

a man. When an offender is burned alive in any community the civilization of that community is not to be judged by its geographical location, nor even by the crime itself, but by what it does about it. The more vigorously it excuses the act the more damningly it accuses itself.

+ +

### A Certain Attitude Toward the Negro.

We shall embody in this editorial a letter on the Negro question which for some weeks we have withheld from publication. At first we thought of publishing it without comment, as an expression from "the other side." But when we considered the pain it might give to a race of people whose history and present position demand from every truly chivalrous person of the dominant race the utmost care to shield them from affront, we hesitated. Yet the letter is from a man in the South who writes in good faith, and with no more offense than is necessarily involved in his honest opinion, and whose opinion is largely that of the dominant race at the South—and indeed at the North also. It has seemed to us better, therefore, that this expression from "the other side," which though blunt is neither malicious nor savage, should appear in our columns even at the risk of pain to sensitive minds. We withhold the writer's name. Its publication could neither add to nor minimize the force of the letter, and we have no desire to appear in any way as personal in the comments we are about to make. They are wholly impersonal and free from any but the kindest feeling. Enough to say that the letter is absolutely genuine.

+

It is as follows:

You are doing fine work for true democracy, but I can't agree with your ideas about the Negro. You assume in all arguments on the subject that the only difference between a Teuton and a Negro is the color of his skin. A greater mistake could not be made. The two races differ: in mind, heart, and (many able writers believe) in soul as well. One of the great Northern medical magazines recently said that it would require 25,000 years to develop the Negro up to the average standard of the Teuton at the present time. This on the assumption that the Negro has the same natural attributes as the Teuton. If the Negro is only a higher development of the simian tribe, as great and good and able men now hold, 25,000 years would utterly fail to produce a Lee or a Lincoln. I suggest that in writing your editorials on the Negro, you remember the radical and utterly irreconcilable differences of opinion on the question.

The Negro has no friends in this Union so valuable to him as the average good man in the South. No others understand him so well, or will stand for him

so firmly in his true needs, and give him intelligent sympathy based on a true knowledge of his nature. Thousands in the North will call him "Mr.," give money for his education, and yet wont employ him. He is repulsive to them. The Northerner wont have any business relations with him. All this is cruel and absurd. The Southerner will compel him to stay in his place, doubt the wisdom of educating him, and yet help him every time when truly the Negro needs help. Now, we hold our plan infinitely better for the Negro than the Northern plan.

Speaking for myself, I am an "agnostic" as to whether the Negro has a soul. I truly feel that I don't know. Splendid people of the South in constant contact with the Negro say he's a natural thief and no exceptions. About this I can't say. I haven't had enough to do with him to decide for myself. They also say there's no virtue among the females, and no respect among the males for virtue. You know only too well, if this be true, that no such race can ever rise high in the scale of civilization.

If you have time and disposition, an answer from you on the points I have stated about the Negro, as I understand him, will be greatly appreciated. No one loves true democracy more than I, and I heartily encourage you in your great work.

+

A statement so ingenuous ought to be its own answer. But some of the human race have always fostered their sense of superiority by degrading others; and, as Guizot somewhere says, they are not satisfied with the mere power to do so, but want to convince themselves somehow that it is right. Captain Marryatt satirized this characteristic when in "Midshipman Easy" he gave the young "leveller" a convert in the person of the ship's cook, the most menial hand on board, and reconverted the cook from his equality theory by having the captain hire a scullion, a grade of hand still lower. It is a characteristic which finds historical expression among all peoples, in all times, and with reference to a great variety of standards. Every ten-penny James has had his nine-penny Jims. All races and all classes have experienced the hardships of this selfish attitude of their "superiors"—Saxon and Jew, scholar and peasant, white laborer as well as black. It expresses itself even by the standard of sex. When men protest tender regard for women while denying them civil equality, they draw a line of inferiority that differs from our correspondent's only as the harem differs from the cotton field. In the one case the "inferior" creature is a pet for the "superior," and in the other his servant. He may be the protecting lover of the one and the condescending friend of the other, but from the elevation of his "superior" intelligence he commands them to stay in their place. The quality of this love and this friendship is such that he holds the woman

as "a little dearer than his horse," the servant as "somewhat better than his dog." "Religion" has usually furnished the ethical justification. It is now more commonly furnished by "science." Our correspondent falls back upon both.

