

Rose, however, is candid enough to admit that he has a personal grudge against Mr. Bryan. "He beat me for governor of Wisconsin," says Mayor Rose. True enough! He did it by denouncing Mr. Rose as undemocratic, in consequence whereof democratic Democrats of Wisconsin refused to vote for Mr. Rose. And this is one more mark to the credit of Mr. Bryan as a democratic leader of the Democracy.

In a previous issue (p. 85), we told of a race war in Mississippi, merely quoting an Associated Press dispatch. We are now able to quote, from the Vicksburg Daily Herald of May 20, what is evidently a fair review of the situation, based upon an account by the Laurel (Miss.) Ledger. The conflict occurred on the Scott and Smith county border. A condition of apparent amity was broken by "a squabble between a white Smith county farmer named Bruce, and a black laborer." The white farmer tried to compel the Negro laborer to work on a Saturday afternoon. Being unable to do so himself, he called in his brother, and between them "the Negro was severely beaten." He and a brother of his then abandoned Bruce's farm and crossed over into Scott county. The two Bruces followed them, accompanied by a third white man. Coming up with the Negroes the white party shot one of them. Thereupon the father of the victim shot back, hitting the third man of the farmer's party. "With the shedding of white blood," says the Vicksburg Herald, "the affair became a race conflict." It then quotes from the Laurel Ledger:

As soon as it became known that the Negro had shot Craft about a hundred men organized into a posse and began shooting and beating all the Negroes in the neighborhood. Most of the Negroes made their escape, but two are known to have been killed. Others have "disappeared," among whom was the Negro that did the shooting. Not a Negro remains in that entire section. Wednesday, Thursday and Friday the men searched for Negroes all day. Now that they have all

disappeared, things have assumed their normal aspect.

The Herald had hoped that previous reports of the circumstances had exaggerated them; but it confesses that the hope was dispelled by "this story from the field of action." In further comment it describes the affair as "bloody and shameful," and strikes an additional note of condemnation in these concluding words: "As to this latest emeute, the Negroes had not even been guilty of anything criminal." The bare facts in this case are so eloquent that the strongest comment upon them would seem feeble.

Of course this sort of thing goes deeper than riotous feuds. It is one of the natural results of a regime in which Negroes are regarded as a different order of beings from the white men among whom they live. The rioters are not alone to blame for these race riots. Everyone is in some degree responsible who fosters race antipathies. That these are fostered where Negroes are numerous, and by "the best people," is evident from one significant phrase of the Vicksburg Herald's: "With the shedding of white blood," etc. The previous shedding of black blood, which provoked the shedding of white blood, doesn't count. The same state of affairs is evident from the reports, if true, that are coming up from Alabama, which show a deliberate plan, connived at by officers of the law, to reenslave Negroes. This plan in operation appears to begin with bringing a poor Negro before a magistrate on a flimsy charge. He is convicted and fined, and having no money to pay the fine, a white man offers to advance the money provided the Negro will make a labor contract with him for a length of time sufficient to reimburse him for his money and trouble. The Negro is thereupon taken away and begins what is frequently a long term of cruel servitude, in which frequent whippings are incidents. These reports may not be true. But unhappily they are not inherently impossible.

ON SECURING THE LEGAL RIGHTS OF THE AMERICAN NEGRO IN PRACTICE.

As matter of abstract principle, it can hardly be unblushingly denied that the legal rights of the American Negro, in respect of his life, his liberty, his pursuits and his property, ought to be precisely the same as those of the American white man. Such is our inference, at any rate, from a brief examination we have heretofore made (p. 83) into the proposition, which seems, indeed, to be almost axiomatic, and which in that examination appears to stand the test alike of Christianity, of morality and of ethics. But if the American Negro's legal rights ought to be the same as those of American white men, as matter of abstract principle, there is no fair escape from the conclusion that they ought to be so as matter of correct practice.

Nothing can be bad in practice which is sound in principle. It is often said, to be sure, of one thing or another that is admitted to be sound in theory, that it wouldn't work in practice; and this astute observation is made occasionally with reference to solutions of the Negro problem which take into consideration any of the rights of the Negro that white men do not feel bound to respect. But all such notions will be found upon examination to be either a lazy man's or a selfish man's door of escape from a dilemma.

The lazy man who indolently concedes a false principle, or indolently makes a slovenly experiment, may save himself the trouble of revising the false principle or of correcting the slovenly experiment, by resorting to the shallow shift of explaining that while the idea is all right in theory it won't work in practice. Or, the selfish man, obliged to acknowledge the soundness of an abstract political principle at variance with some privilege he enjoys or hopes to enjoy, may endeavor to evade it and to guard against the loss, by the same sort of stultification.

Whatever his motive, anyone who asserts that a sound theory won't work in right practice is mistaken. The only sound theories that don't work in practice are those that

are prevented from being put into practice.

