

SOME LETTERS AND ANSWERS

By CLARENCE POE

Plain Talk on an Ugly Subject

I WISH to ask that you bar such editorials as the one headed "The 'Revolution and Bloodshed' Talk and Its Significance," for the future in your paper. The question of land segregation by races is too big to mar by the injection of such utterances. With the general proposition it is possible to be in sympathy, and to work quietly toward that end, but the quotations of Negro preachers of that sort, North or South, ought to be barred, and so, of course, would all comment upon them. To bring them to the notice of our white people can have but one effect—to inflame them against the Negro, and so far as the Negro sees them, their effect on him must be to inflame him against the white man, and to discourage him in his efforts to become in any way a better citizen.

These results I am sure you do not wish to promote. Indeed, it does not seem to me "fair" for you to use the word "unfair" in the editorial above in the phrase, "by unfair economic competition." Granting that the Negro has "ability to underlive the white man," it does not follow that he acquired this ability dishonestly or is using it in any dishonest way in the purchase of lands. The sentence would have been stronger, I think, if that word had simply been omitted.

Because some criticize you foolishly and others criticize severely, don't let them bring you to notice their criticisms. Hammer away on the philosophy of the thing. It must be shown to be reasonable, apart altogether from all clouding by prejudice or sentiment.

W. H. M.

Clemson College, S. C.

Editorial Comment.—We appreciate what our friend says. It is certainly not our purpose needlessly to stir up strife at any time. In fact, we quoted the incendiary utterances referred to simply to make the point that it is the immoral mixing of the races in defiance of the laws of God and Nature, that is largely responsible for the rebelliousness and sedition of the extreme Negro leader. Moreover, while we shall not exploit such utterances, it is questionable whether we can afford to ignore them. We should not exaggerate the extent of incendiarism, but to the extent that it does exist, is it not prudent to recognize it?

Furthermore, while we know our friend does not belong to that class, we believe he will agree with us that perhaps the greatest menace to the safety of the white South is the group of cultured and benevolent citizens in high places who denounce every effort to inquire into the race problem as "agitation," "demagoguery," "stirring up race feeling," etc. In the language of the old prophet they say, "Prophecy not unto us right things; speak unto us smooth things." "The Negro question is settling itself," they tell us, and The Progressive Farmer almost alone among Southern journals to day is scientifically probing to the bottom of the whole big problem to see how it is being "settled."

We wonder, for example, if the official Government census figures reported by Rev. A. H. Shannon, of Mississippi Agricultural College in a letter now before us, will in any way disturb the serene complacency of these people who like to hide their heads in the sand, ostrich-like, and cry out that they can see nothing going wrong? Here are the facts in a nutshell—that from 1870 to 1910 the number of mulattoes in this country increased from 584,049 to 2,050,686, or over 251 per cent—whereas the number of full-blooded Negroes increased only from 4,295,960 to 7,777,077, or 81 per cent.

In other words, there are not even twice as many full-blooded Negroes as there were in 1870, but there are nearly five times as many mulattoes. In the West South Central States in this period (Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas and Louisiana) the proportion of mulattoes to Negroes increased nearly 50 per cent; in the East South Central (Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama and Mississippi) the increase in mulatto proportion was nearly 75 per cent; and in the South Atlantic State, (including the Virginias, Carolinas, Georgia and Florida), the proportion of mulattoes wholly doubled.

In The Progressive Farmer of February 21 we shall present on this page some notable utterances by Mr. Shannon, Prof. T. J. Brooks, Senator B. R. Tillman and others about this whole big, sinister, loathsome subject. It is not going to be pleasant reading, but it's mighty necessary reading and in many respects astounding reading, and ought to arouse the whole South to action concerning the perils that confront us.

Look out for it.

I believe in being just to the Negro. I resent and denounce the indiscriminate, unreasoning abuse in which politicians so often engage. But I

do believe in a fearless, scientific investigation and publication of all the facts bearing on this great issue, denouncing the sins of the whites as vigorously as the faults of the blacks.

A Socialist Runs Afoul of Us

YOUR plan of cooperation does not avoid the "Scylla of capitalism" but it perpetuates it. There is no "Charybdis of Socialism," neither does Socialism advocate communism, as you intimate.

The capitalist wants to own the wealth to make profit off the people and the Socialists want all the people to own the wealth so that they may save to themselves the profit that they now are paying to the capitalists.

Last spring you misrepresented the Socialists and I wrote you a letter and sent you their platform and some books and pamphlets, so that if you misrepresented it any more you would have to do it wilfully. Some other Socialists wrote to you also, for in a few issues after you said a friend from Virginia called you down on Socialism. You tried to explain it by saying there were different kinds of Socialists, which was adding misrepresentation to misrepresentation. There is only one kind of Socialist, the man who wants to get all his labor produces. There are two kinds of opponents, the one who wants to get what some one else produces and the "average citizen," though they call themselves by different names, as Democrats, Republicans and Progressives.

