

employers. Union there seems a remote possibility.

In the economic field so much is in the region of speculation, and demonstration only possible through political action, that harmony there is difficult if not impossible.

The place where all can unite is on the welfare of the child, and the public school as the social center is the common ground on which all can meet to discuss and to settle these questions in the interest of the childhood of to-day—the manhood and womanhood and citizenship of to-morrow—the humanity of the world. And the ideal must be democracy in education, the education that extends from the cradle to the grave. This ideal means democracy in every department of human interest; it means freedom to the human mind.

#### THE RACE PROBLEM DISCUSSED.

Sermon preached by Rev. Quincy Ewing at St. James Episcopal church, Greenville, Miss., June 28, and published in the Springfield Republican of July 12.

There shall no evil happen to the just; but the wicked shall be filled with mischief.—Prov. xi:21.

The path of the just is as the shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day. The way of the wicked is as darkness; they know not at what they stumble.—Prov. iv:18-19.

Let us therefore follow after the things which make for peace, and things where-with one may edify another.—Rom, xiv: 19.

The race problem is not something that belongs within certain geographic lines, dividing one State from another, or a certain number of States from others. It is not southern or northern, eastern or western. It extends as far as the boundary line of nations, and is not confined within them. It claims continents for its territory and does not stop with them, but must have hemispheres as well. It is as wide as the world is wide, and, under one form or another, awaits solution on the part of men most savage and men most civilized. Nor is it a problem but recently come into the life of humanity, unknown to ancient generations. It is as old as the human world is old,—older than the oldest state, the oldest government, the oldest poetry, philosophy, religion; as old as man's capability for love and hate.

It is no secret how the ages of the past, far and near, dealt with this problem, how they tried to solve it in its many forms. The motive of their dealing with it was hate, their equipment the sword, their solution blood and death; the result of that solution, more hate, followed by more blood and death! Up to the present time the world as a whole

can hardly be said to have adopted and put into practice a method for the solving of its race problem differing very greatly from that of the ancient Spartans in dealing with their special phase of it. We recall that the Helots were flogged once a year to keep them reminded of their helotism, and hunted down and slaughtered by the Spartan youth, like rabbits on a western prairie, when they threatened to become too numerous. Two thousand was the "bag" on one occasion, if Thucydides may be credited. By hardships and cruelties inflicted upon men powerless to resent their wrongs, by efforts of one sort or another to degrade them and keep them degraded, and, on occasion, robbing them of life to get them out of the way,—this has been the world's anciently adopted and most widely practiced method up to date of attempting the solution of its race problem.

If that has been the right method, the wise method, the unavoidable method, then we who say that we believe in God say also that He committed a crime when He created the human race, a crime which dwarfs all others into ridiculous insignificance! For He and He alone is responsible for the race differences of the human family. No race of men has been permitted to select its own distinguishing characteristics marking it off from others. They were selected in every case by the Author of the universe; or, if you please, evolved in the course of ages through the operation of his inevitable and unavoidable laws. Whether in the beginning God made as many differing human types as there are distinct races to-day, or made only one man and woman, the ancestors of all; on either hypothesis the responsibility is his,—that some races are fair skinned and others dark, some low-statured and others high, some bearded and others beardless; some with flat noses and others with long, some with thick lips and others with thin, some emotional and others phlegmatic, some disposed to worship him chiefly under aspects that by others are ignored, relatively or utterly.

To say, then, that because there are differing races of men there must be race hatred, and its cruel and bloody consequences until all the weaker races have been harried off the face of the earth, and the one strong race left to know itself God's chosen, is but to assert that God made humanity in order that man might be destroyed by man, that he waits to crown with glory and honor those of the sons of men who shall have proved themselves capable of at once inflicting and resisting more iniquity than their less fortunate fellows. It is God, we read in that book held by

Christians to be inspired, who "made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed and the bounds of their habitation." And so, I say, if some men are to be hated because they differ from others in racial characteristics, despite their "one blood," such hatred to be thought of as justifiable must be conceived of as intended by the Creator when he planned the universe and the life and destiny of mankind. There is no possible word that can be uttered in justification of race hatred which does not lay the responsibility for it upon God himself!

