

The Library
of the
University of North Carolina



Institute for Research
in
Social Science

326 — P59n

UNIVERSITY OF N.C. AT CHAPEL HILL



10000364348

THE NEW NEGRO

HIS POLITICAL, CIVIL AND MENTAL STATUS

AND

RELATED ESSAYS



The New Negro

HIS POLITICAL, CIVIL AND MENTAL STATUS

AND

RELATED ESSAYS

BY

WILLIAM PICKENS,

Dean of Morgan College, Baltimore, Md.

Author of "The Heir of Slaves," "The

Superior Race," "A Visit to the

Art Centers of the Old

World, etc."

ELC. 6
759



THE NEALE PUBLISHING COMPANY
440 FOURTH AVENUE, NEW YORK CITY

M C M X V I

Copyright, 1916, by
THE NEALE PUBLISHING COMPANY.

Affectionately Dedicated

to

*The White and the Black Men of To-
morrow: A Faith in Whose Essential
Humanity and Justice Is the In-
spiration of These Pages.*

139192

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
The Renaissance of the Negro Race.....	9
-The Constitutional Status of the Negro from 1860 to 1870.....	16
The Negro a Test for Our Civilization.....	30
Fifty Years After Emancipation.....	44
Grounds of Hope.....	61
Frederick Douglass.....	71
Alexander Hamilton.....	103
Abraham Lincoln.....	119
Industry	148
Education	155
From the Christian Viewpoint.....	176
Lynching	190
The Ultimate Effects of Segregation.....	206
The New Negro.....	224

THE RENAISSANCE

OF

THE NEGRO RACE

The Great Sphinx at Gizeh, which for many centuries has looked with steady, enigmatical gaze over the plains and the changes of civilization, scarred and marred, but in the main enduring the attacks of time and tide, is symbolic of much of African history. The oldest authentic history is Egypt; Egypt was the mother of civilization. In the dawn of civilization there were no hard and fast lines among the colors of the human race, but it is certain that the darker groups matured more quickly and took the lead. Milleniums before the wolf suckled Romulus, many centuries before Homer sung, the black and brown and yellowish peoples ruled in Egypt, overran the civilized and known world, and brought and wrought the usual changes of civilization before Greece and Rome were even names in the earth. But altho Africa, with its warm climate, its impressionable people and its Nile valley, was fitted for the birth and childhood of civilization, under the conditions that obtained in the ancient world, it was not fitted for indefinite development; old Egypt was flanked by burning deserts, and had what was at

that time the unknown, dark and inaccessible continent at its back. It was sometimes to be overrun by the powers that grew in the more open and accessible region of southwestern Asia, and then it was to yield to the virile and aggressive people who grew up in Europe and who had lighted their torch of civilization at the lamp of Egypt itself.

The black people of this ancient world were not of low caste or marked as inferiors in any special way. They were by no means a slave or servile class; the blood of their veins was poured all through the civilized and half-civilized world, and its traces are clear today in southern Asia as far as India and in southern Europe. Does the traveller not notice the black people among the Turks, and the beautiful brown face that is occasionally met among the Italians? It is said, too, that these African people had a cotton industry before England, and that they originated the smelting of iron. Think of what the invention of iron conferred upon civilization. Our civilization without its iron would be like the human body without its skeleton: it would collapse, it could not stand and go, it could only crawl and creep.

But this civilization of black men, after performing its early mission in the world, was to have its dark ages. The African world happened to be overrun by early Islam (submission), instead of by early Christianity. Islam is ritualistic and formal and fixed, and is not progressive. Greece and Rome, when they began to awake, enjoyed the advantages of situation, of accessibility, of a coast

line suitable for commerce and trade, of free intercourse and contact with many other peoples. It is known that Rome was not an inventor, but that she adopted and adapted the best t h a t she found among the subject peoples. This was her superior genius. The civilization of Europe is the growth and work of many minds and peoples, the confluence of many streams. On the other hand, whatever civilization was developed by the iron-worker in the heart of Africa, was a straight lift out of his own life and environment, a creature of his own generations, a sort of progress over his dead self.

And in addition to the ritualism from the Mohammedan world Africa later received a still more blighting visitation from the Christian world—the *slave-hunter*. This abortive horror from Europe and America came upon Africa as a very contradiction of all Christian principles. This emissary from the Christian world brought an era that was worse than heathendom. Whatever civilization Africa had already developed was cut off and broken up. The greed for blood-money took hold of the tribes, setting chief against chief and clan against clan. What need was there for the slow processes of iron-work and textile industry, when a strong tribe could get goods or gold by simply hunting down the members of the neighboring tribes and selling them to white men? This trade in men, brought in by civilized people from Christian lands, was the worst blight that ever overtook a continent. It is sometimes said by way

of excuse that the blacks in Africa were already holding each other as slaves and were glad enough to sell slaves to white men. If this were the whole truth it would not be an excuse—but it is only the half truth. The Negroes had a normal domestic slavery, such as is found in every infant civilization, such as was in Europe when Spartan noble held helot and Roman patrician held plebeian. But this great commerce in men, with its insatiable demands, its cunning and its avarice, which changed a whole continent into a slave corral, was never before known in Africa and has never been known in any other part of the civilized world. Is there any wonder that centuries of such ravishment should have destroyed African culture and broken up whatever civilizing influences were at work there? And altho Greece had looked up to the pyramids of Egypt as the lighthouses of civilization, and altho black men had not been marked as special subjects for slavery before the fifteenth century, yet under the influence of this lucrative foreign commerce in human flesh *black man* and *slave* became synonymous.

“Jove fixed it certain, that whatever day
Man makes a slave takes half his worth away.”

Philosophically the pronoun *his* in this quotation can refer with equal truth to the *slave* or to the man who enslaves him.

Africa, which had produced the Fathers of the early Christian church, now had many millions of its people stolen and carried away into captivity by

Christian nations. The trade in men was profitable in money and made or straightened out the fortunes of many a noble house. The energetic Dutch wrested the trade from the indolent Portuguese who had started it. So lucrative was the business that the English took it from the Dutch by war. But what providence was at work here? The Negro blood was being carried to every civilized country, many millions coming to America. The Negro became the major part of the population in many of the West Indies, in parts of Brazil, and practically half the population in much of the southern United States. The children of the expatriated slaves have become an ineradicable part of the vast New World. In the progress of civilization they have attained their freedom and varying degrees of citizenship. In Latin America they are accorded a place in civilization rather more liberal than that which is accorded them in Anglo-Saxon countries. This is true in spite of the fact that the Negro has made the most substantial progress in those parts of North America where he is in contact with the Anglo-Saxon. And the fact that he enjoys less equality there than in Brazil, for example, would be very strange were it not to be explained by the difference between the natures of the Teutonic and the Latin races. The latter have a much less intense race consciousness, which permits them to quickly assimilate other peoples. This difference is noticeable from the time of Caesar and the Teutonic tribes, and is seen to-day in the difference between the cordial equal-

ity which is accorded darker people in Paris and the reserved toleration which they sometimes meet in London—as well as in the difference between the absolutely equal rights which the Negro enjoys in Rio de Janeiro and the fine bigotry and benevolent snobbishness with which he is often burdened in Boston. But whatever his condition, a providence has given him the widest contact, has scattered his scions in all the earth and is making him one of the most versatile races of modern history. He stands to-day on the threshold of a renaissance of civilization and culture after four hundred years of interruption by captivity, slavery and oppression.

This awakening of the darker and the more handicapped people is to be noted all over the world. Japan from the vantage ground of its island independence, has led off nobly. China is beginning to shake off the lethargy and conservatism of thousands of years. The brown Hindu is growing conscious, the Philippino is pleading and expectant, and the Ethiopian in Africa is stretching forth his hand. In spite of the traditions of the slave-hunt and the repressive measures of the Christian foreigner in Africa, the natives are said to have captured the unskilled labor market and to be encroaching upon the skilled labor of the whites. They are even clamoring for the vote in the aboriginal land of their fathers. What is to be the future of the African in Africa? When the Sphinx speaks, what will he say? In the West Indies the blacks are asking and receiving a

greater share in their own government. In the United States during the few years of their freedom the colored people have made a material, intellectual and moral progress which is wondered at even by the white people among whom they live—and yet they are stoutly held back and hindered in civil and political development. And they are now awakening to the truth that they must advance along all lines to make their advancement secure, that they must “straighten out their front,” as they say in the European war. The struggle of fifty years has made them know that their position in this civilization cannot be secure unless they have the full citizenship of the country. These essays aim to voice that aspiration. Conditions will be described from different viewpoints, without unnecessary repetition. The condition of the American Negro is hardly sufficiently known to the members of his own race. The history of the race has been distorted or buried in contempt. But along with the great advance which the Negro can be expected to make in the United States in the next fifty years, every few years should see a book up to date on the general subject of “The Renaissance of the Negro Race” or “The New Negro,” the subjects respectively of the first and last essays of this volume.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL STATUS OF THE NEGRO FROM 1860 TO 1870

The second decade of the latter half of the nineteenth century was the most epochal period in American legal history since the time of the origin of the national constitution. So far as the American Negro is concerned, this period marks the greatest possible changes in legal and constitutional status. Three years before the opening of this decade the highest court of the nation had declared the Negro to have only the status of the lower animals, while at the close of the decade the Negro had acquired a status in the organic law of the land which entitled him to membership in the Supreme Court itself. In this period the Negro changed from a chattel to a person, from an animal to a man, from a slave to a citizen, so far as the supreme law of the land is concerned.

This period also contains the two extremes in the scale of discriminations against the American Negro in statute law. Before this period there were comparatively few statutory discriminations against the black race in the Southern states. For in that section the Negro had no personal rights at law, and discriminatory statutes were not necessary. When a discrimination is made against a class in statute law, it is thereby implied that this

class has at least some rights based on the fundamental law of the land. Therefore, the legislative discriminations against black people before this period were found chiefly in the border states and in the "free" states against "free" Negroes—a strange contradiction of terms. But this decade, from 1860 to 1870, also contains the extremes of the Negro's legal status in the South: at the opening of the decade stood the Negro slave, at the close stood the Negro senator; after the middle of this period the South passed the extreme "Black Laws," intended to nullify the effect of the Thirteenth Amendment as far as possible, while at the end of the decade came the Fifteenth Amendment, marking an epoch. These "Black Laws" of the South were enacted between 1865 and 1868 and were inspired by the ratification of the Thirteenth Amendment. They had for their models, it is claimed, the similar laws that had been passed in previous decades against the helpless "free" Negroes of the North and the border states. But they outdid the models.

These "Black Laws" are worth considering, for in them are found a sufficient cause and a very cogent reason for the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments. There is really no need for the charge that these two Amendments were the inspiration of revenge or of the desire for the political advantage of the party in power. At any rate, such great products of statesmanship should stand on their merits, and not be condemned, even if it could be shown that they were originally based

in unworthy motives. It does not lessen the beauty of the rose if the plant was sprouted in manure. But the argument of the ultra-motive is unnecessary, for the "Black Laws" of the South were the immediate occasion, and doubtless the only efficient cause, of the Fourteenth Amendment. After the passage of the Thirteenth Amendment, if the former slave states had accorded the ex-slaves even half justice, it is very likely that the Negro's friends in Congress would have quickly forgotten him—as they have since done in the face of the worst injustices. But it was not unnatural for the South, after the ratification of the Thirteenth Amendment which gave the Negro only the lowest degree of freedom, to try to pass systems of laws that would cause the Negro's freedom to make as little change as possible in the social organism and in his relation to the white race. Not to have done so would have been evidence of superhuman foresight and self-control. From the standpoint of the Negro's interests, however, these laws were "black" not only in name and aim, but in their very nature. Instead of being the property of a personally interested master, the Negro was to be converted into the slave of a much less sympathetic society in general. The "free" Negro's lot was to be much harder than that of the slave had been; for altho no longer entitled to "board and keep" from his employer, yet he was to be forbidden by law to move or to change his employment. This would have left his wages at the mercy of the employer. It is a law of economics that the mobility

of labor is necessary to the normal regulation of wages. Some states absolutely forbade the freedmen to engage in skilled work, leaving for them only the most menial and least profitable occupations. In the famous old state of South Carolina the employer was to be allowed to inflict corporal punishment, or as the euphemism of the law put it, to "moderately correct" the servants. "Master" and "servant" were the terms used in these laws,—not *employer* and *employee*. The vagrancy laws and laws of apprenticeship were all of a nature to entrap the ignorant and take advantage of the weak. Famous old South Carolina even sought to regulate the amount of "politeness" due from the "servant" to the "master's family."

In the face of all these stereotyped facts, why should any honest student of history have to resort to any intangible and indefinite thing like a feeling of revenge or a desire for political and party advantage as an explanation of the motives of those who conceived and passed the Fourteenth Amendment? This Amendment was passed by the friends of freedom to keep the Thirteenth Amendment from being a mere farce. They sought thereby to secure for the Negro the protecting power of the ballot, as the only effective means of influencing his civil and political interests in a government like this. There was no thought or hope of making him dominant in a country that was predominantly white. But the backers of the Amendment sought to lead the state governments to this reasonable end by inducing rather than compelling them. The

effect of this amendment was to be based on impartial mathematics, and the choice was to be left to the majority of the voters of the state. The state was simply not to have a power in the national government based on a population which the state itself did not recognize as a part of its own citizenry.