+

As for the Negro's identity with the human race, who has yet been able to distinguish any peculiarity in the life blood that courses through his body? As for his soul, the revolting history of Negro slavery amply testifies that the white man has less reason for doubting the Negro's than the Negro has for doubting the white man's. The white man understand the Negro! It is not true that the average white man of the South (or of the North either, for that matter) understands him. No man can understand another man unless he associates with him upon the basis of equal rights. The Southern white man doubtless understands the Negro slave, the Negro serf, the Negro menial, the cringing creatures that white men have made of Negroes, but it is simply as slave or serf or menial; he does not understand the Negro man. Negro nature (in contradistinction to slave nature of whatever race or color), the domineering white man does not understand, and he never can until he shall have acknowledged it to be identical with human nature.

+

Quincy Ewing, himself a Southerner of many generations, has answered our correspondent at every angle, in the *Atlantic Monthly* for March, and we leave him and those who hold with him to fight it out with Mr. Ewing. It seems appropriate, however, to say that in considering the pain which our correspondent's letter might give to Negroes, we must not ignore the pain it ought to give to those good people for whom and to the very section for which he especially speaks. Could there be a more terrific indictment of the intelligent and moral South? We are well aware that some empiricists have contended for the non-human status of the Negro. We are also aware that an illiterate class now furnishes adherents to the same doctrine, for we have seen that monstrosity of bookmaking—"The Negro a Beast," put out by a St. Louis house. Disinherited whites might hold such views of a distinct race with whom they are in a life and death labor struggle, without other blame than would imply pity. But the case would be far different should we attribute such views to that intelligent, able and conscientious class in the South who themselves, or their progenitors, have held the Negro in bondage, and who now live

upon the Negro's underpaid labor, as the plutocracy of the North live upon the underpaid labor of both whites and blacks. Think of the crimes against persons and civilization which our correspondent's suggestions proclaim! Can we conceive of an intelligent group of the Anglo-Saxon race as having taken a domesticated group of soulless and unmoral animals into the bosom of their families, and as putting their babes into their arms to rear? Can we conceive of them as leaving their children of both sexes in the care of these talking "simians"? More monstrous still, can we think of them as raising up a mixed race, half beast and half human? No crime against civilization could be more horrible. Yet this is the crime our correspondent charges against his own Southland. Not alone is the suggestion that they are mere animals an intolerable aspersion upon a race of affectionate, faithful and intelligent people whom our race has grossly wronged; but the necessary corollary makes the suggestion, under the indisputable circumstances, a hideous libel upon our own race as well.

+

In what we have said, there is no sectional spirit. Our correspondent is right in charging the white North with equal or greater cruelty to individual Negroes than the South inflicts. He is right in his contrast of North with South in their treatment of the Negro; for most white men of the South do treat individual Negroes who "know their place," better than most white men of the North treat individual Negroes whether they "know their place" or not. The question is no sectional question; it is a man question. The real difference between the North and the South is one not of sentiment but of expression. It is analogous to the difference in an individual between covetousness and theft, or the adultery of the New Testament and that of the Old. The white North is pretty much at one with the white South in unbrotherly sentiment toward the Negro; but the North cloaks the sentiment in fine phrases, whereas the South expresses it without reserve. The South thereby reveals to both sections the essential ugliness of the sentiment they harbor in common. Let us hope that this revelation may bear repentant fruit. Let us hope that both sections, loathing the sentiment so revealed, will with one accord cast it out of our national life. Let us hope that the time is at hand when both the white North and the white South will be democratic enough to think of their black fellowmen in connection with the Declaration of Independence,

and Christian enough to deal by them in accordance with the Golden Rule of the Nazarene.