I am well aware of the weakness of such an argument in this day and time. I am well aware that the Christian church, which, a generation ago, was united in belaboring Charles Darwin, and praying to be delivered from the godlessness of his doctrine of the survival of the fittest, is now disposed to defend and applaud to no small extent the acting out of this doctrine with an orthodox zeal that makes heretics of such foremost disciples of the great evolutionist, as Alfred Russell Wallace, Herbert Spencer, Goldwin Smith, John Fiske, and others. I am well aware that among Christian men and women to-day the disposition is becoming less and less to refer fundamental questions of right and wrong for final arbitrament to the God revealed by Jesus Christ. I know, if I know anything at all, that there is to-day a deadlier atheism in many of the pulpits and pews of the Christian church than ever fell from the lips of an Ingersoll or a Bradlaugh. I know that in this day of grace, in the house of his friends, Jesus Christ is wounded more tragically than ever he was in any street of Jerusalem, on any hill in Palestine; that the God he revealed is for many but a name to be juggled with, not a father to be obeyed; and he himself little more than an excuse to roll up the eyes and turn loose the tongue of un-pious piety! And therefore I should not expect this argument, that God being responsible for race differences, his goodness and wisdom are attacked when men make these differences their justification for hatred of their fellow men; I should not by any means expect it to appeal effectively to the reason and conscience of all people who profess and call themselves Christians.

But surely there are some professing Christianity who really want to be Christians; to look at things and men, and God, as Jesus Christ looked at them, honestly eager to rid their hearts of every prejudice, their souls of every sentiment and conviction, which would imply denial or doubt of the goodness and wisdom

of the Heavenly Father. To them I would appeal with this argument, and may, without the consciousness of wasted effort in declaring a gospel already repudiated! Suppose a good man, the father of a large family. There are great differences, let us suppose—as often happens,—among his children. Some are much stronger physically than the others, and very much superior to them mentally and in moral inclination. They were all so born without choosing of their own. What is the father's wish as he looks upon his children and considers their needs and destiny? Is it his wish that the inferior ones among them should perish, and only the superior survive; that the strengthening, educative, elevating things of life should be partially or totally withheld from the inferior to be bestowed in greater measure upon the superior? Is it his wish that the weak boy, physically, mentally, morally, should be kept weak, denied the means of developing his body, his intellect his conscience, lest the gulf be contracted between him and his superior brother,—lest, perchance, he should become a less pliant and useful tool to accomplish the ends of his superior brother? Is it the father's wish that his superior children should manifest their superiority by hating their inferior brothers and sisters; treating them with harshness, contempt, cruelty, berating them with evidences of their relative dullness, ignorance, misdeeds, degradation; and should finally show themselves fit to be his chosen, the rightful recipients of his bounty and his great love, by driving their weaker brethren from the common home,—to claim it all for themselves? What would you think of the father whose heart made room for such a wish? If you are a Christian, what the good God of heaven must think of the bad God of this world, if this world was made by any God for race-hatreds and their consequent cruelties. What would the good man think of his superior children, who mistreated and sought to degrade still further their inferior brethren, instead of endeavoring to strengthen, enlighten and lift them up? What, doubtless, the God we worship, Our Father of heaven and earth, thinks of men, swayed by the brute impulses of race hatred, who aim to be destroyers rather than saviors unto their fellow men!

If hate rather than love must suggest the solution of the world's race problem; if the safety of the world's good depends upon its obedience to the dictates of the former and not the latter, then let us all at once have done with Jesus Christ and the God of Jesus Christ; or let us agree that the beloved disciple misunderstood the spirit

of his Master when he wrote: "Beloved, let us love one another; for love is of God; and every one that loveth is born of God and knoweth God. He that loveth not, knoweth not God; for God is love." Let us put away that saying of the apostle; and, thinking of all peoples on earth who differ from us noticeably in race characteristics, let us substitute for it what St. John should have written for us: "Beloved,—that is, you of the Anglo-Saxon type,—let us hate—not one another; but millions not ourselves. For this hate is of God; and every one that hateth is born of God and knoweth God. He that hateth not, knoweth not God; for God is partly love, but mostly hate."