Up to 1865 nearly all of the states of the Union had restricted the right to vote to white men. After the Negro was freed some Northern states voluntarily removed this restriction. The friends of freedom hoped that the Fourteenth Amendment would induce others to do so, by making it to the advantage of their national representative power. But from the ratification of the Amendment in 1868 to 1870 not a single state, with the sole exception of Minnesota, heeded the warning or yielded to the inducement of the suffrage clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. And it might be noted in passing that there were not enough Negroes in Minnesota to make any difference either way. Up to 1870 fourteen states still restricted the suffrage to white men. This obstinacy on the part of the reactionaries caused the friends of freedom in 1870 to ratify the Fifteenth Amendment, which substituted *must* for persuasion and virtually penalized discrimination against any race in the matter of the suffrage. What evidence is there that any one of these steps was taken in a spirit of revenge? Revenge usually acts in haste and without waiting on the development of other sufficient causes. The persuasion of the Fourteenth

Amendment was not resorted to till three years after the close of the war, and when there had risen the plainest need for even more than persuasion in the interests of justice and humanity. And the Fifteenth Amendment did not appear till five years after the war, when even the Fourteenth Amendment had failed to persuade. Why should revenge wait so long and advance so reluctantly? It seems that the friends of freedom, who had the political power in their hands, were slow to anger and plenteous in hope.

This suffrage amendment was to be a bulwark to the liberties not only of black men, but of all men in America; it was directed not only against the "Black Laws" of the South, but against political and civil slavery everywhere in the nation. It is interesting to note that of the states who were members of the Union up to 1865, only five can be listed in the honor roll of those who have never discriminated against the Negro voter: Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont.

The constant question raised by these discriminating laws is: What is a Negro? When we are going to discriminate against a fellow, we must be careful and definite in pointing him out. And so each set of discriminating laws contains its own definition of the word *Negro*, and the definitions have differed widely. At first in some parts of the North the Negro was defined as any person who was *visibly* colored. It is plain, however, that if the matter is left to the eyes, millions of American

"Negroes" will have to be taken into the Caucasian race,—and so most of the state legislatures reduced their definitions to the finer discriminations of mathematics. These mathematical definitions vary all the way from one-fourth of the blood of the black man to a mere one-sixteenth; but some laws of the gallant South go so far as to say that if one has even one drop of Negro blood in his veins he is a Negro. Thus it is seen that "the Negro," so far as the United States is concerned, is an arbitrary creature of law and includes within its scope hundreds of thousands of people who by every law of God and nature and reason are members of the Caucasian race, principally Anglo-Saxons. For whatever the legal definition, it is the common practice in the United States to class as Negroes all persons known to have any part of Negro blood. The white American, therefore, ascribes the same potency to Negro blood which he ascribes to the blood of Jesus Christ,—that it only takes one drop "to make you whole." The statement needs no proof that there are thousands of people in America who are related to the Negro and do not know it, and others who know it but also know that its acknowledgment would not increase their comforts in life.

It was especially necessary to define the term *Negro* when the intermarriage laws were being considered. These queer laws have always had the support of the vast majority of white people, wherever the Negro has become a considerable part of the population, and especially after the

Negro was freed. I call them "queer laws" because they always, in spirit and in effect if not in letter, tend to make the naturally honorable relation of marriage a worse crime than the naturally dishonorable practice of illicit intercourse,—which abuse, however, is practiced chiefly by the men of the stronger against the women of the weaker group. For this illicitness there is in practice no punishment, while the sure penalties of intermarriage range all the way from a fine of one hundred dollars to ten years in the penitentiary,—and the danger of still more horrible extra-legal penalties. There could be but one result of thus outlawing decency and tolerating indecency,—of putting honor under the foot of dishonor,—and that result has been attained in the United States: namely, millions of interracial illegitimates, and some admixture of Caucasian blood in at least nine-tenths of the American Negro group.

Such is the American group against which these discriminating laws have directly and indirectly aimed. In the historic decade (1860 to 1870) many forms of discrimination and distinction began to appear in the laws of the South: in public travel, in the courts and in the matter of suffrage. In 1865 and 1866 "Jim Crow" laws were passed in Florida, Mississippi and Texas, but not in the other states until 1881, when Tennessee started the new era of "Jim Crow," which has since overrun the whole South and threatens, as did slavery itself, to invade the North. Is it not queer that this passion should have gained such headway so

long after slavery? It would seem that the more the Negro advances in education and refinement, the less acceptable he becomes to a large number of white people. In North Carolina or South Carolina a Negro may be taken into the white people's car if he be a criminal or a lunatic; but if he is a gentleman and a scholar, it will be a serious offense against earth and heaven, subject to heavy fine,—and when his train reaches Georgia, even the conductor may be fined one thousand dollars! This race distinction on the cars serves no useful, honorable purpose which classified passenger tickets would not serve. But of all the humiliation, wrong and robbery possible against a free people, the devil and the Sicilian tyrants working together could never have devised a more ingenious scheme than the "Jim Crow" car.

As to the courts. Until 1870 the laws of Iowa forbade the Negro to practice law; many states sought to invalidate or restrict the testimony of a Negro witness against a white person; and most reluctantly of all has any state conceded the Negro the right to be a juror, even where both parties to the suit are Negroes. In law and in theory the Fifteenth Amendment, March 30, 1870, repealed all statutes and nullified all constitutional clauses discriminating against people on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude, but in practice in the United States the Negro is still handicapped as a lawyer, discredited as a witness and almost universally excluded from juries. This is queer again in the face of the

almost unanimous testimony of the courts to the effect that the Negro jurymen are more inclined to convict a real Negro criminal than is the white jurymen.

The Reconstruction constitutions of the South, in 1868 and 1869, following the Fourteenth Amendment, gave the Negroes the ballot. It is needless to say that this was not the will of the white majority. And it must always be said of these Reconstruction governments that, whatever faults they may have had, they made the first, and up to the present time the *last*, serious and straight-going efforts to establish real democratic-republican organization in the South. In this era the Congress of the United States was in the hands of the friends of freedom, and in 1866 the Negro was given the ballot in all the territories of the United States. On June 8, 1867, the Congress gave the ballot to the Negroes of the District of Columbia, over the President's veto and against the will of the white inhabitants. In a popular vote on the proposition the city of Washington returned 6,521 votes against enfranchising the blacks and 35 votes for it; while Georgetown returned the interesting figures of 812 votes against the proposition, and for it *one vote*. This record of fifty years ago is sufficient to indicate what would be the condition in Washington, D. C., if it were left to its own devices.

Such are the facts of obstinate resistance to the Negro's actual freedom, which brought the friends of freedom in Congress rather slowly around to

the necessity of adopting the Fourteenth, and when that failed, the Fifteenth Amendment. I repeat that if, after the passage of the Thirteenth Amendment, the legislatures and courts and other creatures of popular suffrage had shown a genius for doing justice to the Negro, it is likely that his friends in Congress would have forgotten him entirely, that the two subsequent amendments would not have been proposed and that he would have been left outside of the Constitutional pale of citizenship indefinitely. The Thirteenth, Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments put the enemies of freedom successively on trial, and each time they failed. Yea, even against the direct decree of the Fifteenth Amendment have they defeated democracy by indirection and duplicity. If the aim of the Fifteenth Amendment should be finally defeated, it would be the ultimate failure of democracy,—but there are late indications that in the end it will not fail. And of all the many-angled struggle which the colored people are supporting in this country for their advancement and ultimate security, the central aim of every fighting line should be full-fledged citizenship.

There is no doubt about the truth of the plain statement that the Negro race in the United States of America does not get a "square deal." But we observe frequent efforts to minimize the appearance of this wrong by the ambiguous statement that it is "natural" under the circumstances. I call the statement ambiguous because in one sense of the word every fact of life and history is

natural; all virtue and vice, lust and love are natural. Many natural things are very undesirable,—and fortunately some of them are not indestructible or unalterable. It may be natural for the white race to disfranchise, “Jim-Crow” and burn Negroes, but it naturally feels unnatural to the Negro, and he is naturally opposed to that procedure. Is it not natural for the victim to be uncomfortable under these things, to complain against them, to organize and fight them? The naturalness of injustice, if it be natural, does not make it one whit more just. It is natural, or at least it is historic, that men will rob and commit murder and bastardy,—but there seems to be something in man which is higher than nature and which fights against these things.

The same sort of fallacy in reasoning is resorted to when the effort is made to palliate the wrongs done in one section by stating the fact that the same or similar wrongs have been done, are being done or will be done to the Negro in other sections or eventually in all sections of the United States. What on earth has this to do with the wrong, except to make it more horrible? Does it justify wrong to show that other people have done it, are doing it, or may do it? If so, then sin itself ought to be the fairest thing in the world, for all men in all ages and all countries have committed it. The poor sinning South painstakingly points out and tabulates every single instance of its own wrongs against black men which can be found repeated in the North; and when the North

slips from virtue in the same path, it cries out Pharisaically that such horrors are common or even popular in the South. If mere ubiquity justifies, remember that the devil's work is ubiquitous, too.

Again I have read books and arguments that sought to minimize the importance of the industrial, civil and political discriminations against the Negro by saying not only that these practices are "not confined to any one section of the country," but also that such-and-such an evil did not even "originate" in the South. We are told with great unction that Philadelphia and San Francisco once excluded Negroes from street cars altogether, that slavery originated in the commerce of the North, and that Jim-Crowism was first met in Massachusetts. I have heard that the devil was first met in the Garden of Eden, but he is none the less the devil. And as to origin, who cares where the smallpox or the yellow fever originated? It is their nature, not their origin, which makes them horrible.

There is really no room for one section to boast or to proudly accuse the other. So far as the Negro's experiences go, both sections need to improve perhaps in their ideals but certainly in their practices respecting democratic liberties and human brotherhood. Let the Negro and his friends realize that the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution represent not a backward step, but a stride forward in civilization, and that they were fostered

and ratified, not for the sake of the temporary burden which they may have put upon the white race in the South, but for the benefit of all races, at all times, in all America.

THE NEGRO A TEST FOR OUR CIVILIZATION

More than three hundred years ago the Anglo-Saxon came to this continent. Being very religious, he landed and immediately fell upon his knees; but, being very ambitious, he arose and immediately "fell upon the aborigines." At that time provisions were scarce and work plentiful in this country, and, in order to conquer the more unconquerable wilderness, the white man wanted the best help he could get and wanted to pay only "board and keep," so he drove a bargain with the Africans, the unsophisticated children of the sun. For about two hundred and fifty years this peculiar economic system persisted, the white man reaping the chief benefits of the economics and the black man bearing the chief burden of the system and the peculiarity.

This system prevented the white man from seeing the black man as a fellow-Christian and fellow-citizen; when he read "Love thy neighbor as thyself" in his Bible, his imagination pictured white neighbors; and when he wrote "All men are born free and equal" into his political creed, he was thinking white. Taxation without representation was wrong, of course, but right against the slave. The white man thought black when he read from

the Old Testament, "a servant of servants shall he be," or from the New Testament, "that servant which knew his master's will, and prepared not himself, neither did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes." Little did the white man suspect that the ultimate test for both his government and his religion would lie in his relation to that silent, accommodating black man. There is one Negro in every ten persons in this country. How many white American citizens ever imagined the Congress of the United States and the legislative and judicial departments of all the states with every tenth officer a Negro? On earth there are about seven colored persons to one white. Be honest, O white American Christians! how many of you have ever pictured to yourselves the joys of heaven with seven dark souls to one white?

All other nationalities who have come to this country since the Negro have been more readily accepted into the Anglo-Saxon's scheme of government and Christian brotherhood. Two hundred and fifty years of wrong relationship got this civilization into the unfortunate habit of excepting the Negro. He became the standing exception to the rules of civilization. We can help a man best when we know his hindrances. What are the industrial, civil and political hindrances of the American Negro?

Industrially he started as a slave, worked two hundred and fifty years without a pay day, and then got discharged without credit or capital, when his employers fell out. The system had marked

him as menial in the eyes of his fellowmen, and had not made industry attractive in his own eyes. As a free laborer he began in the lowest-paid and least desirable occupations and rose upward only so far as economic necessity demanded. Industrial society intended that the free Negro should be what the economist might call the *marginal employee*,—to be employed in that margin of industry where it is impossible or difficult to employ any white person. And where, on the upper edge of this margin, he was brought into contact with other free Americans, he was to receive lower wages or bear some other distinct badge of industrial inferiority. We see this contact and distinction on American railroads, where colored men and white men who do exactly the same work are distinguished respectively as “porters” and “trainmen.” A few years ago there were some Negro Pullman conductors on a road in the South, but they were officially designated as “head porters.” It is needless to add that the wages followed the designation. Industrial segregation has been the tendency north and south: in the South the Negro is more largely employed because he is more needed; in the North he is less largely employed because he is less needed. In both he is the “marginal employee,” the margin being wider in the South and narrower in the North.