To this law of the universe the rights of American Negroes to equal legal protection with American whites, in respect of life, liberty, pursuits, and property, make no exception. If Negroes ought to have such rights, as matter of abstract principle, they ought to have them as matter of right practice. There is no room for distinction here between principle and practice; and in the language of John Randolph of Roanoke, we "envy neither the head nor the heart of the man" who thinks there is.

But if this equality of legal rights does belong to the American Negro, not only upon abstract principle—whether of the Christian religion, or of intuitional morality, or of utilitarian ethics,—but also as matter of right practice, then a vitally important practical question arises: Who is to secure those rights to the American Negro?

We may concede that, in abstract principle, the Negro ought to have the same legal rights of life, liberty, pursuits and property as white men, without bothering ourselves about their enforcement. But the moment we advance to the point of conceding that if he ought to have those rights as matter of principle, he ought to have them also in practice—from that moment we are obliged to grant the necessity of lodging protective power with some one who will exercise it faithfully, or at least try to do so.

Should this power to protect the black race be lodged, then, with the white race? The proposition is wholly inadmissible.

Southern leaders, it is true, often assure us that the whites of the South would protect the ballotless Negro in all his primary rights. Recently the Hon. R. G. Humphreys, of Mississippi, put the assurance in brief and positive phrase. On Confederate Decoration Day at Port Gibson, Miss., May 1, 1903, he delivered the memorial address, in which he said:

It is my firm conviction that whenever we convince the people of the North by frank and honest arguments,

that the Fifteenth amendment was an error, and by our conduct satisfy them that the Negro disfranchised will be protected in all his civil rights, and secure in his life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, that they will then be as persistent in correcting the errors of reconstruction as they were relentless in committing them."

So far as this is an assurance of protection for the Negro disfranchised, it cannot be trusted. Not because the assurance comes from a Southern white man about a Southern community. That makes no difference. It would be no more trustworthy if it came from a Northern white man about a Northern community. The reason is that no governing class ever did or probably ever will fully protect a disfranchised class in the enjoyment of their civil rights. In verification of this we need do no more than point to the Greek helot and the Roman slave of the ancient world; to the serf of the mediaeval ages; or, in our own time, to the Jew of Russia, or the Kaffir workmen of South Africa, whether under Boer or Briton. Whenever and wherever any class is treated as incapable of participating in the government by which it is governed, it is also treated as incapable of enjoying the same rights of life, liberty, property and pursuits as the governing class arrogates to itself. This is what history tells us, and our knowledge of human nature assures us that it cannot be otherwise.

If the power to protect the black race were lodged in the white race, there is not a State in the Union, with a considerable Negro population, where legal rights to life, liberty, pursuits and property would long be the same for Negroes as for white men. It may be difficult to prove this with reference to some Northern States, where there are too few Negroes, except in some obscure localities, to make a Negro problem; but it is easily proved with reference to Southern States; and what can be proved against them in this respect may be taken as a sufficiently accurate index of what could have been proved also against the Northern States if the provocative circumstances had been the same.

When the civil war closed, with the Negro a freedman instead of a slave,

the power of protecting the Negro's legal rights of life, liberty, pursuits and property, lodged at first with the white race. But instead of protecting those rights alike with the same rights of white men, the white race set at once about reducing the Negroes to legal serfdom. The "black codes" that immediately followed the war, gave little promise of a disposition on the part of the whites to secure equal legal rights of life, liberty, pursuits and property regardless of race. On the contrary, they showed what all human experience testifies would be shown in similar circumstances in any community, North or South, in Europe or America, now or aforesaid. They showed a purpose to establish Negro slavery in some form legally consistent with the abrogation of the old form. It was to enable the Negro to protect himself against this new species of aggression that the ballot was given him by amendment to the Federal Constitution.

Whether Negro suffrage has served that intended purpose, or has proved a failure, as is freely asserted by party leaders in the political party whose traditions are associated with its bestowal, and if it has proved a failure, why?—these are questions that call for no consideration at this point. It is more appropriate here that we deal with the most familiar apology for arbitrary disfranchisement of the Negro, namely, that he used the ballot not to protect himself but to oppress the whites.

If he did use the ballot to oppress the white race, he only did what the white race had long done to him, and what any race will do to another if it holds the ballot for both. But the Negro did not hold the ballot for both. Whites as well as blacks were voters at the South; and although the latter were in the majority in some States, the enfranchised Negroes as a race nowhere oppressed the whites as a race. They paid to the minority voters that respect which majorities always pay to minorities, of enacting, adjudicating and executing laws without distinction of race.

