

take on new hope because their adversary has been drawn into the open struggle.

The election in North Carolina forcibly recalled the days when it was part of the democratic faith that white men have an inalienable moral right to wallop niggers. The negroes of the coast counties were terrorized by armed white mobs, who forbade them to exercise their suffrage rights, openly proclaiming that the negro who dared to be a candidate for office should suffer death, and as openly intimating that negroes who valued their lives must stay away from the polls. In this way a republican county was made democratic in the wink of an eye; and to celebrate the despicable victory, the office of the colored paper at Wilmington was gutted and its editor driven out of the state.

The men who engaged in this series of outrages for the purpose of denying equal rights before the law to their neighbors, have the effrontery to call themselves democrats. Among them, too, were professed ministers of Christ, idolators who, because with wooden literalness they believe in the allegory of Jonah and the whale, suppose that they may disregard the two great commandments and ignore the golden rule. And all these rioters, these pulpit defilers, these hypocritical democrats, these murderers, these cowards, claim to belong to the respectable classes, and to be of a superior race!

In what are they superior? Certainly not in respect for the law. Not in peaceableness. Not in neighborliness. Not in Christian forbearance. Not in anything except that which by certain standards makes the cut-throat superior to the gentleman. And what is their title to respectability? They themselves lay stress upon the false pretense that they are the taxpayers. Of all the taxes of Wilmington these lawless white mobs pretend to pay 96 per cent.; and therefore they claim the Christian right to disfranchise the negroes.

But in fact the negroes of Wilmington pay as much in taxes as the whites, if not more. What the whites mean when they say that they are the taxpayers is that they deliver most of the tax money to the tax collector. But they get a large proportion of this money from the negroes. They make the negroes pay that much more for almost everything they consume. Negroes rent houses if they don't own them, and the white landlord adds his house tax to the rent. Storekeepers do the same as to the taxes they have paid; when they sell the negroes goods, they add the tax to the price. And while each white man in Wilmington probably pays more taxes than each negro, because he consumes more goods and lives in a better house, yet as the negroes largely outnumber the whites, it is reasonably probable that the burden of the largest proportion of the taxes of Wilmington is borne not by the whites but by the negroes. The talk about the whites paying 96 per cent. of the taxes is empty talk. As to the largest part of this per centage the whites are not taxpayers at all; they are only tax collectors. They have as much reason, and no more, for saying that they pay 96 per cent. of the Wilmington taxes, as the county collector would have for saying that he pays all the state taxes. It is one of the infamies of indirect taxation, that it enables mere tax collectors to pose as taxpayers.

By way of excuse for such outrages upon the legal and moral rights of negroes as that of last week at Wilmington, it is often urged that the presence of the two races in large numbers in the same community makes an irrepressible race conflict. But it is not a race conflict. That is only the surface appearance. It is a labor conflict. The whites want to make the blacks their virtual slaves.

If the negro question were a race question, the whites would be glad to have the negroes leave, just as the whites of the Pacific would be glad

to have the Chinese leave. But that is something they bitterly oppose. When a negro exodus set in some years ago from some of the southern states, the whites opposed it in the same lawless way in which they had opposed the enjoyment by the blacks of civil and political rights. The exodus would have deprived them of their laboring class! The whites don't want the negro to leave; neither do they want him to have the rights of an equal before the law while he remains. Those whites who own the land of the south want the negro to work it for a bare living, giving the rest of their produce to them in ground rent or its equivalent; and the whites who don't own land are assinine enough to play into the hands of those who do. That is what makes the race question.

The essential character of the race question at the south is illustrated by the disposition shown by the whites towards negroes in respect of common social rights. A bill is now pending before the Georgia legislature, which requires separate sleeping cars for whites and blacks. It was the outcome of a railroad episode in which two state senators figured. These senators had engaged berths at one end of a Pullman. They afterwards found that a negro and his wife had a berth at the other end; whereupon with characteristic good feeling and chivalry they demanded that the negro and his wife be ejected. Their demand being ignored, they introduced in the legislature the bill for separate sleeping cars. Now does any one suppose that it was mere race feeling that prompted the ruffianly demand of those two senators? It was nothing of the sort. At any rate, it was only that kind of race feeling which yearns to make servants of people of weaker races. Had that negro and his wife been servants, and had they been sleeping in the car on chairs or on a bench, they might have gone on breathing the same air and snoring in the same key with the highbred Georgia senators without evoking a protest. It was not their presence in

the car, but their presence there as equals, with equal accommodations, that the senators objected to. During the very night when these white men demanded the ejection from their sleeper of the negro passengers, they no doubt endured without a murmur the presence, and the sleeping presence too, of the negro porter. But he was a servile porter, not an equal passenger, and in that distinction lay the whole difference.