It is plain that a permanent handicap like that would tend to embarrass the whole life of the Negro, for if industrial inferiority is to be maintained, certain other things are necessary and

logical, like class education and disfranchisement, —a lower standard of living and a lower order of citizenship. For with brains in his head and a ballot in his hand a man cannot ultimately be industrially repressed. The Negro's economic progress as revealed in the census, when seen from the viewpoint of this handicap, is exceedingly creditable. When an unwelcome and beginning race stands up against an entrenched civilization and wrests from it an increased measure of life, that race possesses the strongest potentialities of civilization. Look at our humble possessions and see how they have mounted upward from zero to a billion dollars. Look at us and see how we have grown from three and a half million chain-marked slaves to ten million aspiring freemen.

The relation of the Negro to trades-unionism shows that he is to be either a help or a hindrance to industrial freedom in America: he must be in the union on terms of equality, or if out of the union he will be a strike-breaker and wage-reducer, a weapon of the employer against the white employee. If the black is pushed down, the least that the white laborer can expect is to be pushed down next to him.

Besides industrial segregation, there is what we will call civil segregation; and then there is the natural tendency to class education and disfranchisement. The effect of segregation is to handicap and thwart the Negro's progress. Some try to hypnotize us into the belief that it means simple, harmless, spatial separation. But some of us who

are hard subjects to hypnotize continue to see and to say that every single fact of color segregation in this country, where it does not mean absolute independence, means subordination and degradation for the weaker party. We have a right therefore to suspect that degradation is the aim; it is at least such a huge temptation that no white organization or community has ever yet successfully resisted the temptation to degrade after segregating. Our various "jim-crow" arrangements are an illustration: there is not a railroad in this country required to furnish separate accommodations for white and black, which makes those accommodations equal. In many cases the arrangements for the colored passenger are unsanitary and indecent: overcrowded cars, one toilet for both sexes, and the white trainmen and rougher Negroes permitted to smoke in the face of colored women. I sometimes see the colored waiting-room lined with cobwebs, and spittoons that have not been emptied or disinfected for weeks. In all cases, mind you, the Negro pays equal first-class fares. However much he may be rated as inferior in this country, he is counted equal in the payment of fares, fines and taxes: equal in the bearing of burdens, only inferior in the sharing of privileges and opportunities.

✓ In many respects American civilization requires just as much of the Negro as of the proudest and most fortunate Anglo-Saxon, altho the Negro's history in America has not bequeathed him a chance in the present to meet the requirement.

The past seeks to damn him with its heritage and the present casts about him an environment which aims to restrict him much more than any other race in America is restricted. It is not only true that we exact of the Negro as much as we exact of any other man, but sometimes we seem to require even more of him, to expect him to be even more virtuous than other races: it is well known that, on the whole, Negroes are given much longer terms and heavier fines for the same crimes. Yet they are called criminals by nature. Why mete out to a criminal-by-nature severer punishment than to a deliberate criminal? Negroes are given inferior schools to meet equal tests; they are given inferior wages to pay equal prices; they are expected to work out their economic salvation with no political power, without even the ballot. These wonders no other race has ever accomplished or has ever been expected to accomplish.

Heredity and environment are the factors of destiny. Heredity is the multiplicand and environment the multiplier. The Negro is a factor of American destiny: the nearer zero any factor is, the nearer zero will the product be. Justice cannot be corrupted for black men and remain pure for white men. Government cannot be tyranny to the weak and democracy to the strong. American civilization will be what it is to the Negro.

The effect of segregation is felt in the Negro's education, public and private. There has been much effort to find a type of education which would fit the Negro for the status which the weight

of American sentiment aimed to give him. If the aim is right, the educational principle is all right: if the Negro is to have a special place, he should have special preparation for that place. But if he is to be only an American citizen, he needs only such education as other American citizens. Now the Negro is not only good-natured but often very cunning, and some of his leaders affect to have accepted these limitations for the sake of present profits. These men are shrewd, not honest. They believe, as they privately acknowledge, that the only way to manage a white man is to allow him to be quietly, peaceably, comfortably and completely fooled. The Negro is constantly trying to manage the white man as "Br'er Rabbit" managed "Br'er Fox," by his superior wits: by indirection, circumvention and cunning. The defense of the weak is cunning. The Negro had two hundred and fifty years of schooling in this defensive art. Even in the days of slavery the black "conjuror" often had both white and black at his mercy. He learned to give indirect answers, to profit by ambiguous terms, and to get where he wanted to go by a sort of broken and uncertain course. My father told me of such a slave, who had everybody on the plantation, white and black, believing that he had the supernatural power of seeing into all secrets. One day his master even bet a sum of money to some white neighbors that his Negro could tell them anything they wanted to know. They caught something and put it under a barrel, all unknown to the Negro. The confident mas-

ter called in the slave and asked him to tell what was under the barrel. For a moment the Negro was baffled and almost trapped; but while his master threatened, he used his ears and his wits. By chance he overheard just one word spoken by one of the white men, but he did not know whether this word referred to him or to what was under the barrel. The Negro knew that he must either make good or beg for mercy. Therefore, he took this one word and fashioned a sentence which could pass either for an interpretation of what was under the barrel, or failing in that, could be taken as a plea for mercy: "Well, Massa, you has done caught de ole *coon* at last." It happened to be a coon under the barrel, and the white people did not detect the double-edged nature of the reply. Till this day the Negro is seldom frank to the white man in America. He says what he does not mean; he means what he does not say. I have heard Negro speakers address mixed audiences of white and colored persons, and both white and black would go away rejoicing, each side thinking that the speaker had spoken their opinions, altho the opinions of the blacks were very different from those of the whites, even contradictory. This is one reason for the great misconception in the white race respecting the desires, ambitions and sentiments of the black.

The greatest need in America to-day between white and black people is an era of frankness and honest expression of opinion. As long as we seek to fool each other, employing cunning on the one

side and insincerity on the other, we shall not rest on the solid foundation of truth and there will be live coals under the smooth-looking ashes of our sophistries and deception. We must face facts and tolerate the truth, however much opposed it may seem to our dearest preconceptions. We must pursue the rule of justice even if it seems to lead out of the window.

Now, as to politics, our first impulse is to wonder that nine-tenths of a democratic state could be so opposed to the voting power of one-tenth. Is Reconstruction the cause? But the intelligent Negro of to-day is not the ignorant Negro of Reconstruction days. Besides, it was psychologically impossible earlier and now must remain forever impossible to know the truth about Reconstruction. We can only judge of what must have been the distortions of Reconstruction history by analogy with the distortions of present-day Negro history; and we know that now, nearly fifty years after Reconstruction, with nearly fifty years more of civilization, Christianity and "free speech," not one newspaper out of a hundred dares to tell the truth about the Negro. How, then, can we ever hope to have the truth handed down from a society that was dominated by the Ku Klux Klan? The Negro's argument for citizenship is based, not on the doubtful past, but on the eternal and demonstrable present. Is it a question of ignorance and unfitness in the Negro? The Negro can boast that he never has, does not and never will ask to be enrolled as a voter on

any test more lenient than the test given white men. He will let the white man "set the pace" in the matter of attainable qualification. Is it a desire to preserve the white race? Does the history of the world and the present European war teach us that races and nations are preserved by injustice and bullying? Finally, is it a vague and inexplorable fear of the Negro? Well, if nine white men fear one Negro on general principles, they should be encouraged when they reflect how much the one Negro must fear the nine white men on the same principles.

Here again is where the Negro conjurer comes in: he tries to charm the white man into the belief that Negroes are not interested in politics; that they regard balloting as a mere empty formality which might just as well be left to the leisure-loving and deluded white race, if only the long-headed Negro is granted such useful blessings as education, property and police protection. The Negro does not mean this. He is interested in politics and self-government. But he simply hopes that the economic and industrial course will prove to be an indirect route to these other things.

Let us see. First, as to education: this trifling pastime of voting elects the educational officials, and the states which have disfranchised the Negro have relatively cut down his educational appropriation, in many cases shortening his school term and lowering his school grade. The same prejudice which pushed him away from the polls tends to push him out of the school. And now as to

property right,—have votes any bearing on that? Will money-getting per se improve the condition of the disfranchised or will it endanger his life by making him a richer prey for the mobocrat? Votes elect the taxers and decide the taxes. The power that can take 1 per cent of a man's property without his consent, can take fifty per cent of it, and then the other fifty. The power to tax is the power to confiscate, and taxation without representation is confiscation. But what about police protection, protection of civil rights, and fair treatment in public places? If the Negro will only give up his vote and his annoying insistence upon political equality, will not the officers elected by the votes of white people be so obligated to the Negro that they will be zealous in his interest, while the halls of legislature will fairly ring with enthusiasm for these admirable "wards of the nation"? That is a flat contradiction of human nature: elective officers are obligated to those who elect them; legislators look after the interests of those by whom they are sent; sheriffs respect the influence of those who can vote in the next election. Where the Negro is disfranchised, the white officers who have impulses to do him justice are handicapped; they must constantly choose between justice to the Negro and their own personal interests,—a dangerous dilemma for human nature. As a result, in the very states where the Negro is disfranchised he receives the least protection and incurs the most virulent attacks from the successful politician. To get the Negro question out of poli-

tics, give the Negro a fair ballot and he will vote it out,—for if both races vote, no candidate who needs the votes of both will drag the race question into his campaign.

Fifteen years ago even the friends of the Negro were persuaded to believe that if he were debarred from the polls, the mob would be pleased and lynching would stop,—that pampered prejudice would be sated and abated. But prejudice, like most monsters, grows by that it feeds on. A white officer is but human nature, and it is unfair to expect him to choose the safety of Negro prisoners when society has made such a choice disastrous to his own interests. Some officers are predisposed toward duty and loathe the thing which they must tolerate: recently in Shreveport, La., when an untried Negro was being hanged to a telegraph pole of the courthouse corner, the poor sheriff, torn by conflicting emotions, instead of actively opposing the mob, sat upon the courthouse steps limp and helpless, almost in tears and muttering his disgust,—a sight to stir the pity of the gods! Had the Louisiana Negro had a vote to support that sheriff, he could have and in all probability would have acted the part of an officer.

In this, as in many other matters, it is plain that American civilization fixes its own status when it fixes the status of the Negro. Give the Negro his ballot and let him stand by American civilization by active influence; or take away his rights and he will destroy American civilization by passive influence.

Even the church does not escape: on some occasions so triumphant becomes the spirit of barbarity that even the white preachers yield and publicly endorse the acts of the mob from their pulpits. The church has done more for the education and soul-freedom of the Negro than any other agency, and it is regrettable that in many instances it is acquiescing in and exemplifying the various forms of jim-crowism and segregation, thus lending them the authority of religion. We know nothing more inconsistent with the recorded life of Jesus of Nazareth, or which will be more embarrassing to the influence of the church among colored people in this country and in others. The church will be judged in this world and in the next by its attitude toward "the least of these." If the church yields to jim-crowism, what shall we expect of railroads, steamboats, theaters, labor unions and the United States Government?

The Negro asks not pity: pity is shallow, evanescent and often unreasonable. We pity the overtaken criminal. We ask only for a strict application of those principles of morality and justice which the white race has been foremost in formulating and spreading in human society.

But whatever others may do, the Negro has a duty to himself. He must continue to want and to work. By no means must he stop wanting, for that is the stimulus to his working. He must want life, want civilization, want citizenship, want votes and equal opportunities,—and for all these wants he will work. (A man is as civilized as his

wants.) The only way to work effectively is through organization: to work as individuals is like bailing out the ocean with a quart cup. The Negro is only one among ten in this country, but the white man is human, and if the black man works well he will gain friends and co-operation. The surest way for a thousand to put ten thousand to flight is by winning many of them and chasing the others. The struggle of the Negro is not a struggle of days, but of decades. Success can be measured only by looking backward over the years. In the last decade he seems to have advanced along many lines but to have retreated along political and civil lines; but like a baffled but determined European general he should call that retreat a "withdrawal for strategical purposes only," and in the present decade seek advancement along all lines with greater intrepidity than ever.

FIFTY YEARS AFTER EMANCIPATION

FIFTY YEARS! Half a century is but half a day in the thought of God and in the life of a race. It is scarcely the earthly life-time of one full-grown human mind. A race which in so brief a space can learn most of the lessons of civilization, is indeed a precocious race.

From the middle of the 15th century for four hundred years, from the time when Henry the Navigator, of Portugal, accepted ten Negroes as ransom for captive Moors till the time of American Emancipation, Africa had been the world's big game preserve for the hunter of black slaves. The system was on the verge of decline in Europe when the New World with its uncultivated wilds offered new fields and fresh motives for the propagation of human slavery. Again by the middle of the 19th century most of the civilized world had come to regard slavery as a crime against humanity, a contradiction to the Christian religion and a menace to the freedom of the free. Even Russia abolished serfdom. Most of the Spanish-American States had fallen into line, some of them writing emancipation and freedom into their new constitutions. But in this progressive movement three parts of the Western World

lagged behind — Brazil, Cuba and the Southern United States.