The special phase of the race problem that concerns us most deeply as white citizens of the United States, and, more intimately and pressing, as white citizens of the South, does not differ fundamentally from other phases of that problem in other parts of the world. As elsewhere, so here, there are but two methods of dealing with it as it is presented to us; but two ways of attempting to solve it, one or the other of which must be adopted—the way of love and righteousness, and the way of hate and iniquity. These black people are here among us in this "white man's country," not as invaders, not as immigrants, not of their own choosing. Neither they nor their ancestors went down willingly into any ship that would bear them from their African huts to our plantation cabins. Neither they nor their ancestors are responsible for the problem that confronts us. The responsibility is the white man's. In our time thousands of mules have been corraled in this country and shipped to Africa; in the days of our fathers thousands of human beings were corraled in Africa and shipped to this country to meet the demand of this country's markets. The mules in the one case, the human beings in the other, were consulted to just the same extent. Had we let these black people alone, beyond any shadow of a doubt they would have let us alone,—us of this land from upper Maine to lower California, from the Cascade mountains to the Florida keys. We—the Anglo-Saxons—chose not to let them alone, knowing their distinctive race characteristics as well as they are known now; their race inferiority as conspicuous and repellent then as it is now. They, in short, are just as responsible for the problem that confronts us, the white people of the

United States, as the elephant would be for the trampling down of my rose bushes if I took him from his native wilds and turned him into my flower garden. This, then, is strictly a problem of our making, and when I say our, I am identifying myself with the white men, not of the State of Mississippi or the South only, but of the entire country. The problem was created by the nation, not by any section thereof, and the responsibility of dealing with it is national as well as sectional.

But here in Mississippi and the South the question is addressed to our consciences with singular and awful emphasis. How are we going to deal with it, how are we going to undertake to solve it—this problem that is ours, of our making? Shall it be by the method of love, and pity, and righteousness, or by the method of hate, and contempt, and iniquity? Shall it be along the clean way of law and law abidingness, or along the foul way of lawlessness and anarchy? Shall we hate these black people so much that our white legislators must fail to enact penal statutes sufficiently severe to fit their crimes? Or shall we love them enough to trust their punishment, when they are criminals, to the laws passed by white legislators, to the indictments presented by white grand jurors, to the convictions agreed upon by white petit jurors, the sentences imposed by white judges and executed by white sheriffs? If there is one crime that the legislatures and courts are powerless to deal with, to provide punishment for of adequate dispatch and severity,—in the case of any man, whatever his race and social condition, and we are resolved in the matter of this one crime to deny their authority,—still the field is an immense one, where we may choose in dealing with these weaker people to regard or disregard the law of a civilized land, to obey or disobey the dictates of justice and righteousness. The field is an immense one in which we may show these people that we hate them, that we have contempt for them, that we look upon them as degraded and desire to keep them so; that their rights as human beings, their sensibilities, their mental capacities, their ambitions, and hopes, and aspirations, their intellectual and spiritual development, as human beings, do not concern us in any way to command our regard and respect; that it is our purpose simply to use them for our benefit, as we use our mules; to keep them in that state of mule-like ignorance in

which they will be most useful to us, and that they need not expect law abidingness from us when their ignorance and degradation raises the hand unlawful against us. So may we choose to solve our problem by brutalizing the weaker race and ourselves in the process—a process lengthened out perhaps through black and bloody generations till our land is desolated by civil war or befouled with a massacre of the weaker by the stronger that would redden the universal heavens with shame!

Or, in the wide field of our association with these black people, we may dare to face and meet the difficulties arising out of such association, trusting in justice enough to believe that there can no evil await us in the path of it; and in righteousness enough to feel that its way can issue only in right. And it is no new courage or faith that we need to meet and face these difficulties in the way of righteousness and justice; it is but the same old courage with which we dare to confess, despite all the heart-breaking defeats and perplexities of human life, that there is a just and righteous God, who, because He is what He is, may be trusted by our groping souls, and adored, to the end of time, and onward into eternity! As we trust our eternal salvation to the justice and righteousness of God, we may surely trust our temporal welfare to the way marked out for us by our love of justice and righteousness. We may dare to deal with these people, showing them that we do not hate them, and that we have not contempt for them, because they are black, or brown, or yellow; ignorant as compared with us; wanting in mental power and moral discrimination as compared with us; and because many of them were once our slaves. We may dare to show them that by us their rights as human beings shall be regarded and respected; that from us they shall get justice; that our purpose is not to keep them ignorant, but to help them to knowledge; not to brutalize, but to humanize them; not to trample them down to deeper degradation, but to lift them up to that light of the loving God which should shine in the face of every son of man!

