

CHILDREN equally with the richer members of the family, to SUE in the COURT for an accounting.

"Do you notice how all the SUITORS are poor and discontented?" said one fat and prosperous one, with a WINK at another fat and prosperous one.

"Yes," was the answer; "Starved and Thin—that is the meaning of 'S. T.'"

THOS. H. POTTER, S. T.
Belleville, N. J.

THE SHAME OF A UNIVERSITY.

Lines by a student of Stanford university, written upon the dismissal of Prof. Ross from that institution, and published in the San Francisco Star of November 17.

Is it a lie? Is it all a lie?
The great ideal and the purpose high?
Where is the promise of yesterday
That freedom and light should hold full sway,
Unfettered of thought and free of speech,
The right to learn and the right to teach?
What if the part held another view?
Is the right less right or the truth less true?
Shall the hand of death reach, out of the past,
To throttle science and learning at last?
Are the truths of science bought and sold?
Must learning bow to the weight of gold?
Not towering buildings nor massive arch
May turn the truth in its onward march.
Gone is our glory and pride of name,
For the selfish gift is the giver's shame.

THE BROOKLYN SINGLE TAX CLUB TO MR. BRYAN.

The following letter has been sent by the Brooklyn Single Tax Bryan and Stevenson club to W. J. Bryan:

Hon. William J. Bryan,

Dear Sir: This club, which was organized to promote your candidacy, desires at the close of the campaign to express its confidence in you, and the profound conviction of its members that the cause of equal rights for all and special privileges for none, for which you have so ably stood for four years, has been greatly advanced as the result of your two magnificent campaigns. Believing this, we cannot look upon the struggle which has just closed as having been a fruitless one.

Although not successful in securing the indorsement of the people at the polls, you have done that which is probably much more important to posterity — you have directed the minds of thoughtful men, not only of this country, but of the whole world, toward the finding of a remedy which will avert the danger to society which lurks within legislation favoring monopoly and special privilege. To the minds of the believers in the doctrine taught by Henry George there can be no sure foundation for the permanent existence of a true republic without equality of opportunity that would

result from the public appropriation of land values known as the single tax. We believe that in no other way can justice be established on earth. While we have seen no expression of your opinion coinciding with this belief, we have supported you in both campaigns because we have recognized by the position which you have taken on all public questions that the keynote of your action was justice. We are confident that the work which you have done in directing thought to the attainment of such an ideal condition will ultimately triumph in the battle that is ever being waged between right and wrong, between democracy and plutocracy.

It is our earnest belief that you will continue your admirable and effective efforts in behalf of the rights of the masses of men against the oppression of unjust legislation.

With our most earnest wishes for your welfare and for the coming of that true democracy which we all desire, we remain, faithfully and sincerely yours,

Brooklyn Single Tax Bryan and Stevenson Campaign Club,

D. B. VAN VLECK, President.
H. G. SEAVER, Secretary.

AN ENGLISH VIEW OF OUR RECENT ELECTION.

It always savors of impertinence when the citizens of one country show themselves partisans in the domestic affairs of another, but the American people for all their different blood have so much in common with us in their language and their religion, and the principal difficulty before them so closely resembles that with which we are ourselves grappling, that it is impossible for English liberals not to give some expression to their disappointment at Mr. Bryan's defeat. We do not believe this defeat to be wholly due to Mr. Bryan's silver fallacies, still less do we believe it to spring from any passion for expansion. It is not out of any respect for the name of Mr. McKinley or for the character of the strong man, Mr. Roosevelt, or for the cunning of the boss, Mr. Hanna, that an appreciable majority has returned the republicans to power. It is because they have never yet had a national experience to teach them what "imperialism" means, so that they still confuse it with the pride in and love of one's country, and the coupling of this ignorance with the fear of idealism and reform that prosperity always produces in a commercial people. Neither of these causes is worthy of the men who first wrote down in English that

political liberty was "inalienable" and "a self-evident truth."

If one descends from the ideals upon which this election turned to the practical results which it may produce, one thing stands out prominent. The return of Mr. McKinley means that the one chance offered by fate to the United States to save their prestige in the far east has been thrown away. The unselfish emancipation of the Philippines under the enthusiasm of a generous impulse, coupled with a declaration of protection, would have left the international power of America and its military name intact. As it is the American people have pledged themselves to one of two inevitable courses. Either they will plunge into that hopeless morass, the continued attempt to conquer under conditions that forbid conquest; or they will consent to admit themselves beaten and will retire by force when they might have retired of their free will. The first misfortune is that which has throughout history been the principal and most obvious cause of national decline. The second is a sharp humiliation which a selfish aristocracy or a wise despot may inflict on a nation, but which a democracy of all forms of government will be most reluctant to adopt; and if it is better than a hopeless and weakening struggle, yet it certainly lessens for a time the strength of any nation compelled to it. That the half-barbarous, tropical Philippines, with millions of inhabitants, can be conquered and administered by the volunteers of an unmilitary democracy, living in a temperate climate on the other side of the world, is a fantastic notion.—The London Speaker of Nov. 10.

THE DEMANDS OF THE PRESENT CRISIS.

For The Public.