Mammon, who is the creating and sustaining god of slavery, fought mightily to perpetuate the system in America. Humanity and religion and patriotism were all about to yield to men's pockets and stomachs,—luxury and avarice, those twin pests which, according to Cato the Censor, have ever been the ruin of every state. Even the Church, whose God is the Lord, bowed to its arch and ancient enemy Mammon. The "Colonization Journal," published not so much in the interest of Liberia as in the interest of getting the free Negroes out of the United States, declaring them to be "a greater nuisance than slaves," said "You cannot abolish slavery, for God is pledged to sustain it." The Church was corrupted and God was slandered.

But the modern slave had something which the ancient slave had not,—an ABOLITIONIST,—Garrison and Philips and John Brown and Frederick Douglass,—the best conscience of the white race and the best courage of the black. The runaway slave was the pioneer abolitionist; he was the appointed creator of antislavery sentiment,—an avenger born from the womb of slavery for slavery's own destruction. Wherever he went with the stripes of his back and the eloquence of his tongue he fired the hearts of men.

"Who would be free themselves must strike the blow." The runaway Negro was the vanguard, the first hero in the struggle to free his race.

The result was war. And the result of war, tho not its purpose, was freedom. It is one of the mysteries of Providence that slavery caused a war about something else, and that this war about something else had for its most beneficent result the abolition of slavery. When brave black men answered the reluctant call of the hard pressed Union and came to her defense, the war necessarily took on a more definite anti-slavery phase and the proclamation of emancipation became a "war measure" in a new sense of the word.

Thus snatching freedom from the issues of a war which had at first considered his liberty neither as its immediate object nor its remote aim, the emancipated Negro began a handicapped struggle for existence, and a passive but effective fight against the efforts to practically re-enslave him. Much has been written and said about the sad plight of the ex-master; but even if the pathos of his position has not been overdrawn, it was less pathetic than the outlook of the ex-slave. Upon the ex-master shone the light of centuries; over the ex-slave hung the darkness of ages. The ex-master by race and blood and feature could easily become a part of the very civilization against which he had fought; the ex-slave was an alien in blood, with the indelible birthmark on his forehead, destined to receive contempt, made worse by pity from that same civilization, whose fall his manacle-marked arm had stayed. The ex-master inherited the cumulated results of 250 years of toil; the ex-slave was grudgingly accorded the

threadbare clothes which hung upon his back. The ex-master had a legal title to the very ground upon which the ex-slave walked, while the latter could not lay claim to the stones which bruised his naked feet.

Against such desperate odds the freed black man in America began his passive and voiceless struggle, which for accomplishment is without parallel in the records of the human race. Mere statistics of material progress do not suffice, for figures cannot give a fair idea of even the skeleton of life. We can count a man's dollars, but not the resolutions and triumphs of his heart. We can measure his land, but we cannot measure his ambition and his sacrifice. We can sum up his material gains, but not his moral progress. We can know about him and not know him. Very few white people, even of those who admire the material progress, appreciate the pluck and staying stuff which in an uneven struggle have sustained the American Negro in his half freedom for half a century. In population he has had normal increase under very abnormal burdens. The prophets of fifty years ago, foreseeing the odds against him, did not think that he could live and multiply, and predicted his extinction. His death rate is much discussed to-day, but if we regard the conditions of his life, the rate at which he dies is to be wondered at not for how large it is but for how large it is not. Poverty and ignorance and economic injustice are not good for a people's health. Fairmindedness would rather credit the

Negro with the fact that he lives so well under such conditions; for as large as his death-rate figure is, it is not relatively as large as his poverty figure or his ignorance figure,—his death rate is not as high as his wages are low. Where Negroes die twice as fast as white people they are generally much more than twice as poor or twice as ignorant, and do not get half as good wages and have not half as good housing, as a group. And according to statistics of the United States Government, his death rate decreases as his home ownership and general welfare increases.

In the matter of acquiring property the Negro has been verily emulous of his Creator;—for beginning with nothing he has made his material world. He is reputed to have a billion dollars, and out of nothing created he it. He has almost a billion known to the tax office, and we can be sure that, emulating the virtues of his white brother, he has been consistently modest in the presence of the tax assessor. And how has this been acquired? As a rule the Negro must do more and better work for the same pay,— and sometimes for smaller pay. Just as women get women's wages for work equal to the work of men, so colored people get "colored" wages. In reason we should think that workers would be paid for their work, and not for their sex or their color, but in fact it is not so. The laws of economics, as often the precepts and more often the practices of religion, will bow to a prejudice. The South is sometimes called a good place for the Negro in-

dustrially; and in many respects it is a better place than the North. It is said that the Negro has a somewhat better opportunity to earn money in the South and a somewhat fairer privilege to spend it in the North ;and someone has said that the chance to earn money is more important for the Negro than the privilege to spend it. This remark is as fallacious as it is shallow: for the chief incentive to the earning of money is the privilege of spending it well. Money is not an end in itself. Neither North nor South offer the Negro a fair industrial opportunity, if in the one he can boast but starve, while in the other he may eat but cringe. The man who can earn a dollar and cannot spend it is no better off than the man who can spend a dollar but cannot earn one. The latter inability cuts off a man's work while the former cuts off his stimulus to work. The two roads lead to the same end. The choice between these evils is like the choice which the antebellum preacher offered "Josh," an erring member of his flock. As "Josh" staggered toward him the parson remonstrated: "Josh, you has jes' got to choose the other way." Then solemnly: "Dar am befo' you jes' two ways, Josh. Broad am de way dat leads right to *damnation*, but narrow am de way dat leads straight to *perdition*. Now, which one o' dem ways will you take?" Josh, tho a double-seeing back-slider, had a quicker perception for identities than had the parson, and replied: "Well, parson, you can take whichever one o' dem ways you please, but if dem's de only two ways you's got, dis here Nigger is gwine to

take out right straight th'oo de woods." To narrowly circumscribe the Negro's opportunity to work certainly leads toward industrial damnation, while to lessen his interest in work by cutting off his privilege to spend what he earns in the sweat of his face, heads him straight toward economic perdition. What the Negro needs for a normal industrial stimulus is the right to work at any trade in which he can excel and the right to buy and enjoy anything for which he can outbid his competitors.

From their attitude of opposition to Negro education many American people must be put into that class, who, according to Sir Sydney Smith, think "that ignorance is the great civilizer of the world." It would seem that ignorance has actually been believed in as a cure for all the ills which America has suffered as regards the Negro. The education of the Negro has never yet been given a *bona fide* trial as a remedy. The public power, the State, during all these fifty years, has only tolerated Negro education; has seldom assisted and never truly encouraged it. And for the last fifteen years, since the beginning of political disfranchisement, the public school systems for the Negro in the states which disfranchised him, have been allowed to fall into a decadent condition. With the passing of the Negro's ballot the public school official lost the last poor incentive which had spurred him to even half justice to the Negro school. The average American public official will not heed those to whose suffrage he owes no obli-

gation. And in that, he is human rather than American. In many of the towns and cities there is not seating capacity in the Negro public schools for the children who apply for admittance, to say nothing of others, who being discouraged by the uncomfortable situation, do not even apply. If the Negro school is in the "red light" district, the members of the school board, who owe nothing to black men's votes, may lend a dull ear to their protests. It sounds incredible, and I hope that posterity will not believe it, but in some of our states, while the pay of others has been increased, the pay of the Negro public school teacher has been pushed down, until a convict working out a fine is allowed a higher wage per day than the teacher of the Negro school.

And yet, at the end of fifty years of nominal freedom less than one Negro out of three is unable to read and write. It would seem almost superhuman to have accomplished so much against such odds, did we not know that when surrounded by dangers both animals and men instinctively develop means of defense. In this case the Negro has resorted to double taxation; he pays his taxes to the state and taxes himself again in the necessary fees to place his child in a private school kept by some church or missionary society. In the state of Alabama which is practically half white and half colored and is a fair representative of the states which have disfranchised colored men, there are several large institutions maintained for the higher and professional training of white men

(and women at the expense of the public treasury, and not one for the whole Negro population. And yet they will tell us how many million dollars have been spent on the public education of the Negro "since the war," which sounds big in the aggregate. But when we divide it up among several million Negro children, extend it through a period of nearly fifty years, and spread it over ten or fifteen states, the figure then stands, not in millions of dollars, but in pennies. It is generally assumed and asserted in speech that the Negro is of an inferior order of capacity, but it looks as if indeed the white people believe the Negro to be a superior being: those who are his friends expect him to do so much with so little, and those who are his enemies fear that he may do too much with too little.

The one sufficient reply which the Negro can make today to all his critics, old and new, as to his education, is this: nearly ten thousand college graduates, thirty thousand busy teachers and two million school children—and all this with much less than half of his just share of the public educational funds.

The political history of the Negro in the United States is full of tragedies and comedies. Before the Civil War he was not regarded in politics or court save as a chattel,—when he was a chose in action, as the lawyers say. His only constitutional privilege was that three-fifths of him was taken to add political power to his master, so that the South enjoyed the unique un-

American distinction of being able to vote its property. After the war he was enfranchised, and some seem to think that his early enfranchisement was particularly unfortunate and unwise. It may have been unwise as man measures wisdom, but it was a very wise providence: for had the Negro not been enfranchised within ten years after Appomattox, while the rivers were still red with blood and the memory of his heroic deeds was yet fresh in the minds of his white comrade, that man is not now born who would have lived to see the day of his enfranchisement. "A democracy has a short memory," says James Bryce. It may have been unfortunate for somebody temporarily, but it was fortunate for the Negro everlastingly that he got citizenship before his country forgot. The best time to do a thing is when it can be done. Reactionary sentiment may not be strong enough to-day to take the 14th and 15th Amendments out of the Constitution,—but there is certainly not progressive spirit enough in any political party to put those amendments into the Constitution if they were not already there. If the amount of energy displayed in efforts to divest the Negro of his citizenship had been directed into channels to fit him for good citizenship, he would be to-day second to no citizenry of the round world. Even Reconstruction, a word which has been exaggerated into synonymy with all horrors, had lessons for American democracy. It should have taught the danger of ignorance and

demagogism,—ignorance in the black and demagoguery in the white.

Slavery and oppression are poor schools in which to train citizens, poor for oppressor and oppressed. The conclusion is, not that an oppressed people should be deprived of citizenship, but that they should be relieved of oppression. But whatever may have been the unfitness of the Negro in the reconstruction period, who can convince the reasonable people of the world that a race which under a partial freedom has made such progress in the short space of fifty years, is not now fit for a voice in its own government? Most of our Southern states have laws and constitutional provisions which on their face have an impartial-sounding phraseology to square with the national constitution, but in their avowed intent and in their administration they aim neither at ignorance nor vice but at the American Negro vote. These laws are mere shams, and the millions of youth of both races in the South are growing up knowing that these laws are shams and that they have absolutely no intent for what they pretend. Is there any wonder that this youth should come to regard other laws as shams,—for example, the law against murder,—as mere petty schemes for hedging about the interests of one class and permitting it to depredate another class with impunity?

Even the “grandfather clause,” tho manifestly unjust, discriminatory and unconstitutional; was reluctantly done to death only after being allowed

to live for many years to the great embarrassment of respect for political justice in this country.

The American Negro's life is paradoxical. "A little learning is a dangerous thing,"—but for the Negro, they say, much learning is perilous. His race is continually called the "child race," but full-grown white men of the full-grown white race will not compete with him unless he is greatly handicapped. He makes the laws of the South without being in the legislatures, and elects or rejects senators and governors without a vote. And the part of the comedy which he enjoys less is: his very presence and numbers, where he is disfranchised, makes him the source of political power over which he has no control and which is pretty generally used against him. As a slave he gave his master three-fifths of a vote to keep him in slavery, and as a free man he gives his oppressor five-fifths of a vote to continue his oppression. He is condemned in many words but feared in almost every action.

A dozen or so years ago the states in which Negroes are often lynched seemed to be saying: If you will only allow us to disfranchise these black people, we will not find it necessary to lynch them; it is their vote, their defense, which annoys and irritates us; disfranchise them and we will not want to murder them. Aesop tells a fable of the wolves and the sheep: the wolves were ever making war on the sheep, and the sheep kept for their protection a number of dogs. One day the wolves proposed terms of peace, saying that if

the sheep would only dismiss their dogs they should no longer be annoyed by a wolf, and that the idea of sheep defending themselves by dogs was what insulted and angered the wolf tribe. Aesop says that the innocent sheep accepted the proposal and dismissed the dogs,—and you do not need to be told the rest of the story. It is coarse irony for one inspired with the lust of gain or power to suggest to his intended victim that a surrender of his means of defense will appease that lust. The greatest possible aid to the lynching spirit is to make the sheriff of the county dependent upon the votes of the lynching class and independent of the favor of the victim class. No greater burden could be laid upon the weak, no greater temptation placed before the strong.

And yet colored people, because they do not assist in running down a black man whom the rest of the community is threatening to lynch if he is caught, are accused of abetting and condoning crime; while in fact it is because they are opposed to lynching which is the greatest of all American crimes. They are forced into a seeming favor for the accused: they are making an indiscriminate defense against an indiscriminate attack,—a thing which is as inevitable and necessary as it is natural. The fact that a black prisoner can be so easily taken from the hands of the law by the lyncher has caused Negroes to lose enthusiasm for assisting officers. They know that black men are lynched for having made a necessary self-defense; they know that sometimes a

black man is lynched for defending his wife; they know that colored women have been lynched for defending their own virtue and honor.