You intimate that under Socialism we would have a form of communism by which an idle class would live off the labor of others. I challenge you to prove by any Socialist book, paper, speaker or writer that Socialism advocates any such. If you haven't got the proof, I demand that you retract. Now, I am an "average citizen" but I think I know just and right and expect to contend for it.

I am in favor of race segregation, but I would have it right and be done with it. I would give the Negroes as many states as were necessary and put them all there and let them manage their own local affairs. No injustice in that, but it is best for both races.

SOCIALIST.

Alabama.

Editorial Comment.—We print our friend's letter but we don't see any occasion for "retrac-

tions." If he doesn't know there are many kinds of Socialists, he is in a poor way to give information to other people. It is a case of "Physician, heal thyself." Nor do we expect to find Communist Socialists admitting that communism would cheat industry—certainly not. Nevertheless, it is our opinion.

As for our difference with "Socialist," it seems to be simply a difference of opinions as to whether governmental Socialism is or is not more desirable than a system of voluntary cooperation. He thinks it is and we think it isn't; and so, as Mr. Dooley says, "There ye are."

We cannot refrain, however, from noting how characteristic it is of our Socialistic friends that they simply shut their eyes to any obstacles in the way of any glorious schemes they want. Instead of the practicable but necessarily slow plan allowing white neighborhoods, where they wish it, to segregate themselves from Negroes, he would do the whole job at once by a wave of the hand, setting aside several States and putting the Negroes there, and everybody would be happy forever after. Of course, there would be nothing to do except make the wish in order to get all the white people in "as many states as were necessary" to sell their lands and houses and abandon their homes and businesses and give them up to the Negroes! I have not found such faith, no not in Israel!

In Justice to Our Commission Merchants

I THINK you have caught admirably the spirit of our Eastern Shore of Virginia Produce Exchange and depicted with unusual vividness in a few strokes its main aims and working methods. There is just one particular in which I feel that you give the wrong impression, and that is with reference to the seriousness of dishonesty among commission merchants.

There are, of course, in the produce business, as in every other calling, dishonest men; and the relationship of trust involved constantly "opens the door" to fraud; but it is our opinion, based on long experience, that dishonesty among commission men is the exception and not the rule.

The vital fact is not the occasional dishonesty of a commission merchant, but the unintelligence of this whole plan of distribution, under which valuable goods are sent out to a market on the mere chance of their being wanted there, and under which it is impossible to observe any relationship between the total needs of a market for a particular product and the quantity of that pro-

(Concluded on page 47)

HOW THE GOVERNMENT WASTES ITS MONEY

DO YOU see this magnificent Government building at Raleigh, N. C., erected not many years ago at great cost out of beautiful granite—a building justly the pride of the city in which it is located, and which would stand for a thousand years?

But don't think from this remark that The Progressive Farmer has become an architectural journal. Nor are we now praising the living. We are only paying tribute to the dead. For the Government is tearing down this building. It doesn't matter that there is probably not a private business on the North American continent that would have destroyed so beautiful and ample a structure under like conditions—for there was ample space to add to it, if needed, in the rear. But the Government doesn't do business that way. Congressmen and Senators must make a reputation for getting big appropriations for their "deestricks," and so this building is to be leveled to the earth and about \$200,000 of the people's money spent to put another in its place.

And Congressmen go back in campaign years and proclaim how much they have done for their dear people in this way! Actually boast of the extravagance they ought to be ashamed of. We know of one able and valuable Congressman whose re-election is threatened because he opposed the public building plunder in his own district. We do not know what Congressman had the Raleigh postoffice torn down; we are only condemning a system.

How much longer will our farmers be fooled into believing that appropriation-getting is statesmanship? How long before they will understand, as Senator Tillman puts it, that "the Government has nothing to give except what it takes in taxes from the people?" And just now comes the announcement that another man we have long honored and respected is to accept a job paying \$7,500 a year which "will hardly interfere with his regular work." We are astonished that he is not ashamed to take such a place.

When President Wilson finishes with the tariff, the currency bill, and the trusts, we hope he will start a crusade to stop the waste of the people's money in erecting buildings that are not needed and in paying salaries that are not earned. Fortunately, he will now have the support of thousands of wealthy and influential citizens who heretofore haven't cared how much extravagance went on at Washington. So long as the poor people paid the great bulk of the Government's receipts through tariff taxes on necessities, they were not disturbed. But now that the wealthy pay on their incomes, they are ready to insist on Governmental economy.

It's a good time for the farmers to join the business men in letting Congressmen know that it is the smallness of appropriations rather than their bigness which commands votes hereafter.