Yet the charge that they did oppress the whites has a semblance of

truth. Such maladministration as they were accountable for bore heavily upon tax payers, and the whites were nominally the largest tax payers. But in fact the oppression of tax payers through maladministration was a burden that fell upon both Negroes and whites. And when it is considered that in the last analysis the earner and not the mere appropriator of wealth is the true taxpayer, this burden fell upon Negroes more heavily than upon the whites, for most of the work of the South was done not by the white race but by the Negro race.

There is no real basis for the accusation that the Negro of the South used his ballot to oppress the whites. Neither is it to be inferred that the maladministration when he freely voted and was in the majority furnishes evidence of any peculiar lack of voting capability on his part. The corruption of the South during the Negro regime was peculiar neither to the Negro nor to the locality.

At that time "Boss" Tweed was riding on the crest of his corrupt career. He and his ring were exploiting the tax payers of New York under the sanction of a majority of its voters, but few of whom were Negroes, to a degree and with an abandon that makes the Negro legislatures of the South seem almost like ethical institutes by comparison. Nor was the Tweed ring alone in its satanic glory. Political corruption was rampant, without regard to party, or race, or locality. The politics of almost every State and even of the national government was at that period streaked with putrescence. With a wave of political corruption sweeping over the country, is it remarkable that the men whom Negroes voted into office in the South should have been less than immaculate? Does it reflect especially upon the Negro race to point to the office holders they elected, as imitators of the Tweeds, the Sheppards, the Colfaxes and the rest? Is it significant of civic inferiority, either, that newly fledged Negro voters were not swifter to discipline their leaders than were Tweed's white constituents to discipline him?

Let it be remembered, too, that it was not black men alone who availed themselves of Negro majorities to do what Tweed and his like were doing or had done with white majorities. The white man was well in evidence in all the rascalities at the South in reconstruction times. Nor were these white men by any means all Northern adventurers. Native vultures were in no wise reluctant when the savor of the flesh pots scented the air. The whole thing was neither "nigger" nor "carpetbagger," especially, but human; a bad kind of human, to be sure, but a kind, nevertheless, of which no race has a monopoly.

And when the whole story is thought over, one can hardly feel that it was "nigger," or "carpetbagger," or "scalawag" (as the native vulture was called), that wrought the worst.

Was it not, rather, those white Southerners of aristocratic lineage, who, though too big to be corrupt, were not big enough to seize upon a great moral opportunity in higher politics. They could have made of the South a fair land for two distinct and flourishing and mutually confiding races of American citizens, each with its own message for the other, each rendering its own service to the other, each bound to the other by joint pride of citizenship, and each in the full and secure enjoyment of all the legal rights which the other claimed.

Such an opportunity there was. For old leaders in the South were besought at first to take the lead again—not of one race now, but of two. Their experience and ability and acknowledged probity were in demand for the highest offices. Had they responded with the broad good feeling of fellowcitizenship, instead of recoiling with the narrow ill feeling of race arrogance, the South would have had a different and better history and there would be no Negro problem now.

It was not Negro domination that offended then, for the Negro neither dominated nor sought to dominate. It was narrow white pride in the white race. The men who ought to have led, and could have led, and were begged to lead, contemptuously refused to lead, a

mass of Negro citizens up out of the slough of an old bondage.

So the Negro, with an impulse eminently human, having discovered that the old master race of the South was not to be his friend and mentor but his deadly enemy, retreated to the recesses back of the race veil in which the whites force the blacks to live; and thence he peered out in awe upon the savagery of the white man when the era of persecution began.

Talk of the corruption of the Negro in politics! It bears no comparison for iniquity with the persecution he has suffered at the hands of white men. During the shameful "Klklux" period, murder and arson and incidental rape were among the outrages to which the Negro was subjected—for merely being a Negro. Even that period of criminal intimidation has since been outdone in the boasted crusade to nullify his vote by fraud at the polls, and to prevent its being cast at all by menacing his family with the midnight shotgun in the hands of valiant assassins. And what could Negroes do to rival the barbarity of whites, as exhibited in the press dispatches that tell of the mobs that lynch Negroes? From the various horrible burnings at the stake of the past decade, to the mobbing of the Negro residence quarter at Joplin a few weeks ago, there is nothing in the history of Negro crimes upon whites—whether political or not—to equal in barbarity the outrages of whites upon Negroes.

It will not do to charge these barbarities to the savagery of a low class of whites or to the frenzy of angry mobs. Such savagery and such frenzy—distinguishing, as they do, people of a particular race for their peculiar victims—do not originate in lower class instincts or mob fury. The race distinction they make identifies them with the race hatred of all the whites as a class. They are the brutal expression by brutal or frenzied men of the brutal prejudices of the community in which they do or can occur.