And is there any creature upon whose head the perils of this unnatural situation have fallen more than on any other? Yes,—the Negro woman. For two hundred and fifty years she was absolutely without protection: and for the last fifty years if protected, she has been protected sometimes at the cost and always at the peril of the life of the male member of her household. Is there a record anywhere else in human history that wife, sister, mother bore such a burden borne so well,—and lost no more? Endowed with all the affections of her race and denied all the tenderness of her sex, for the first two hundred and fifty years her life was one incessant travail. But out of her original vitality of womanhood and motherhood she has for fifty years of partial freedom cheerfully supplied the sinews of the war. The physical and moral well-being of the race are largely within her keeping. Virtue is a thing that is tried and proven, not a thing that is protected and innocent. Therefore the most virtuous creature in the United States of America is the virtuous Negro woman. Her resisting and enduring powers are of the highest order. In this she is a prototype and prophecy of what her race is to be if it will overcome. Her character is often assailed in fact and her reputation more often assailed in slander. But those of us who know the Negro race know that the

virtuous colored woman's name is legion and that her ranks are increasing. It seems almost absurd to feel the necessity of saying so,—but the boldness of the slander elicits the defense. This woman has honored her sex by proving the virtue of womanhood as few groups of women in the history of the world have ever had the privilege of proving it. The worst elements of both races have been her pursuing enemy; and she has run the gauntlet of the double fire and delivered the destinies of a race.

These are some of the conditions out of which has grown the demand for such an organization as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, which should seek to maintain and advance the Negro's civil and political status. There is as much need for such work to-day as there was for that of the Anti-Slavery Society in 1857. Some "new abolitionism" must free the American Negro from the more subtle but not less real chains which would perpetually shackle his mind, his spirit and his soul.

Will the American white man forget how potent a factor the American black man has been in the prosperity of this great country? In all her labors and struggles he has shared,—whether as slave or freeman or patriot soldier. ✓The Negroes of America played a loyal part in the perils of our country. And you know the story of Peter Salem on Bunker Hill and of Crispus Attucks on Boston Commons, and of the black battalions of other Northern and Southern States, who at the

call of Frederick Douglass and Abraham Lincoln rushed to arms and interposed their bodies between freedom and death; not the freedom of the Negro, for the Negro was already a slave, but that free government might not perish from the earth. But do you also know that Rhode Island had a Negro regiment in the Revolutionary War? That there were 755 Negroes with Washington after the battle of Monmouth? That he had about five thousand Negroes before the end of his campaigns? That in all of the white regiments there were Negroes? That a Negro named Prince helped to capture General Prescott at Newport? That the Negro voted in at least five states when the Constitution of the United States was adopted? He helped Jackson at New Orleans and paid full toll in the sacrifices before Richmond. Lincoln said that the Civil War could not have been won by the North without him, and he made the Spanish-American War an almost bloodless victory on the American side. There has been much dispute as to whether the Negro's best friends are in the North or in the South. Sometimes I am in doubt as to who is the Negro's best friend,—but there is one thing about which I have no doubt, and that is that the very best friend which the American white man has in the whole round world is the American Negro. For three hundred years he has been a part of the life of this country. For fifty years he has been a large factor in making it, especially the southern part of it, what it is. In the next fifty years

it will become what it becomes largely because of what he is. Active or passive his influence is nevertheless relentless.

A providence wiser than men has brought the children of Africa and mingled them in goodly proportion in this great melting-pot of peoples. After confusion there will be fusion of thought and spirit. In summoning to her hills and valleys every type of man providence has given America the finest position on the whole battle-line of humanity. The fight here is decisive. Our success at this point means world-wide victory, our failure world-wide disaster. In the matter of race adjustment all the lines of humanity will go forward when we go forward or fall back when we fall back. No finer ground could have been chosen for freedom's last great battle than this young and virile nation filled with all the elements of the world. The thought should inspire the meanest. And let those who fight among the pioneers remember the distress and glory of the pioneer's fight—that against us are fighting hoary-headed, horny-handed prejudice, and greed and avarice, and mammon the mighty; while for us are fighting love and justice, time and evolution, and God the Almighty.

GROUND S OF HOPE.

“The mainspring of effort,” according to Horace Mann, is “The desire of bettering one’s condition.” Back of this desire there must be hope. Hope is the lodestar of human progress. There can be no strong effort without desire; there can be no strong desire without hope; and strong hope must have some reasonable grounds.

If the progress of the Negro is to continue in this country, he must be hopeful, and his friends must hope. A confidence in the American Negro’s future has many reasonable grounds,—first

In history. If anything in the records of the last three hundred years can inspire the heart of humanity, with a faith in God and the ultimate success of the human family, that thing is the tale of the American Negro. All the way from Africa to America he has come; all the way from savagery to civilization, all the way from slavery to citizenship, all the way from ignorance to enlightenment, all the way from heathenism to Christianity,—with every inch of the road made hard or sternly disputed. He has had some friends, but it has not always been in accordance with the will of the majority of white men that the Negro has succeeded. We cannot thus explain his attainment of freedom or of citizenship or of

education or of some measure of wealth. But the weak has literally triumphed over the strong, as if some strange divinity were at work in his history, mocking opposition. Single decades have seen revolutions of opinion.

His fellowman has for the most part been a blind helper in the divine plan of the Negro's advancement. Those who brought him from Africa did so without the slightest intention of saving him from savagery,—it was a cold business proposition with all the selfishness of commerce. There was not the least thought of saving him to Christianity; the god Mammon was the only god in the consideration. Kings, potentates and priests shared in the profits of the slave-trade, and conscience was lulled to sleep in the lap of luxury. Two hundred and fifty years ago the Church on the American continent held it "a sin to baptize a Negro." Irreligion and cruelty are inevitable wherever Mammon is god. But through inhumanity itself the first purpose of the just God was fulfilled by a bodily transfer of a large number of the race from a country where environment forbade civilization to a land of large opportunity like America.

Then there was the period of American slavery,—slavery which some indignant soul has called the "sum of all villainies." American slavery as a whole was the most cruel institution of its kind that the world has ever seen. But Providence, partly through agitation of men and largely through the demands of public policy and the ex-

actions of war, brought freedom. The American Negro's freedom can hardly be ascribed to the deliberate and purposed will of his fellowman. Mars was mightier than Mammon and Jehovah was superior to both.

After the acquisition of freedom came the question of the Negro's citizenship. After getting freedom in a democratic government, it takes citizenship and the ballot to keep it. Freedom without citizenship cannot stand any better than an empty sack. In this matter, too, God and a few good men proved to be an overwhelming majority. Wise men saw that there is as much hope for a flock of sheep in a pack of wolves as for a voteless people in a selfish democracy.

Accordingly the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments were added to the fundamental law of the land, primarily to protect the Negro, but secondarily protecting every man in America. Some might think that these amendments are veritable "broken reeds" of hope, since they are continually violated. But so it is with every other law of man and every law that God has made for man; they are continually violated. But they are still the highest law of the land, the ideals toward which the nation moves, the standards of our justice, the straight-edged rules by which just men of the future will measure the irregularities of our courts of to-day. There is vindication for every violated law.

In 1856 political leaders asked Abraham Lincoln what principles should underly the new party

that was to be organized. Lincoln replied: "Let us build our new party on the rock of the Declaration of Independence and the gates of hell shall not prevail against us." This Declaration of Independence, with its lofty principles of equality, which the political charlatan seeks to ridicule, is still the best rock on which American civilization can stand.

But there are some who lay upon their consciences the unction of expediency, that the Negro is disfranchised simply for the sake of peace with the lower and more unreasonable element of whites, that this element will like the Negro better if they can rob him of a good measure of his freedom, and will be kinder to him,—in short, that the Negro is disfranchised for his own best welfare—physical welfare! Thus they would damn his soul in order to save his hide, they would deprive him of the precious jewel of liberty in order to grant him the baser metal of physical existence,—in order to do him a little kindness, they will do him the greatest wrong in the world.

But there is hope for the Negro because the white man is waking up more and more to the fact that he is "a part of all that he has met," and that in this country he has met nearly a dozen million Negroes. Their fate is his fate, unless the laws of God and Nature are subject to repeal. The law of compensation is relentless: if the virtue of the black race is set at naught, the best citadels of the white race are undermined;

if a black man is pressed down to the brute end of society, white men must then be brutal enough to pay his brutish acts with retaliative brutality; if a law is made to disfranchise Negroes in Georgia, it will disfranchise a hundred thousand whites, and the very class of poor whites whose misguided votes made the disfranchising law possible. There is hope for the black man if there be any hope for the white man.

There is hope for the Negro in education. The question of capacity is a question of the past; the man who does not know it is a quarter-century behind. All the poverty of opportunity has been unable to defeat his almighty desire for education. In one locality in Alabama the Negro child gets less than one dollar per annum for his education, and the white child gets eighteen dollars,—so that if attainment were proportioned to the money (which, thank Heaven! it is not), it would take a Negro 180 years to get as much learning as the white child gets in ten years. The Negro's desire for education is a tale that should stir men's hearts. This desire persists even where there is the meanest opportunity for satisfaction. This attitude in the Negro should fill his friends with hope. There is the story of the old gentleman who always had "something to thank God for," whatever happened. He once slipped and fell and dogs seized the meat which he was carrying home for his dinner. A voice of scorn called out: "What is there to thank God for now?" The answer came: "Well, my meat is

gone, and my dinner is gone, but thank God, I have my APPETITE left." When there are no means left, the Negro's desire and good cheer and his hope abide, and these no man can destroy.

If there be any truth in the statement that the education of the Negro has brought evils, still the reply is, that the only remedy for the evils of education is MORE education. Some men speak as if ignorance were the sum of all blessings. If the education of the Negro has been an evil to anybody, that body has not been the Negro. The elevation of a man may be an evil to the man who is trying to keep him down; to the man who is trying to rise, every bit of aid is an undeniable blessing. Ignorance for the oppressed is a necessary part of the policy of oppression.

There is hope for the Negro in religion,—in his own religion and in the religion of the people among whom he lives. The Negro, for his part, has enough religiousness to save America. In many cases this religiousness very sorely needs to be Christianized. Less religion and more Christianity would not hurt the Negro—nor his friends.

The progress of a race cannot be measured day after day, but must be taken decade after decade, or generation after generation. Has the Negro advanced? Fifty years ago he did not own his own body; now he owns a billion dollars besides. Then he was a man without a country, hardly

claiming a foot of land; now he has three hundred thousand farms, half a million homes and half a hundred banks. Then he was ignorant; now he has thirty thousand schools with more than thirty thousand teachers, and half a dozen millions who can read. He always had religion, but now, in addition to that, he has about thirty thousand churches with millions of members and the Lord only knows how many preachers.

Should America be hopeless of a people who, in proportion to their numbers and opportunities, have done as much for America as any other people living? Who have cleared the forests of the South and driven the dragon from her swamps? The South sometimes boasts of the purity of its Anglo-Saxon blood. For that it must thank the Negro; for the superior fitness of Negro labor kept out the foreigner. The Negro has been the vaccine in the body of the South which has impregnated the system against the worst diseases of southern Europe and Asia. But for the Negro, Atlanta would to-day be as much of an interracial hodge podge as is Boston or New York.

The black American should advance faster in the future than in the past, for nothing succeeds like success. But if it should take two years of the future to equal one year of the past, it would not justify despair. In 1837 Lovejoy was murdered in Illinois for a mild opinion against Negro slavery; in 1863 a man of Illinois issued a proclamation freeing millions of Negroes. In

1857 the highest court in the land expressed an opinion that the Negro had no more respectable rights than the beasts of the field; and a little more than ten years later the Negro was made a citizen by the highest law in the land. Fifty years ago if a book was found in the hands of a Negro, that hand might be cut off with a carpenter's tool; while to-day he has thousands of schools and millions of students. There is absolutely no reason in despair.

When a black slave woman saw Lincoln at last entering Richmond in 1865, she exclaimed, "Well, de Lord am slow, but He am sho,"—and the truth is as sound as the grammar is poor.

In the last fifty years the Negro has accomplished all that he could have been expected to accomplish and more than he actually was expected to accomplish. Perhaps no people in all history have ever disappointed so many ill predictions as has the American Negro. If the terrible prophets of forty years ago could rise from the dead, they ought to be most agreeably surprised. He has answered the prophecy of reversion to savagery by becoming at least the most religious element in the country. He has answered the prophecy of ignorance by wiping out two-thirds of his illiteracy. He has answered the prophecy of public menace by being peace-loving. He has answered the prophecy of extinction by multiplying his numbers by 300 per cent. according to the count, and perhaps by another 100 per

cent. who never get counted. He stands to-day the despair of the prophets.