\* \*

### Tariff Tenderness for Farmers.

The attention of farmers is called by Alderman George Stewart Brown of Baltimore to another "innocent" in the free list of the Payne tariff bill. It is the item of "sheep dip." Sheep dip, by the way, is a disinfectant much used for the cure of a certain disease of sheep. Of course it may be used for other disinfectant purposes. If not, of what good would it probably be as a disinfectant for sheep? Now this "sheep dip" is in the free list. But it is put there with a proviso excluding "all compounds or preparations that can be used for other purposes"! In other words, "sheep dip" is in the free list provided it be a compound that will not disinfect anything but sheep. For, as Alderman Brown adds, "the Board of General Appraisers have already decided that unless it confines its disinfectant action to a sheep's back, it 'can be used for other [disinfectant] purposes,' and cannot come in free but must pay 20 per cent duty." Farmers should be interested in knowing that it is the name "sheep dip," and not its curative properties, that goes into the free list.

\* \*

### Religio-Economic Lectures.

An experiment in popular lectures on religio-economic subjects was begun at Handel Hall (40 Randolph street), Chicago, last Sunday by the Rev. A. B. Francisco. The experiment is to be continued next Sunday at the same place at 3 o'clock sharp. Mr. Francisco is a rugged, plain spoken clergyman, of commanding presence, who feels strongly, thinks straight, and enlivens his oratory with flashes of spontaneous eloquence. He aims his speech at head and heart alike, and keeps his feet firmly upon the ground. His governing idea is that the social whole, no less than the individual person, is subject to spiritual law. But the spiritual law he preaches is not arbitrary; it is rational. And it is related to natural phenomena in every stage, from the simplest natural laws of physics, up through all the natural laws of industrial activity, including the natural laws of human association. In his Handel Hall lectures, therefore, he keeps himself in close touch with life as we know it here—the picture of a life more real, it may be, but in itself a real life nevertheless. Mr. Francisco's meetings occupy middle ground between religious meetings that leave out economics, and economic meetings that leave out religion.

### ARRAYING POOR AGAINST RICH.

If opportunity were equally open to all in this country and every one had his rights fully safeguarded, there would be no occasion for any protest such as this which recently appeared in Leslie's Weekly, and has been approvingly quoted in great newspapers:

Cruel wrong is done by those who constantly seek to array the poor against the rich and to misrepresent the latter as void of sympathy and all the kindly instincts of humanity. When we stop to think that most of our rich men of to-day were the poor men of a few years ago, we realize the injustice of the accusation. In this great country, where opportunities for advancement are open to all and where every one has his rights fully safeguarded, no class distinction should be permitted to prevail. Demagogues who endeavor to create such distinctions, should be regarded as a menace to the public welfare and be treated accordingly.

No "demagogues" can create class distinctions in any country where opportunities are open to all and rights are safeguarded. It is because opportunity in this great country has been monopolized to an enormous extent by the few, and the rights of the many have been insolently and wickedly ignored, that men of "kindly instincts" protest, in the name of justice, against the class distinctions which have resulted.

Demagogues do not create class distinctions—they merely take advantage of any class distinction that manifestly exists. The ignorant demagogue mistakenly draws the line of class distinction between Rich and Poor, instead of between the promoters and beneficiaries of Special Privilege on one hand, and the victims thereof on the other. And the ignorant press commentator does the same. But the "demagogue" rightly denounces the existing evil, while the ignorant press commentator seeks to defend it by brazenly denying its existence.

There is never any menace to the public welfare from the "demagogue" who tries to create a class distinction; but there is imminent menace to the generating cause of class distinction in the denunciation of special privilege by the prophet and the seer. And always Jerusalem stones the prophets!

Ignorant speakers and writers have so persistently misapplied the epithet "demagogue" that well-informed readers have come to regard its use as signifying a strong probability of exceptionally high virtue in the person assailed. And this because individuals thus stigmatized are in the great majority of cases found to be men of ster-