Wesay "can occur" advisedly. The community where these outrages do occur is not alone responsible for them, any more than are the brutes who actually commit the crime. Race hatred causes them, and whoever fos-

ters race hatred makes himself an originating cause of race outrages. As the Jew haters of Russia, no matter where they live, are morally responsible for the massacre at Kishineff, so the Negro haters of the United States, North as well as South, are morally responsible for the outrages of white brutes upon Negroes. Such outrages could not occur if public opinion everywhere were as sensitive to the rights of Negroes as to the rights of white men.

The whole history of the relations of whites and Negroes affords overwhelming proof of the incompetency of white Americans to protect the rights of black Americans. If the Negro is to be protected equally with white men, respecting his life, his liberty, his pursuits and his property, one thing is certain, however uncertain other things may be. It may be doubtful if the Negro is capable of protecting these rights for himself; but it is absolutely certain that the white race cannot be trusted to do it for him.

And that answers the question we have propounded: Should the power to protect the black race be lodged with the white race? The answer must of necessity be, No. The white race cannot be trusted either to exercise it faithfully, or to try to exercise it faithfully.

But there is only one alternative. We must either lodge this power with the white race, or else make Negro suffrage secure, so that the Negro himself may use it to protect his own rights. If the first horn of this alternative must be rejected—and who with a conscience has the temerity to argue for its acceptance—then the second must be adopted. It must be adopted, that is, by those who recognize the Negro's right to be protected.

Wherever the Negro has been divested of voting power, partially or wholly, the white men of that community must either insist upon its full restoration upon equal terms with whites, or by their refusal confess that they do not believe the Negro ought to have, either in principle or practice, the same rights to life, liberty, pursuits and property that they claim for themselves.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, June 4.

Great Britain is stirred from Lands End to John O'Groats, by a political agitation of the first magnitude. It is due to nothing less than a proposal, made by Joseph Chamberlain, the British secretary of state for the colonies and leader of the Unionist faction of the Conservative party, seconded by Arthur J. Balfour, the British prime minister and Conservative leader, that Great Britain abandon her policy of free trade and return to the policy of protection.

This proposed change of front with reference to an economic policy that dates back to the days of Cobden and Peel, in the 40s, when Parliament began the abolition of tariff taxes on imported food, is urged as a necessity for the maintenance of British imperialism. But it is believed to have been inspired in no little degree by the seeming necessity for raising a new patriotic issue to save the Conservative party from disaster.

That suspicion is reenforced certainly by the manifest decline of this party in popularity since the close of the Boer war (vol. v., p. 264), with its incidental advantages as a political issue to the party in power. Several by-elections, this Spring, to fill vacancies in Parliament, have been badly disappointing to Conservative hopes. The only one in which Conservatives even pretended to find consolation, had returned the Unionist candidate by only half the usual majority; and this poor consolation was more than neutralized by the triumphant election of Sir Wilfrid Lawson, a thorough-going "Little Englander." His majority was several hundred larger than the Liberals usually poll in his constituency: notwithstanding that Mr. Chamberlain forced the Boer war question against him in the contest and that he responded by placarding the district with a strong denunciation of the annexation of the Boer republics. These Liberal successes created a widespread impression that at the next general elections the Conservatives would be retired from power.

About this time the first clear intimation of the new tariff policy was made. A large and influential dele-

gation of Unionist members of the House of Commons, supported by members of the Lords and delegates from chambers of agriculture and of commerce, waited upon Mr. Balfour on the 15th of May to protest against remission of the war duties on grain. Mr. Balfour is reported to have made a long and groping argument in reply to their representations. He explained that this grain tax had accidentally and without the slightest intention on the part of the ministry, given some protection to millers and thus indirectly and unexpectedly helped farmers, but that inasmuch as the measure was never intended to be protective, the ministry must not be blamed for now remitting the tax. He urged them to consider, also, that protection cannot be introduced silently, as if by accident and without a broad public indorsement of such a change in the national policy, at the same time assuring them that he must not be understood as saying that the existing policy must necessarily be permanent. On the contrary, he thought it must be recognized that new conditions have arisen since the old free trade policy was adopted, and he could imagine circumstances under which Great Britain would no longer consent to be made a passive target for other countries living under different conditions. While he believed in universal free trade, he realized that at present every country except Great Britain is protected. In conclusion, he said that he would welcome a closer fiscal union of the motherland and the colonies, but that the movement would be extremely difficult to carry out, and must come from the heart, conscience and intellect of the great masses of the people.

On the very day of that conference with Mr. Balfour, Mr. Chamberlain addressed a great Unionist mass-meeting at Birmingham, making the abolition of British free trade the burden of his speech. As this speech was cabled, Mr. Chamberlain declared—

that England had reached the point in her career where she must abandon the policy of free trade or lose her colonies; that on imperial policy for the next few years depended whether the British empire should stand together as a free nation against the world, or fall into separate States, each selfishly seeking its own interests and losing those advantages which unity alone could give; and that the policy of dictation and interference by foreign Powers was justified by the be-