He should be taught that next to the hand of God his own hand rules his destiny. The story is told of a white preacher who was endeavoring to explain to a Negro candidate for the ministry the doctrine of ELECTION,—that some men are elected to be saved while others are elected to be lost, by fore-ordaining powers over which they have no control. The black candidate could not understand how a fellow could be elected to a position without ever consenting to be nominated, until a Negro bystander volunteered to help the white man out by offering this explanation: "It is just like this," said the Negro, "God, He votin' for you; and the devil, he votin' 'gin you; so whichever way you vote, that's the way the 'lection goes." In the decision of a man's own fate he has the deciding vote.

That truth is not at all inconsistent with the fact that we are all, white and black, subjects of circumstances, children of antecedents over which we have no control. The present is the offspring of the past. We have been cast up as a mountain is cast up from the deep, and it will take time to alter our relation to one another and to the rest of the world. Tho all is not well, and tho the changes of a day are invisible, yet the decades and the ages are telling and will tell the story of our progress and mutual adjustment. Race prejudice is simply the last great enemy of human brotherhood, and in its turn it

will be destroyed as have all the other enemies. It is simply the last barrier behind which the retreating narrowness of the human heart has taken refuge. All other bars to universal brotherhood have been broken one by one: First, man tried to live to himself; every man's hand was against his neighbor, and he scarcely trusted even the female with whom he associated. This isolating prejudice was finally broken down and he acquired an interest in certain other individuals, his family. But it was family against family now. Intermarriage brought families into alliances, and retreating prejudice took its next stand behind the clan-family,—and it was clan against clan, and finally tribe against tribe. It is now nation against nation and league against league. Will it later be race against race and color against color? The lines of civilization are surely drawing closer against the grim and ancient caste of race prejudice. And whether it comes as a sequel to gigantic interracial conflict or through the long siege of intellectual, moral and religious forces, it seems certain that the overthrow of this last enemy will mark the establishment of Universal Human Brotherhood.

FREDERICK DOUGLASS

We shall next speak of the history of three remarkable men, a Negro, a near-Negro and a white man. Frederick Douglass, who was known and treated as a member of the American Negro group,—Alexander Hamilton who was not generally known to be a Negro in the American sense of the word, and was therefore not recognized and treated as a member of that group,—and Abraham Lincoln, the American of the Americans, whose connection with the life and history of the Negro race is like that of a finger of destiny.

It is a terrible, almost incredible history which we are about to recite, but the authors and actors thereof have already appeared before the just judgment of Heaven,—and the living can review their virtues and their vices and read the lesson of their lives with neither malice nor passion.

The life of Frederick Douglass is an epitome of human life, which begins at the very lowest and ends at the very highest. The life of Abraham Lincoln is typically American; the life of Frederick Douglass is typically human. Lincoln began in the lowest deprivation of American freedom; Douglass began in the lowest degradation of human slavery. Douglass was 21 years old when

he escaped from slavery to a partial freedom,—21 years old before he reached the place where Lincoln began. The life of this black man, more nearly than that of any other notable American, spans the whole space of the life of man.

Human slavery is pre-eminent enough in its badness to deserve a word by itself. Slavery is a human custom, one of the *mores*,—like commerce, marriage, agriculture, labor, law. But unlike these other mores it is born not of worthy but of unworthy sentiments. The others are born of desires and efforts on the part of the individual to serve himself and his fellows, and they develop a fellow-feeling. Slavery is born of the desire to serve oneself at the expense of his fellows, and begets ill-feeling. So while slavery is like other mores a child of human life, it is an illegitimate child, dishonorably born; its mother is laziness and its father is Mammon. It is the degenerate offspring of the desire to have, mated with an abhorrence for work. Indeed like the half-human creatures of ancient myths, slavery seems to be the unnatural issue of the man and the brute.

Some scholars claim that in savage and uncivilized society slavery is normal. Whether that be true or false, it is abnormal and unnatural everywhere in civilization. But any institution, however wrong, which allies itself with human greed, bids fair to outlive the day of its normality, to die hard, and to defy the bolts of the reformer. Slavery is such an institution: it has the powerful alliance of men's pockets and stomachs, and the

passion of gain. As society becomes civilized and conscience begins to open its eyes, men begin to palliate and excuse their pet passions. The wish will father any kind of thought. The civilized, Christianized enslaver accepted the doctrine of the brotherhood of man and piously said: We will elevate and bless our heathen brother by reducing him to slavery. This absurd contradiction for nearly two thousand years seduced the Christian church. It is notorious that no group ever enslaved another group from the motive of conferring benefits.

As we have indicated in a previous chapter the commerce in slavery began in 1442 when Henry the Navigator, a Portuguese prince, allowed some Moors to ransom their own men by delivering ten Negroes instead. This taste of human blood at once excited the cupidity and avarice of the Spanish race, which gradually infected better civilizations and filled the earth with a million horrors. What with the seductiveness and contagion of avarice, and what with the discovery of a New World and the development of agriculture, Africa became the world's mart for the raw material of slavery. The horrors of the slave ship are matters of cold record, written not by the victims but by the perpetrators. Two captives out of every three were either starved or drowned or butchered on the high seas, before reaching a worse fate in the Western World.

With this virus British America was inoculated in the year of 1619 at Jamestown in the colony of

Virginia. Until thistles produce figs a system rooted in such antecedents will be ugly in its fruit, ugly to see and ugly to relate. In such antecedents American slavery was rooted. In this institution began the life of Douglass, which we shall report with fidelity to truth,—with love of right and hatred of wrong, but without malice.

In Feb., 1817, as nearly as he could determine over half a century afterwards, Frederick Douglass was born in Tuckahoe, Talbot County, Maryland,—a place till this day remarkable for nothing save the sole fact that Douglass was born there. His mother was Harriet Bailey, a slave owned by Aaron Anthony. She was black and of comely African lineaments. Of his father nobody knows anything; some have supposed that he was one of the slave owners or overseers,—but Douglass was woolly-haired and rather dark for a mulatto. Until seven years of age he lived happily in ignorance of the fact that he was a slave with his own grandmother, Betsy Bailey, who was the caretaker of all the slave babies of Capt. Anthony until they should be ready for the field or the market.

Between seven and eight years of age he was carried by his grandmother, with a crowd of other youngsters who had reached a useful or a marketable age, to his master, who was general superintendent of the plantations of Col. Lloyd, a wealthy Marylander, owning a thousand slaves and many farms. The home of Col. Lloyd, known among the slaves as "The Great House,"

with its imposing wealth and antebellum munificence, made a profound impression upon the mind of the child.

Here he had his first taste of the bitterness of slavery, and as an onlooker beheld some of the horrors to which his birth would make him heir. In the first place he was put under the stern and cruel governance of "Aunt Katy," a slave woman who seemed to be a sort of superintendent of the youthful slave property of Capt. Anthony. He seldom saw his mother, for in order to have a moment with him she had to walk twelve miles from another plantation at night and be back for work in the morning. Through all his life he remembered with profoundest gratitude how upon one such mission she came just in the nick of time to save him from actual starvation at the hands of merciless "Aunt Katy." Lucretia, his master's daughter, and little Daniel, the youngest son of Col. Lloyd, were his "friends at court," and often befriended him against the tyranny of "Aunt Katy" by buttered biscuits and other food, or by the still more kindly ministrations of humane and sympathetic words. His mother's nocturnal visits suddenly ceased altogether: she had either died or, still worse, been sold to the "far South." Somehow she had learned to read and it was a risk to keep such a slave too near to the borders of the free states.—And alas! for the horrors which his waking mind was permitted to see through his natural eyes; he saw slave girls beaten and mangled by the overseers without

remonstrance from their owners; he saw the undefined and indefinable crime of "impudence" punished like murder; he saw young Denby shot down in cold blood for running from the lash; through a crack in the wall of the little cell where he slept on the ground without covering, he peeped early one frosty morning into a neighboring room and saw his Aunt Esther, a beautiful slave girl, tied up by her hands and on tiptoe, while a human demon stood by and coolly drawing his rawhide through his hand, as if delighted with its delicious feel, dealt blow after blow until her bare back was like fresh bloody beef,—and for an unnameable reason entirely to the credit of the girl. Sometimes he saw the slave resist and fight the overseer,—and although a resisting slave was sure to be overpowered, tied and whipped finally, as a matter of policy, his youthful mind was quick to seize the fact that those who resisted most sternly were seldom attacked. A fight with such a slave was neither pleasant nor safe, and the overseer would diplomatically avoid an encounter. This observation caused young Fred to make a formula which he carried and repeated through his whole life: That those are whipped oftenest who are whipped easiest.

A working slave's weekly allowance of food was two pounds of pickled pork, one peck of meal and one handful of salt,—and his clothing was of the same scantiness. But the most neglected little animals of any slave plantation were the slave children not yet large enough to work. Little

pigs could soon be killed for meat, and so they were fed; little calves could be slaughtered for veal, and so they were fattened; but little "niggers" could do nothing but consume what they could not earn, and so they were stinted. Until ten years of age they were allowed neither hat or shoes, coat nor trousers,—only one tow-linen shirt per annum, and if that wore out before the end of the year they could wear their skins for the remaining months. They had no beds but the floor or ground of their huts. Fred found him an empty feed sack and used to crawl into it, and slept head in and heels out. No wonder that he said when reflecting on this childhood that "the pigs in the pen had leaves, and the horses in the stable had straw, but the children had no beds." Their food was coarse meal boiled into a mush and poured into a common trough,—and like little piggies they were called and like little piggies they came, with neither spoons nor forks, but some with oyster-shells, and some with chips or pieces of shingle or potsherds from the yard,—and the strong and more muscular would get most and the weak and most needy would get least. Fred could have fought his way but the vindictive hate of "Aunt Katy" would punish him if he pushed the others. So that even in childhood, which is proverbially happy, he says he was led to wish that he had never been born.

"Why am I a slave?" was a question that puzzled his boyish brain.

So the "great house" of the slave plantation,

with all its splendor, had an underworld, an antipodal condition, within a stone's throw. Like the ancient conception of the future life it had the abodes of the blest and the damned in close proximity. The opulence and plenty of the mansion were balanced by the poverty and squalor of the cabin. But the slave servants in the "great house" itself were more fortunate; that is, they were better fed and dressed, fat and sleek. And a visitor from the outside world, from free states or from Europe, might be shown the mansion but not the slave quarters; and seeing the well-kept, liveried waiters standing behind the chairs in the dining-room, he might wonder why it is that Lovejoy and Garrison and Phillips lose their lives or get themselves into so much trouble over a people who are being treated so kindly.

Miss Lucretia, the kindly daughter of his owner, was to marry Thomas Auld, and Fred was to be sent to Thomas' brother, Hugh Auld, in Baltimore to take care of the little nephew Tommy Auld. Boys usually regret to leave their homes and early mates, but little Fred received the news from Miss Lucretia that he was to be transported out of this den of horrors with unbounded joy. His tow-linen shirt was to be exchanged for real trousers; he had three days to prepare for the journey, and he spent most of the time bathing in the creek and scraping the dead skin from his knees and the soles of his feet. When he reached his Baltimore home Mrs. Sophia Auld, the wife and mother, said to her

little son: "Tommy, here's your Freddy,"—as one might speak of a new poodle.

But Mrs. Auld was at heart a kind and gentle lady, who had never been a slaveholder, who did not know the philosophy of slavery, and who made the egregious blunder, from the slaveholding standpoint, of teaching "Freddy" to read. And one of the greatest indictments against slavery is illustrated by the change which the poison of irresponsible power wrought in this noble woman's character. Her disposition gradually changed from sweet to bitter, from gentle to vindictive. One day, while her soul was still white and unscarred, she innocently boasted to her husband how quickly and well Fred had learned to read the Bible,—but Master Hugh was better instructed in the creed of slavery, and immediately he forbade it, and thundered his disapproval in these words: that "if you give a nigger an inch he will take an ell. Learning will spoil the best nigger in the world. If he learns to read the Bible it will forever unfit him to be a slave." No wonder that Douglass contended in all his after life that this was the first and one of the best anti-slavery speeches he had ever heard. He caught the cue at once: learning is inconsistent with being in slavery. All right. He had already seen enough of slavery to give his vote against that, and if learning was the key to the way out, he was going to find the key. Master Hugh's objection was as great a stimulus as Mrs. Sophia's instruction.

Poor Mrs. Auld now sought to undo what she had done. She was more vindictive than her husband: she tore papers from Fred's hand, she peeped through keyholes and cracks, she eaves-dropped at his door. Too late; she had given him the "inch" and he took the "ell." Persecution stimulated him. Crayon was his pen, and a barrel head or the pavement of the street was his desk. This contradiction in her noble soul made the woman lose her sweet disposition and become vixenish and shrewish even to her own family. An anthropologist says that no man was ever known to be great and good enough to be a slaveholder.

Capt. Anthony died, and Fred had to go back to the farm where he and the other slaves and the horses and sheep and cattle and plows must be "valued and divided" among the heirs. Being "valued and divided" he fell to Miss Lucretia, and to his great joy and greater fortune she loaned him again to the Aulds in Baltimore.

Lucretia died, leaving him the property of her husband, Thomas Auld, and he was brought from Baltimore to Thomas' plantation near St. Michael's, Talbot County, Maryland. Thomas married a new wife, who "knew not Joseph," who was hateful and stingy, and she starved Fred and the other slaves almost to death. She had a horse from her father's place, which when he got loose would run back to her father's house. Fred would let him loose to get to go after him. Beast and man had the same object in going: the horse

found fodder and Fred found bread. A cook was there who was generous to the hungry.