To all who observe closely the trend of social forces, it is apparent that the crisis long ago foreseen is now approaching with the cumulative power and swiftness of a terrible storm. For years far-sighted men and women have been faithfully laboring to avert social disaster by teaching great economic truths and by pointing out simple methods of bringing about a better social order. Noble efforts have been made to enlighten the people upon the true fundamental relations of human society. What has been the result? The people have not heard. They have not heard because they have not listened. Plutocracy and monopoly rise supreme from every contest and triumphantly maintain their ascendancy. In spite of every demo-

cratic effort on the part of those who believe in the common man, the mass of the people remains unmoved, untouched, ignorant that there is a social problem they themselves can solve; unconscious of their power to change the institutions under which they are victimized; viewing with apathy and indifference the insolent encroachments of plutocracy upon their rights and liberties. Greed, commercialism and the spirit of conquest stalk across our sacred precincts, worshiped by the masses whom they trample upon and destroy.

Could aught more sharply testify to the moral and mental degeneration of the people than the recent presidential election? In this the people have officially repudiated the doctrine of self-government which our fathers died to establish. They have forgotten what liberty is, and principles of justice have lost their inspiring influence. This degeneration has come in the face of the most active, persistent, unselfish reform efforts that the world has ever seen. Why?

It is because the people have lost faith in American ideals. The conscience of the people is asleep; the consciousness of a loving brotherhood is dulled and deadened. So long as their thoughts are only of self and of the shrewdest winning from others in the bitter struggle for existence, the people will remain as putty in the hands of the careful, discerning, plutocratic genius.

Before we can have an economic system, based upon common right to the resources of nature, the people must want such a system, and want it badly enough to take steps to secure it. They are now indifferent; they are undeniably content to play at the present game in the hope that they may achieve some sort of individual salvation. When they shall be brought to conceive the desirability of a better social order, and a faith in justice and human brotherhood shall revive, they will listen to those who are qualified to teach fundamental economic truths; truths which must be recognized to insure the stability of the state they desire.

The imperative thing to do now is to waken the sleeping conscience of the people; to revive in them a devotion to ideals of human liberty. The faith that is dead must live again; the old fires of freedom must be rekindled, and the new made to blaze with the promise of a better industrial day. The hearts of the people must be made to burn with a faith in the possibility of a heavenly order on earth. This

once achieved, the beauty and significance of the idea of brotherhood once understood and acknowledged, the selfish barriers to the common ownership of the natural resources God has provided for all men will fall like a house of cards.

The only way to stem the coming disaster, or even to raise a better order from its ruins is to strive now to fill the souls of men with vital religious fire. The supremest output of spiritual strength from every devoted, fervent soul who loves the cause of humanity is, in the face of the gathering social revolution, the least that God may hope for or require.

FRANKLIN H. WENTWORTH.

THE DISFRANCHISEMENT PARTY.

"It is of course absurd to speak of the party which withholds from the negroes privileges extended to the whites as the party of 'equal rights to all, special privileges to none.'" Thus says the Dubuque Times, and we quite agree with it. But the Times is in error in implying that the democratic party does this. The organization does nothing of the kind. Its principles are set forth in its national platforms, and in none of these since the party has come under the control of those who are democratic in fact as well as in name is inequality approved. On the contrary, equality is demanded for all regardless of race, color or creed. It is true that southern states which for a considerable period have cast their electoral votes for democratic candidates for president have disfranchised the blacks by amendments to their state constitutions. But this is not the work of democrats, republicans or populists, but of white men acting as such. In the south the question is not one of partisanship, but of race. The Caucasians refuse to accept negro domination, and to prevent it they have taken from the African the elective franchise. Without stopping to discuss the wrong or the right of this, it may be said that no party can be held responsible for what has been done in and by these states unless it approves it. We challenge anyone to find in the democratic national platform of 1900 or that of 1896 a paragraph or a sentence which the utmost ingenuity can torture into even a semblance of approval. And as the party is not and has not been in power, it has not sanctioned the disfranchisement by its acts. The organization, therefore, must be exonerated.

But the republican party cannot be,

for while it does not approve the disfranchisement in its platform it intends to do so in fact. It has control of both branches of congress and of the executive department, it is about to make a new apportionment of congressmen based on the recent federal census, and the Fourteenth amendment provides that when citizens of the United States are disfranchised by any state for other cause than conviction of crime the representation of such state shall be reduced correspondingly. The constitutional provision is mandatory, not permissive. It says shall, not may. Is it to be enforced? Is the republican majority to reduce southern representation because of negro disfranchisement? Not at all. Though he is solemnly sworn to respect and uphold the constitution of the United States, President McKinley protests! And why? For sound public reasons? There can be no sound public reason for a violation of the organic law. He objects for partisan reasons. He is satisfied that with the negroes divested of the elective franchise and the whites thus emancipated from the danger of black domination, the southern whites, no longer bound to act together as a unit in the face of a common menace, will divide politically, that in consequence of the division the republican party will experience a rapid growth south of Mason and Dixon's line, and that by reason of its growth the party will carry states which have been democratic since the completion of reconstruction. For reasons so obvious as to make detail needless, congress will do as the president desires. To strengthen the republican party where heretofore it has been weak, no provision will be made in the reapportionment bill for a reduction of southern representation, and the absence of such provision, especially in view of the constitutional mandate, will be an approval by the republican party of the practice of taking from the negro the franchise which the party, in its earlier and better days, conferred upon him for his protection. Now that it has become the facile instrument of plutocracy, the party is eager to undo what it did when it was a party of freedom.

The very opposite of what the Times implies is the fact. The democratic party is not in favor of negro disfranchisement. It objects to it first because it is wrong in principle, and next because, from the political standpoint, the party has everything to lose and nothing to gain by it. The republican party favors negro disfran-