

struggle short or long, it can, as so many of the wisest men in the Lords warned their fellow Peers, have but one issue. The forces of democracy will not suffer the struggle to be ended until they have attained security. The watchword will be "Never again."

+

London Morning Leader (Lib.), Dec. 1.—This is not a question of whether this or that Minister or party shall be in office next year or the year after; it is a question of putting the clock back to the days beyond the Stuarts. If the incredible happened, and Mr. Balfour regained the form as well as the substance of power next January, the ultimate ruin of the party which engineered this conspiracy would be no less certain. Liberals will never lay down their arms; they will never abate one jot of their demands, and if this fight were to go on for a generation or for four generations it would still be fought by the united armies of progress doggedly and relentlessly, year after year, to its inevitable end.

+

Manchester Guardian (Lib.), Dec. 1.—From the question of whether he should use his vote to get this or that done in Parliament the ordinary voter, Conservative as well as Liberal, will now be forced by the Lords' action to turn away and stand up for his bare right of getting anything done in Parliament at all. For with the power of the purse goes all power in English politics, and if the Lords could by any prodigies of skill in false pretences procure an amnesty at the polls for their first seizure of forbidden power, the all-important precedent would have been given and taken, and the supreme power would in two months have passed from the voters of England, who have held it for three centuries, to the House of Lords.

+

Birmingham Daily Post (Tory), Dec. 1.—If the general election demonstrates a readiness to plunge into the Georgian abyss, the electors will have themselves alone to blame for any resultant suffering, and the Lords will be absolved from responsibility as contributory agents. Should they vote against the Government, the Lords will have the satisfaction, as in the case of the home rule controversy, of feeling that they, and not the Cabinet, have more truly interpreted the spirit and temper of the nation. Whatever the result of the election, and whatever be its influence on our Constitutional history, the fact will remain for all time that the Lords have been prepared to face the manifold pains and penalties with which they have been threatened, simply and solely because a sense of duty, as they conceive it, has weighed more with them than counsels of expediency.

+

South Wales Daily News (Lib.), Dec. 1.—The announcement of the figures was received at midnight in the streets of Cardiff with cheers for Mr. Lloyd-George. That is the sign of the times. Is the country to be governed by 350 Peers? That is the issue, and Liberals go into the fight forced upon them with clean hands.

Leeds Mercury (Lib.), Dec. 1.—The adoption of Lord Lansdowne's amendment marks the temporary disestablishment of the representative Chamber. It represents also the transitory triumph of plutocratic interests over the aspirations of the democracy. The blow long meditated by the oligarchy against a free and representative institution has at last been delivered, and we all know where we stand today. The adoption of the amendment is a shameless affront to the moral conscience of the nation.

RELATED THINGS

CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

RAGGED HEROES.

From the Hungarian of Alexander Petofi. Rendered Into English Verse by Alice Stone Blackwell.

For The Public.

I too could dress my verses up
In rhymes and metres fair,
As fits when we go visiting
In fashion's pomp and glare.

But my thoughts are not idle youths
Who for amusement live,
To go, in gloves and well-curled locks,
Calls to receive and give.

No sword rings now, no cannon booms;
Dim rust has quenched their rage;
Yet war goes on; instead of swords,
Ideas the battle wage.

Among your warriors, O my Time!
I combat as I can.
'Tis by my poems I contend;
Each is a fighting man.

Ragged but vallant lads are they,
All brave in battle's press.
A soldier's duty is performed
By courage, not by dress.

Whether my poems will survive
I do not ask at all;
If in this battle they perchance
Must perish, let them fall.

This book that holds my dead ideas
E'en then will sacred be,
Because of heroes 'tis the grave
Who died for Liberty!

+ + +

WHAT WAS THE MATTER WITH DIVES?

Extracts from a Sermon Preached in the First Baptist Church of Los Gatos, Cal., Sept. 19, 1909, by the Pastor, Robert Whitaker.