Will it increase and intensify the difficulties of our race problem so to deal with these people? Must we keep them ignorant and degraded, and deny them justice and kindness—the justice of the law of the land, the kindness of the compassionate heart—in order that the gulf be not contracted which sepa-

rates our superiority from their inferiority? Great God!—the atheism of an idea like that! And like all such atheism, the base of it is selfishness and cowardice! The strong, brave man is not disposed to deny his weaker brother the means of muscular development, lest his own prowess should cease to be conspicuous, and himself be menaced by a rival; and the strong, brave race cannot afford, without sacrificing its self-respect, to make the confession of cowardice and selfishness which would be implied in the policy of withholding the opportunities of intellectual and spiritual development from a race weaker and inferior. Not without casting away, as a thing of no worth, their most valuable possession—their self-respect—can the white people of this land consent to be typified by the individual who, having the power, would choose to stand high by standing with his heel on a weaker brother's neck!

A word of warning before I close. There seems to be just now a sort of mania getting possession of the white men of the North as well as the South for mobbing the Negro when he is a criminal and when he is not. Within the past two weeks in a Northern State two mobs have spent their fury upon him, and neither was inspired by any crime committed or any charged, unless it be a crime for black men to do honest work, or to worship God in one of their churches. Within the past week at least two of these people have been lynched in Southern States, one in Arkansas, the other in Mississippi, for an offense committed five years ago. Very recently, according to the editor of the Vicksburg Herald who is a Southern gentleman and tells the truth, there was a "shameful occurrence" in one of our interior counties, where a number of Negroes lost their lives at the hands of a guerrilla band of "avengers," who rode and shot, and shot and rode. And, still quoting from the editor of the Vicksburg Herald, those murdered Negroes had done no crime at all!

It may puzzle some of us to account for the suddenly increased disposition of Northern communities to mob and lynch the Negro; it does not puzzle me. I saw, and said, and attempted to publish, several years ago, that the piling up of dead men in the Philippine islands, on the ground that the inhabitants thereof were an inferior people, with no rights which the Anglo-Saxon was bound to respect—that this performance was certain to inspire something of the same treatment for the millions of black people throughout

the United States. It was practically inevitable that Northern communities, which approved and applauded the shipping of soldiers by thousands to kill by tens of thousands the inferior Filipinos—whose sin was that they wanted to govern themselves—would not be so likely in future to hold themselves under the restraint of justice and righteousness in dealing with the inferior Negro here at home. In our immediate locality I believe that the mob spirit is being nursed and nurtured from day to day by several of the vilest newspapers that ever came from a printing press. For some reason—a keen-witted young lawyer friend of mine tells me it's politics!—the newspapers of this section—those with the largest circulation and some others—seem bent on convincing their white readers that the only way to save themselves, soul and body, is to hate the Negro! I would warn you, if you value the only souls you have that are savable and worth saving, if you value the cleanness of your hearts and the sanity of your brains—I would warn you to be on your guard against the terrible, conscienceless work of these newspapers!

And to this warning let me add the exhortation that we be true to the best tradition of our Southland, spoken to us from the graves of the noblest of our fathers! They did not hate the Negro, for all his ignorance, unintelligence, inferiority. I never met a Southern gentleman who did. They loved their slaves, and their slaves loved them. The brutal masters who abused these black people with the lash, forerunners of the politicians who abuse them now with the tongue—the old-time Southern gentleman did not regard as his social equals. We shall not go widely wrong, I think, in the solution of our race problem if we follow the Southern gentleman, whose father and grandfathers were gentlemen before him!

#### REVISED QUOTATION FOR OUR NATIONAL SCRAP BOOK.

Be strenuous, and let who will be clever.  
Strike crashing blows, not shun them all day long:  
And so make life, death, and the vast forever—  
One Chinese Gong !!!  
—Life.

This matter of heredity, of explaining how things came to pass, is a fit subject for antiquarians and archaeologists, but for the poet and seer *life is*, and he looks for causes among the living and not among the dead. The real sustaining cause of things *is*, and not *was*, and