

ed by the republican prophets in the next; but while the majority in the next house is not yet determined, it will be less than 20 and probably not more than 13.

To one class of voters, the elections were unalloyed disappointments. We refer to single taxers. In Delaware, where there is a single tax party, probably the only one in the world, the single tax vote of two years ago was not increased. In fact there was a falling off. But as that was about in the proportion of the falling off in the total vote, the single tax party may be said to have held its own. In 1896 its vote was 1,146 in a total of 38,520; in 1898 it was about 900 in a total of about 30,000. But the managers of the little party claim to have defeated the democrats in Delaware and to have made the state republican.

In Washington and California the single tax question was at least a more sensational feature of the elections than in Delaware. The republicans of Washington fought a "local option in taxation" amendment to the constitution, which the democrats, populists and silver republicans had indorsed, doing so upon the ground that this amendment would be an entering wedge for the single tax; and in California they fought Maguire, the nominee for governor, of the democrats, populists and silver republicans, upon the ground that he is a well known single tax advocate. In both states the attack upon the single tax was virulent. In both the issue was refused, nominally because it was not an issue of the campaign, but really because the fusion managers were in sympathy with the republicans regarding this question. The constitutional amendment was defeated in Washington and Maguire was defeated in California.

A correspondent, Alfred Cridge, of San Francisco, writes vigorously in condemnation of the fusion managers in California. Among other things he says:

Somebody has said that "God hates a coward." I don't know; but I know

that men do. And it is largely because men hate cowards that Maguire, who could have been elected governor by 40,000 majority, was defeated by a non-entity by 17,000. At least 30,000 voters hated even the appearance of cowardice. In speaking of cowardice I do not refer to the candidate, but to the fusion state campaign committee.

For some two months past two morning papers of San Francisco have averaged two columns of mud-slinging at the single tax in each issue. They asserted that under the single tax, taxes upon working farmers and small city home owners would be more than tripled. In fact, as I could easily prove by statistics in abundance, the single tax would reduce the taxes on those classes in this state by from 25 to 75 per cent. But the fusion state campaign committee, acting just as it would had it been bribed, would not allow the subject to be discussed. Any well informed single taxer could have refuted the enemy's proposition in this instance inside of 10 minutes on the platform or a column of a daily paper. I had the figures to do it, and did it, in type, so that any farmer could comprehend it. But the orders were silence. Nothing could be said of the single tax except that it was not an issue.

When small farmers and home owners are thus made to believe, or even to suspect, that a candidate for any office whatever is fundamentally determined, whenever opportunity permits, to confiscate the farm or home by taxation, what else is to be expected but that they will vote to keep such a candidate out of office? That he might have no power to enact such a law in such an office would count for little with them. That a tiger might be securely fastened in a cage would not reconcile a farmer to having it on his premises. The farmers were taught, without contradiction, to regard Maguire as a confiscator of farms and homes. Can it be wondered at that enough of them, who would have been favorably disposed had they known either the candidate or his doctrine, accepted the uncontradicted assertions of their enemy, when their friends, with abundant opportunity, failed to show them that the single tax instead of confiscating their homes would make them more secure and lessen their taxes?

Mr. Cridge believes that the fusion committee was bribed, and that a bolder campaign would have won the fight. We should hesitate to accuse the fusion committee of venality. On the face of things, its attitude is fully and fairly explained by the fact that none of the organizations it represented was favorable as an organization to the single tax. Probably a

large majority in every one of those organizations would, after a two months' campaign, have voted against the single tax. To have made the campaign upon that issue, therefore, would have insured defeat unless enough republicans could have been won over to make up to Maguire for the loss of his own supporters. Moreover, the question was really not an issue in the campaign. What Maguire believed as to the principles of taxation had nothing more to do with the real questions at issue than what he believed as to religion. That a bolder campaign would have given more luster to his name, whether he won or lost, and that it would have been better for single tax propaganda, is doubtless true. But then the question arises, whether a political committee or a candidate would have the moral right to make a campaign in advocacy of a radical doctrine held by the candidate, which the party had not only not adopted but to which as a party it was opposed.

Single tax men will have to learn patience. Their reform will not be accepted in a day. Its very simplicity, justice and perfection, will delay the time of its acceptance. While superficial reforms are quickly taken up by the multitude and as quickly cast aside, fundamental reforms are but slowly apprehended by the many whom they would benefit, and are most easily fought off by the few whom they would divest of unholy power. Those were not idle words of Henry George when he wrote:

The truth that I have tried to make clear will not find easy acceptance. If that could be it would have been accepted long ago. If that could be it would never have been obscured.

Nor when he predicted that—

for the man who seeing the want and misery, the ignorance and brutishness caused by unjust social institutions, sets himself, in so far as he has strength to right them, there is disappointment and bitterness.

Disciples of Henry George who ponder those words will lose no heart in the fight because an election or two goes against them. They will rather

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