The boy was not an ideal slave; he hated slavery; he was rebellious. He exasperated Thomas Auld, who was one of the worst types of slaveholding character,—selfish, cruel, stingy. Finally the slaveholders had a great Methodist camp-meeting and Master Thomas professed religion. The slaves secretly rejoiced at this conversion, hoping for more bread and less beating from the hand of a Christian master,—to their great disappointment. The only difference was that now when “brother” Thomas Auld, class leader of his church, got ready to whip a slave, he would quote the passage of scripture which says: “That servant which knew his lord’s will and prepared not himself, neither did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes.” The sternness and gravity of religion were added to his meanness. Fred was fifteen years old and had professed religion himself, but he doubted the genuineness of Thomas Auld’s conversion.

Finally Thomas decided that Fred needed “breaking.” You have heard of “broncho-busters” and “ox-breakers.” Well, Thomas had a neighbor known as a “Negro-breaker.” This Edward Covey was a pious man; his religion kept him from breaking any rule of the Sabbath, but not from breaking any bone of a slave’s body on any other day of the week. Fred’s treatment by this man in the year of 1834 is too harrowing, bloody and inhuman to relate in detail. In the

first six months he was several times nearly killed by untamed oxen which he was compelled to drive, or by Covey's lash and bludgeon, until one morning in despair he made up his mind that, live or die, he was going to resist. After Covey had fought him for hours without being able to subdue or whip him, he turned Fred loose and said diplomatically: "Now, you scoundrel, go to your work; I would not have whipped you half so hard if you had not resisted." This physical fight, this resistance, this refusal to be whipped, reawakened Fred's intellectual and moral manhood and was one of the crises of his life. He never received another whipping in slavery.

"Those are whipped oftenest who are whipped easiest."

Slavery would be bad enough if the slave could be treated as well as the horse, the cow and the dog. But no system of slavery can ever treat its average slave as well as the horse and cow and dog. Slavery itself is such a revolt against human nature that the slave's very humanity, instead of protecting him, damns him. For instance: if the horse balks, he is an unreasoning brute—pat him and coax him; if the slave balks, he is a malicious devil—kill him. If a horse breaks a wagon, it is an accident; if a slave breaks a tool, it is sullen revenge—beat him. If the horse is sick, he is sick; if a slave is sick, he is trying to get out of work. If the horse is slow, he is a slow horse; if a slave is slow, he is stubborn. If the horse injures his owner, it is regrettable; if a slave in-

jures his owner, it is murder. And the most blinding and dangerous thing of all is this thought in the mind of the slaveholder: If I were in that fellow's place and he in mine, I would do every sly, mean thing I could do to him, and I know he does the same. Thus a man always develops hatred for the one whom he habitually wrongs. The slave's very humanhood damns him below the dumb unreasoning beast; and as to slaveholder, there is no position within the gift of the devil better fitted to destroy the character of the one who fills it.

The next year our 17-year-old lad was rented out to William Freeland, who was not a church member, but as compared with the brutality of Covey he was a kind and gentle master. You might think that the slave would be contented with kind treatment after being treated so inhumanly. But such is not human nature. The "inch" and the "ell" philosophy is literally true in the matter of liberty. Give a slave a cruel master and he will wish a kinder master; give him a kind master and he will want no master at all. The half free aspires to full freedom. Give him an inch and he demands an ell. Such is human nature. And human nature is right: kindness or cruelty is not the essential question; it is slavery or freedom. To make a man a slave and then treat him kindly is to put a chain on him and paint it with gold paint. To be chained with a chain is to be chained, whether the chain be gold or iron.

So, what did Fred do under the experience of

better slave treatment? Thank God and be contented? The first, but not the last. He planned to run away from all slavery, kind and cruel, "good" or worse. He began to teach John and Henry Harris how to read to inspire them with the feeling of liberty. Thus organizing a band of five he wrote passes for each and set a day for flight. They were betrayed, arrested and put into jail on the horrible charge of an attempt to steal themselves. But the brave little fraternity stood together, ate their passes with their bread and gave not a word of incriminating evidence one against the other. They narrowly escaped being sold into Georgia or Louisiana or Alabama, a fate worse than hanging; they were released from jail and Fred was sent back to Hugh Auld's in Baltimore.

Here he learned ship-calking, and at one time was nearly beaten to death by the white apprentices, who thus showed their resentment at working with a "nigger,"—a spirit which organized labor still holds. Master Hugh took all his earnings, allowing him poor clothes and poorer food. He hired the boy out as helper to the carpenters in a shipyard,—not to one carpenter but to the seventy-five. All had an equal claim to his time and obedience. He had seventy-five masters, when, as he suggests, one was bad enough. He was to answer the beck and call of each one, even if they all beckoned and called at the same time. He tells how, as a bewildered boy, he received impossible and simultaneous orders from these

hard men: "Fred, come help me to cant this timber here,"—"Fred, come carry this timber yonder,"—"Fred, bring that roller here,"—"Fred, go get a fresh can of water,"—"Fred, come help saw off the end of this timber,"—"Fred, go quick and get the crowbar,"—"Fred, hold on the end of this fall,"—"Fred, go to the blacksmith's shop and get a new punch,"—"Halloo, Fred! run and bring me a cold-chisel,"—"I say, Fred, bear a hand, and get up a fire under the steam-box as quick as lightning,"—"Hullo, nigger! come turn this grindstone,"—"Come, come; move, move! and bowse this timber forward,"—"I say, darkey, blast your eyes! why don't you heat up some pitch?"—"Halloo! halloo! halloo! (three voices at the same time)"—"Come here; go there; hold on where you are. D—n you. if you move I'll knock your brains out!"

"Why am I a slave?" mused he. "Why can I not claim the fruits of my own labor?" Finally he was permitted to rent himself at the hard bargain of \$3 per week and to pay for all his living besides. But this taste of liberty and possession determined him to try again for freedom, and he fixed his date for flight on September 3, 1838.

A second failure would be fatal. Moreover it required unusual courage for any slave to run away. Illiterate slaves knew no more of geography or distance than an infant child, and the very names of the free states were kept from them. Any white person could halt, interrogate and arrest any colored person on any road. A

gang of ruffians might sometimes catch a free colored person, destroy his free papers and sell him into slavery. There were professional kidnappers who caught runaways; and sometimes cunningly inducing a slave to run away, they would overtake him and get the reward for catching him. These fellows literally infested the borderline between the slave and the free states, like human carrion crows circling about the rotten carcass of slavery. Besides, running away was like going into a living death,—burying oneself forever from friends and relatives,—walking into a tomb with eyes open and consciousness unimpaired. The slave who could run away was a hero, and to such heroes the other slaves owe their freedom. These brave men indicted slavery wherever they went. In the free states and in Canada they did slavery no good by their reports. The fugitive slave was the creator of the abolitionist. He made "Uncle Tom's Cabin" and Garrison and Phillips; and those in turn made political parties and Abraham Lincoln. Sometimes fugitives fought with incredible heroism when overtaken. These exiles, perhaps more than a hundred thousand strong, with bleeding backs, tortured limbs and eloquent tongues, were every one ambassadors against the Slave Power.

One of the very means which the law created to protect slavery helped to destroy it, namely, the "free papers" which free Negroes had to carry. Slaves often borrowed these from their free brethren, escaped to Canada and sent them back

by mail. Frederick borrowed a Negro sailor's "protection" papers, boarded a train as it was pulling out of Baltimore, to avoid being questioned and measured by the ticket agent; and being dressed like a sailor and using a sailor's slang, he outwitted the conductor and within twenty-four hours found himself in the city of New York. He was not beyond the reach of fugitive slave laws, and was somewhat dazed by the success of this bold attempt. But an escaped slave cannot live on joy, so David Ruggles, a Negro anti-slavery worker in New York, advised him to go to New Bedford, Mass., where ship-calking was in demand. Even slaves love: the free colored girl in Baltimore received a secret message, came on to New York, and they were married; Frederick paid the minister with "thanks."

From New York to Newport they passed the night on the deck of the steamer, not being allowed in the cabin. From Newport to New Bedford they went by stage, and the driver held their baggage for stage-fare. This was at once furnished by a New Bedford Negro, Nathan Johnson. In these early struggles for freedom the Negroes stood by each other nobly. Nathan Johnson had just read Scott's "Lady of the Lake," so he induced Frederick to name himself Douglass. Fred had come under the false name of "Johnson," and Nathan Johnson perhaps thought that there were enough black "Johnsons" in New Bedford. And the name which Fred's mother

had given him in slavery was FREDERICK AUGUSTUS WASHINGTON BAILEY. Irony of ironies! The greatest Prussian, the greatest Roman, and the greatest American in a black slave baby.

The people of New Bedford would have died rather than allow a slave hunter to return a man from their town to slavery; but they would not give Douglass a fair chance to earn a living at his trade. So he did odd jobs of all sorts. The sweetness of possessing himself and the fruits of his toil inspired him to any honest work. Meanwhile he read the "Liberator," heard anti-slavery discussions, and was schooled in Garrisonian principles. He was much interested by the wealth and industry of New Bedford, and learned for the first time in his life that white people could be rich without owning black people. In Tuckahoe, Talbot County, Maryland, those who did not own Negroes were "po' white trash."

In 1841 Mr. Garrison called an anti-slavery convention at Nantucket. Douglass attended as a spectator, was urged to speak, and was at once employed as agent of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society,—just three years out of slavery. Consequently he was often introduced to audiences as "a recent graduate from the institution of slavery with his diploma written on his back."

Frequently at the risk of his life he now fought slavery like one who knew the monster, and where to hit and how hard. Dauntless in courage, unbending in principle and terrible in logic, he be-

came one of the most inveterate and uncompromising foes to oppression that mankind has produced. If halls and churches were not open to him, he rang a bell through the streets, summoned an audience and spoke under the roof of high heaven. In Syracuse he talked all day, and his open-air audience grew from five in the morning to five hundred in the afternoon. He encountered foul eggs, fouler words, and at one time was beaten into unconsciousness by an Indiana mob. The Northern states were at that time disposed toward the Negro about as Georgia and Mississippi are now,—continually seeking to “jim-crow,” disfranchise and dishonor him. But wherever the fight was thickest, Douglass was there. He helped to defeat the disfranchising “Dorr Constitution” in Rhode Island, and in Massachusetts he made so much trouble by refusing to be “jim-crowed” that the Eastern Railroad ran its passenger trains through Lynn without stopping, because Douglass lived there. When the church people protested, the president of the road handed them a rejoinder like this: Well, the railroads are no better than the churches, and the churches have their “Negro pew.” That was a good argument against the churches, but a poor one against justice to Douglass.

Douglass’s color brought him the usual queer experiences of the Negro, some of the hardest and heaviest of which he softened and lightened with a joke, as is characteristic of his race. Once he was on a train in the North. It was crowded,

many were standing but Douglass had a seat and no one would occupy the seat beside him. As the night grew on he took advantage of this vacant seat, pulled his hat over his face and lay down to sleep. He had begun to feel the real fun of the thing, but just as he was enjoying all the *luxury of being black*, a well-dressed white man got on at a station and came and tapped him on the shoulder and wanted to sit down by him. With a sleepy yawn and the merriest deviltry in his voice, Douglass said aloud, so that his white fellow-passengers could hear: "Don't sit down here, my friend, I'm a Nigger!" There was great laughter, and the newcomer sat down beside him. Once he and several other colored men who were speakers in the anti-slavery cause, arrived at Janesville, Wis., and at the hotel they were, of course, segregated at a table in one corner of the dining-room. This attracted to them quite a deal of annoying attention. Every eye in the dining-room was directed toward them as toward a group of most curious animals. Even the doorway and the windows got piled full of curious faces who stopped as they passed along the street. When this curiosity was at its height Douglass said in a full loud voice to one of the other colored men: "I have just made a great discovery!" "What is it?" asked the other. "Why I have just been out to the hotel stables, where I saw white horses and black horses eating out of the same trough in peace! From which I infer that *the horses of Janesville are more civilized than its people!*"

This raised such a storm of laughter at the management's expense that the colored men were no longer segregated in the dining-room.

The ex-slaves and their children have never yet realized how much they owe their early freedom to this one black fugitive. His example was an unanswerable argument. His very power and presence made converts. Men reasoned like this: If slavery is keeping such men as Frederick Douglass in chains, it is the devil's own institution; and since he is, there must be others.

Indeed such an impression was made by this "runaway nigger," as pro-slavery papers called him, that men began to doubt whether he had ever been a slave. To set the question at rest he published a pamphlet, "Frederick Douglass's Narrative," giving the details of his bondage and the name and address of his owner. This subjected him hourly to the danger of being kidnapped and returned,—for oh, how Thomas Auld and Tuckahoe, Talbot County, Maryland, would have liked to get hands on him then! So he sailed for England. He was not allowed in the cabin and had to go in steerage. The passengers learned who he was and invited him to make a speech; some young fellows from New Orleans and Georgia threatened to throw him into the ocean for speaking, and the captain threatened to put them into irons. When they reached England, these injudicious young men flew to the British press with their grievances against the captain and this Negro, the British people sided with the captain,

and the incident served only to furnish Douglass with the best possible introduction to the British public.

