idle fancy would be evident to anyone who spoke to some of the Negro delegates to the recent conference. One prominent Southern colored man denounced the unions to the writer. Because they excluded Negroes? No, but because they put a buffer between the worker and the stimulus of straight competition, so that the worker was not spurred to "do his damndest."



But must we not admit that real democracy requires two conditions for its ideal success? The

first of these is that every man is an end in himself—not a means merely to your end or mine. And the second and just as important condition is that all truly human ends are reconcilable and co-ordinate, so that—as a recent writer, Professor Warner Fite, has pointed out, in a remarkable book—in a fully conscious society, conflict and personal sacrifice are eliminated by that mutual recognition and intelligence which sees to it that while I gain my ends through your instrumentality, I shall do it in such a way that my doing so enables you to gain your ends while working for mine.

Right here is where Dr. Du Bois and his school supplement the work of Dr. Washington. They see that the Negro cannot gain anything more than a material and partial victory by becoming more and more self-sufficing. Two camps of self-sufficing and self-regarding peoples will never constitute a democracy. Every white advance in the conception of social justice must be shared with the Negro. The Negro who is graduated from a college must not be allowed to take Dr. Washington's advice to go South and start a brick yard, if he has academic abilities that can be employed in other and more ideally fruitful ways. The white unions, for instance, must cease their suicidal and immoral policy of discouraging or excluding Negro members. The Negroes must not meet such exclusion with a self-sufficient, "Well, I shall achieve in some other way." They must insist on achieving in that particular—by insisting on admission to every union that claims to be Labor.

To achieve the proper solution of this problem, in short, simply means that whites as well as Negroes shall be guided by ideals as well as by opportunism, shall have the courage of their lip-service to spiritual realities, shall either admit that they do not believe in democracy at all but only in the struggle for existence, or else pursue their achievement of democracy in the only way possible, by the frank recognition of and action upon the spiritual implications of democracy and self-consciousness.

LLEWELLYN JONES.

---

## CONDENSED EDITORIALS

---

### FUNDAMENTAL DEMOCRACY WORLD-WIDE.

Louis F. Post, in the *Chicago Daily Press* of Aug. 16

No thoughtful person doubts that Theodore Roosevelt and his political party are facts of great significance. Both man and party are startling signs of

progress in public opinion. They go to show that in this country the principle of fundamental democracy, which means fair play all around, is seething in the public mind.

That this is the condition of things is implied by the fact that Roosevelt and his party are listened to eagerly. It is also implied by the behavior of the Republican party which Roosevelt has left. It is implied again by the fact that the Democratic party is more democratic, fundamentally, than it has been since it elected Andrew Jackson to the Presidency some 80 years ago. It is implied by the whole political break-up, about which every good citizen all over the United States is thinking now and thinking hard.

But our country is not the only storm center of fundamental democracy. That principle is at work everywhere. When we read about world politics as we read about our own politics, or about sports, we exclaim again and again, "What a little world this big world is!"

Fundamental democracy has different ways of working. Yet once to know it is to be able to recognize it in its working clothes always and everywhere. If you believe in the Declaration of Independence, where it says that "all men are created equal"—which means that the men and women of every race and class should have equal rights—if you are in that spirit when you read the political news of the world, you know that there is nothing strange in the politics we are having in this country now; nor in the governmental experiments we are making or trying to make; nor in the necessity for them.

We may be ahead of other countries in some things. Or a little behind in other things. And surely there is great variety of detail. But the spirit of fundamental democracy is in them all. From the Northwest Side of Chicago, where the burning question may be street improvements, or some other peaceable proposal for local betterment, to far-away places where struggles for fair-play may still cost blood, the human race is working out its age-old problem of how to live and prosper in good fellowship and with equal rights. That is to say, mankind is everywhere working out into practical life, the everlasting principle of fundamental democracy.

---

## EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

---

### A LIBERAL CRISIS IN GREAT BRITAIN.

Grasmere, England, August 19, 1912.

The Liberal success at the by-election at Hanley has been followed by two reverses, one at Crewe, where the Tory candidate benefited by the Liberal-Labor conflict, and the other at North-West Manchester, where a Liberal majority of 445 was turned into a Tory majority of 1,202.

Mr. Murphy, who fought the Crewe division for the Liberal Party, was heralded as a champion of the taxation of land values policy, but failed to make an aggressive campaign on that issue.

The Liberal candidate for North-West Manchester, uncertain of his position on the land question, declined to pledge himself to support the Memorial

presented by the Land-Tax group in Parliament to the Prime Minister and Mr. Lloyd George, and signed by 177 Liberal and Labor members. He contented himself with an endorsement of the vague land nationalization programme and confined his attention to a defense of Government measures, relying on the historic Freetrade sentiment of Manchester to carry him in. The result is viewed with equanimity by all those whose Liberalism transcends mere party lines.

The situation is thus summed up by R. L. Outhwaite, M. P., in a letter to the "Daily News and Leader":

"When the vacancy for North-West Manchester was announced, the land values men who had carried North-West Norfolk, Holmfirth and Hanley, and, coming in at the end, had averted a humiliating result at Crewe, were prepared to rally to the aid of the Liberal candidate. The division provides such object-lessons in the need for land value taxation and rating reform that, once the question had been raised, the Tory candidate would have found it impossible to talk Insurance Act. Free-trade and the Taxation of Land Values versus Tariff Reform would within 24 hours have been the issue. But the candidate, his backers and the 'Manchester Guardian' decided to fight on a negative policy and to angle for the votes of Free-trade Unionists, and so the land values men decided to stand aside. Precisely the same thing happened at the South Manchester by-election, and the Government has received two staggering blows in the citadel of Free-trade which are the prelude to the loss of Lancashire unless different tactics are adopted. My object in writing is to point out that the land values propagandists have determined to pursue a definite policy. They know that only the taxation of land values can effectively rally the democratic forces. After long years of officially disregarded works they have come into their own. During the last four years, largely owing to the generosity of Mr. Joseph Fels, they have spent some \$150,000 in educational work, and they are not going any longer to act as vote-catchers for candidates who only give lip-service to their cause. When a Liberal candidate determines to fight on the Memorial policy which has been adopted by the party organizations of England, Scotland and Wales, every effort will be made to aid him against Tory or Socialist opponent. I believe that only in this way can Liberalism be saved, and that, if party organizers do not quickly realize what it is the electorate wants and put forward candidates to advocate it, the Government will suffer defeat after defeat and be driven from office before the great measures it has in hand can reach the statute book."

F. W. GARRISON.



### WHAT SHALL WE DO IF WE LOSE?

Warren, Ohio.

"She never knew defeat. When that happened which others called defeat, she was wont to think of it merely as the establishment of a mile-post to indicate the progress which had been made, and she never doubted that victory was just ahead." So spoke Carrie Chapman Catt of Susan B. Anthony in her eulogy of the departed leader. What was true