What was the matter with Dives? There is no evidence that he was a disreputable man. The chances are that he was every bit as decent and likeable a fellow as the average rich man of any

generation? What Jesus said to the Pharisees in substance was that the essential thing in religion in all ages is brotherliness, and that those who had the revelation of Moses and the prophets did not need any further light on that point as the truth was clear enough already, and was only obscured for them because they loved money much more than they loved men. The matter with Dives was that he wasn't brotherly. His wealth had just this much to do with it, that the manner of getting wealth and spending wealth in all ages is contrary to the brotherly interpretation of life, which is the interpretation of Jesus' kingdom. And it is just about as impossible for a rich man to see this to-day as it would be for a camel to go through a needle's eye.

The two things that stand out in Jesus' teaching concerning the kingdom of God are the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of men, and these in a much more intimate and absolute way than we are accustomed to take them. It is naturally impossible for any rich man to feel the fatherhood of God as he should. Much more impossible is it for a rich man to either achieve wealth or hold it in the spirit of any profound, Christian appreciation of his brotherhood with other men. No man ever got rich by living up to the law of brotherhood, nor ever can. The law of brotherhood is the law of mutual consideration, the law of unselfishness, the law of self-abnegating service of the strong toward the weak. It is impossible for brothers to monopolize for their individual advantage that which belongs to them all. It is impossible for brothers to take advantage of each other's failings and faults. It is impossible for brothers to grow rich at each other's expense. And what is impossible for brothers is impossible for any men who live according to the laws of the kingdom of God. . . .

Our money kings are our actual deities as truly as were ever the kings of Babylon or the emperors of Rome the idols of the multitudes who served them. They also had their dead demi-gods and gods, even as we have, but their real worship went out to the men who had wrested power from them and ruled over them with a rod of iron. And we do the same. We cry out "Christ! Christ!" but in our hearts we long to be not little Christs, but little Harrimans. We want money more than we want character, and we want power over our fellows more than we want to serve them. We can believe easy enough that because Dives did not feed a beggar at his gate he was damned to torment for all eternity. Our little charities give us comfort in such interpretation, and our slander of God is an incidental thing. But to believe the heart of the message, that the essence of religion is brotherliness, would convict us all, and show that we are damned already by our selfish living, and our adulation of the very men who are doing on a gigantic scale the very thing that Dives did.

What was the matter with Dives? The same thing that is the matter with all of us who worship the Harriman ideal of life—that he tried to make religion consist in something else than treating the weakest and poorest of his fellows as a brother, and then excused it on the ground that God hadn't made it plain enough so that a man could understand. Well, that excuse has been taken away. We know now, for God has written it in the skies, that religion is love. And still we worship those who make life to consist in greed, and cunning, and force.

+ + +

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON'S LAST WORDS ON THE NEGRO PROBLEM.

A Letter Written to the National Conference on the
Status of the Negro, Held in New York
Last Spring.*

Boston, May 29, 1909.

Mr. William English Walling, Sec'y,
New York City.

Dear Sir: I regret my inability to be present at the conference and record my protest against the rising tide of race prejudice and caste. Every step in that direction needs to be unflinchingly met, regardless of the eminent respectability that now lends countenance to this resurgent spirit of slavery. As in former days, the most insidious betrayal of freedom comes from its professed friends.

The Vardamans and Tillmans are harmless in comparison. Their brutal avowal of a purpose to reduce the Negro to a state of permanent vassalage, through evasion or defiance of constitution and law, repels humane souls and makes for justice. It is men of so-called light and leading, solicitous regarding social problems, arrogating to themselves the character of friendly advisers of the colored people, yet viewing the question from the summit of race pride and birth, who are most to be feared.

From these come easy acquiescence in the abrogation of the Fifteenth Amendment, the approval of separate schools based on complexion, and an affected horror of racial intermarriage for fear of white deterioration,—while contemplating without disturbance the unabated illicit connections so flagrantly in evidence. The creed leads to servitude, in another form, of the people liberated by Lincoln's proclamation; compassing by force or fraud the end for which the Southern Confederacy fought and failed. Now, as then, democracy is in the balance. The issue will determine whether self-government can survive in a land where material interests long overshadow the principles and enthusiasm of liberty. It is

*See *Publics* of May 21, page 492; June 4, page 540; June 11, pages 559 and 563.