This difference is illustrated in the rules governing day cars in the south. Negro cars are provided and no negro is admitted to the white cars. That is the rule. And against independent negro passengers the rule is strictly enforced. But negro servants traveling with white masters or mistresses, are freely admitted to the white cars. The question is not one of race, but of servitude. It is not a question of disagreeable race characteristics; it is a question of democracy. The attitude of the whites toward the negroes at this late day in the nineteenth century, is precisely the same in motive and principle as the attitude of French seigneurs towards French peasants in the middle of the eighteenth.

It would be an oversight to dismiss the elections and the events connected with them, without considering the effect of the returns upon business. Immediately after election it was proclaimed by the whole prosperity chorus, that business had responded briskly to the republican victory. Investigation revealed, however, that the kind of business which responded was Wall street business. According to one rather frank republican report, the election returns which made the control of the next house at Washington by the republicans fairly certain, "struck Wall street as positive forces" and "the strongest market seen in many days resulted." Further examination disclosed the interesting fact that this strong market related to watered stocks. That is to say, the republican success in the elections had inspired

confidence in the ability of overstocked corporations to squeeze enough unearned profits out of the public to make their water yield dividends. But the search for prosperous markets for other things was vain. Farm products fell, as watered stock rose. Verily, of such is the kingdom of Hanna.

What this prosperity for watered stocks means to the public may be inferred, though only in slight degree, by some figures which the United States Investor recently published. That periodical named seven industrial trusts which have outstanding common stock to the amount of \$145,295,000, representing not one dollar of tangible property. This vast amount depends for such dividend paying power as it may ever acquire, upon the strength of the monopolistic privileges of the corporations that have issued it. Should monopolies be fostered by government, it will yield dividends; should monopolies be broken down, it will be blank paper. Such watered stock is bought and sold on the stock exchange as "pure gamble," to borrow a phrase from the Investor. When the prospects for monopoly look bright, the stock rises; when the prospects for monopoly look dull, it falls. Its price, therefore, indicates the views of the stock gamblers as to which political party is most friendly to monopoly. When the first election returns showed a democratic tinge, watered stocks on the exchanges were dull; when the success of the republicans became certain, watered stocks strengthened. The inference is plain. Draw it.

According to an estimate just given out by the war department the number of officers and men who were killed or died of wounds in the war with Spain, up to September 30, was 345. The number that died of disease up to the same date was 2,565. From this the war department argues that as these losses were out of a total military force of 275,717, the number to the thousand, 10.5, is exceedingly

small. But that is not the way to estimate the percentage of loss. Much the larger proportion of those 275,717 men never went where, with decent care, they would have run any risk of death, either from wounds or disease. The number of men in the army who got to the seat of war was little if any more than 50,000. The deaths, therefore, relatively to those who saw actual service, were more than 55 in the thousand.

At last the failure of the Dingley bill as a revenue raiser is conceded. Chairman Dingley himself has given out an interview in which he says that the war revenue bill will be retained in force without material alteration, and that the tariff bill will not be revised. Thus the war revenue bill is to be used as a supplementary revenue raiser. It is intimated, of course, that this is made necessary by war expenses. But that is not true. The cost of the war up to date is less by several millions than the \$200,000,000 which Secretary Gage borrowed for war purposes. Not a dollar of the war revenue is needed, therefore, for war purposes. But the war revenue law is to be retained in force. The only reasonable inference, which does not imply a corrupt purpose, is that it is needed to eke out the income of the ineffective Dingley bill.

Mr. Hanna does not leave the public to draw this inference. In an interview telegraphed from Cleveland on the 13th by the Associated Press, he states it as a fact. Under the Dingley bill, he says, "we are not getting very much revenue, because we are exporting instead of importing; and something must be done to meet these new conditions." For one thing, he proposes a duty on tea and coffee; but he thinks "it will be necessary to retain some of the features of the war revenue measure" also. It is quite apparent that both Mr. Hanna and Mr. Dingley realize that but for the war, with its war bonds and war revenue, and with only the Dingley bill to depend upon, the treasury would be already running low.