The English were pioneers in emancipation, and had become constant and consistent friends of the slave. Canada had steadfastly refused to enter into any extradition treaty to return fugitives from bondage, and the English courts had held that when a slave set foot on English soil and breathed English air, he became *ipso facto* free.

While abroad Douglass did American slavery all the damage he possibly could,—in England, Wales, Ireland and Scotland. He heard the foremost orators, met the pioneer workers for freedom, and enjoyed the society of the greatest men of the time, having the same experiences which the American Negro still has—to be treated better in any other civilized country of the world than in his own.

Yet he wanted to return; he could not enjoy English freedom for the haunting visions and clanking chains of his fellow bondsmen in America. Two English ladies, therefore, started a movement to raise the blood-money, seven hundred and fifty dollars, to buy him from Thomas and Hugh Auld in Maryland and make him a present of himself to himself.

Here are copies of the deeds and the manumission papers by which Douglass and his race came into possession of his body, his soul and his history:

"Know all men by these presents: That I, Thomas Auld of Talbot County and state of Maryland, for and in consideration of the sum of one hundred dollars, current money, to me paid by Hugh Auld, of the city of Baltimore, in the said state, at and before the sealing and delivery of these presents, the receipt whereof, I the said Thomas Auld, do hereby acknowledge, have granted, bargained, and sold, and by these presents do grant, bargain and sell unto the said Hugh Auld, his executors, administrators, and assigns, ONE NEGRO MAN, by the name of FREDERICK BAILEY—or DOUGLASS as he calls himself—he is now about twenty-eight years of age—to have and to hold the said Negro man for life. And I the said Thomas Auld, for myself, my heirs, executors, and administrators, all and singular, the said FREDERICK BAILEY *alias* DOUGLASS unto the said Hugo Auld, his executors and administrators, and against all and every other person or persons whatsoever, shall and will warrant and forever defend by these presents. In witness whereof, I set my hand and seal, this thirteenth day of November, eighteen hundred and forty-six (1846).

THOMAS AULD.

"Signed, sealed, and delivered, in presence of
Wrightson Jones, John C. Lear."
(Attested also by N. Harrington.)

"To all whom it may concern: Be it known that I, Hugh Auld, of the city of Baltimore, in Balti-

more county of the state of Maryland, for divers good causes and considerations me thereunto moving, have released from slavery, liberated, manumitted, and set free, and by these presents do hereby release from slavery, liberate, manumit, and set free, MY NEGRO MAN, named FREDERICK BAILEY, otherwise called DOUGLASS, being of the age of twenty-eight years, or thereabouts, and able to work and gain a sufficient livelihood and maintenance; and him the said negro man, named FREDERICK DOUGLASS, I do declare to be henceforth free, manumitted, and discharged from all manner of servitude to me, my executors and administrators forever.

"In witness whereof, I the said Hugh Auld, have hereunto set my hand and seal the fifth of December, in the year one thousand eight hundred and forty-six.

HUGH AULD.

"Sealed and delivered in presence of T. Hanson Belt, James N. S. T. Wright."

After about two years in England he returned in 1847, took up his home in Rochester, N. Y., founded a paper on money furnished by English friends, and for twenty years, in one of the most eventful periods of all history, he worked as never ex-slave worked before to free a fellow-slave. He risked life and liberty as an officer of the "Underground Railroad." This is the only great railroad system in the United States on

which Negroes never suffered any kind of "jim-crow," and they held all sorts of positions, from stockholders and division superintendents down to engineers and porters. Trains ran mostly on a night schedule, and in one general direction, from South to North. Douglass's Rochester home was the last station this side of Canada, and he had as high as eleven passengers at one time.

Editing a paper made Douglass read and think,—and reading and thinking brought him to disagree with some of the tenets of the Garrisonian anti-slavery school. Garrison held that honorable abolitionists should not vote or have anything to do with the United States Constitution, which he regarded as a slaveholding instrument,—or, as he expressed it, a covenant with death and an agreement with hell. The abolitionists then wanted the free states to separate from the slave states. Douglass came to feel that the Constitution is in spirit an instrument of freedom, inasmuch as those who framed it had shown that they were ashamed to use the word SLAVERY, presumably hoping that the institution would soon end. And he knew that for the free states to leave the Union might consign his people to endless southern bondage.

He became acquainted with Harriet Beecher Stowe and was on intimate terms with John Brown, the hero of Osawatomie and Harper's Ferry, the short-built, plain-looking man, lean and sinewy, with rawhide boots and leather cravat, with iron will and flinty nerve. Brown confided

to him the details of his plans for a sort of guerilla warfare from the Allegheny Mountains, to vex slavery and slaveholders and carry off their slaves to Canada. Meanwhile the legislatures, courts and congresses of the country were hot with the fever of impending conflict. There were fugitive slave laws, Dred Scott decisions, compromises and repeals of compromises. One of the most horrible laws ever enacted by a civilized people was the Fugitive Slave Law now passed by a recreant congress. It endangered the liberty of a hundred thousand industrious prosperous fugitives, made it possible for any two villains to swear away a free colored person's liberty, and gave the judge in the case twice as much fee if he condemned the victim as he would get if he freed him. Even Douglass was in danger: his purchase was of doubtful validity, the owner not having possession of the property at the time. But no act of legislation ever did more to free the slaves than did this abominable law. It stung decent people into a fearful resentment. Indeed the Negro will always have to thank the aggressiveness of the slave power for the rapidity with which the cause of freedom was pushed forward in this last decade of slavery.

In the midst of all this war of words and conflict of principles, John Brown, who had taken eye for eye and tooth for tooth in Kansas, determined to throw himself like a firebrand. Three weeks before his famous "raid" he asked Douglass to meet him at Chambersburg, Pa. Douglass

did so and brought with him Shields Green, a black fugitive from South Carolina and next to Brown the bravest man at Harper's Ferry. Douglass tried to persuade Brown not to make the raid, seeing the physical impossibility of success. But Brown said in effect that if he could not succeed, he could die and so awake the sleeping conscience of a nation.

After the raid the United States Government, then in the hands of Mr. Buchanan and the slaveholders, determined to arrest all who were in any way intimate with Brown and turn them over to the tender mercies of Virginia. Brown implicated nobody and said that he alone was responsible for all that he had done. But if they could not have proven that Douglass had anything to do with the raid, they could have proven that he was Frederick Douglass, which would have been enough to hang him in any court of the South at this particular time. So he again fled from the terrible claws of the American eagle to a place of refuge under the mane of the British lion. His connection with Brown made him exceedingly popular in England, and when he returned to the United States six months later, because of the death of his daughter, he found sentiment so changed that Brown had been transformed from a felon into a martyr and the country was fast moving on to the election of Lincoln and war. There were three candidates in the presidential field, every one running on the "Negro Question": Breckenridge for the right of the slaveholder to

carry his slaves into any territory regardless of the wishes of its people; Stephen A. Douglass for the right of the people of a territory to vote slavery in or out; and Abraham Lincoln for the right of Congress to prohibit slavery from the territories altogether and confine it to the then present slave states. Nobody had any idea of freeing the Negro where he was already a slave. But the ways of Providence often mock the ways of man. Man is not always master of his own fate; if he were it would oftener be a very sorry fate.

Douglass at once saw that Lincoln's position was the only hope of the slave; for to attempt to limit slavery was to fight slavery. The training of a slaveholder is such that he will not submit his wishes to debate. He is used to saying to men, "Go yonder," and they go—"Come here," and they come—"Stay there," and they stay. Such a man will not brook dictation, arbitration or limitation. If you elect Lincoln, we will leave the Union, they said; and after Lincoln was elected one of their leaders said, If you gave us a blank sheet of paper on which to write our own conditions for staying in the Union, we would not stay.

So, behind the candidacy of Lincoln Douglass threw himself with all the might of his tongue and his pen. It is familiar history now, how the North was at first a very lamb in its desire for peace; how the guns of Sumter changed the lamb into a lion, "and his roar was terrible,"—but he only

roared and showed his teeth, at first reluctant to fight: How Lincoln and the whole administration declared to the world that the war would not be an abolition war, that however the war might end the master would be master still and the slave still slave; how Providence confounded these declarations; how under the shock of rebellion the nation began to totter; how Douglass and others urged the administration to unchain in the nation's defence the nation's great black hand; how these blacks, unchained, rushed to the front two hundred thousand strong and stayed a nation's fall. The details would be a long story. Suffice it to say that Frederick Douglass did more than any other man to recruit and rally the Negro troops. He knew that the Negro troops were not treated fairly, but he saw at the other end freedom.

"Hereditary bondmen, know ye not

Who would be free themselves must strike the blow?"

At once the 54th Massachusetts, a Negro regiment recruited mainly through the efforts of Douglass, by its gallant and terrible assault on Fort Wagner, put at rest in one night more questions about Negro manhood, courage and worth than could have been settled by a century of debate. And if any man opens his mouth to say that the Negro was given his freedom and did not win it, let him pause long enough to read how 200,000 blacks rushed into a bloody war, where when captured they were not treated as prisoners but butchered or sold like cattle,—and

how, according to the testimony of the commander-in-chief of the armies and navies of the United States, they saved a nation's life.

After the war he saw that his people were but half free, and that freedom without citizenship was a mockery and might become worse than slavery. In acquiring the franchise for the Negro race Douglass bore a part second only to that of Charles Sumner of the United States Senate. As usual the reasons urged against Negro enfranchisement were the best reasons for it. For instance, it was urged that it would bring the ex-slave into conflict and antagonism to the ex-master; which is an acknowledgment that the two might have conflicting interests, and becomes the best possible reason for giving the Negro the ballot and a fair chance to defend his own. If no conflicting interests were ever possible between white and black people in this country, it would be a sound reason for not enfranchising the Negro or for disfranchising the white man.

Douglass had sense enough to be aggressive. Truth is always truth, whatever opinion might be. And I only speak the truth when I say that the only way in the world to break up an unreasonable prejudice is to contradict it in practice. Prejudice is from custom, and how can a custom ever be displaced unless the opposite custom is established by practice? Those who have rights to defend must be vigilant; those who have rights to acquire must be aggressive. Such is human nature. To complain that it should not be so is to com-

plain against the weather. No people ever acquired rights by sitting down and waiting for them. Rights never come—calamities come—rights, you must go and get them.

For over half a century Douglass retained the respect and esteem of his fellow-man, espoused the cause of woman's suffrage and every other honorable ambition, and held many positions of honor and trust under the United States Government and elsewhere,—among which were Commissioner to San Domingo, member of the upper house of the legislature of the District of Columbia, Marshall of the District, Recorder of Deeds in the District, Presidential Elector at large for the state of New York, Minister to Hayti, President of the Freedmen's bank, and his last public service was as Commissioner for the republic of Hayti at the World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago. On February 20, 1895, at Anacostia Heights, a suburb of the city of Washington and where he had lived for many years, "he died in action with his armor on."

The city of Rochester, N. Y., has erected for him a bronze monument; he has built for himself more enduring monuments in the hearts of the bronze-colored American group for whom he spent his life.

I know no better model for ambitious youth or struggling people. His life completes the record of human degradation, endeavor and rise. Are you poor? Here is one who did not possess his own soul and body; in his own words, his body

belonged to his master and his soul belonged to God, so he poor fellow had nothing left for himself. Are you scorned? Here is one from the lowest condition to which humanity can be depressed. Are you buffeted? Here is one who was beaten with stripes. Are you denied the privileges of a man? He was not accorded the comforts of a horse. Are you handicapped in the struggle for education? Here is one whose study hours were stolen at the risk of the lash, in the school of adversity, with oppression as his teacher. Is there hope for you? Can you succeed? He did. From the bottom of despair he reached the top of success. He was born to the status of the cattle, by his own exertions he freed his body and liberated his mind, he literally wrung recognition from the reluctant hands of a public long steeped in the idea of the essential inferiority of his kind, he fixed the attention of two continents, and when he died, a literary friend of the Caucasian race in a volume of sonnets to the memory of Frederick Douglass pronounced him "the noblest slave that ever God set free."

ALEXANDER HAMILTON

"My blood is as good as that of those who plume themselves upon their ancestry."

The above are the words of Alexander Hamilton. Hamilton was a Negro. He was a Negro according to the definition accepted in our day. That is, he was a man whose blood was mixed black and white. Alexander Hamilton, like the French dramatist Alexandre Dumas, and the Russian poet Alexander Sergeievitch Poushkin, and the American poet Henry Timrod, and the English poet Robert Browning, had Negro blood. Some of these remarkable men had more Negro blood than many of the American Negroes whom we see every day. And it was only the merciful accidents of birth and circumstance that saved them from Jim Crow cars and disfranchisement. *Yea, if Poushkin and Dumas had lived in Georgia and Alabama instead of in Russia and France, they would have been slaves.*

Unjust sneers were cast upon Hamilton because of his parentage. And perhaps his impetuous and imperious soul was smarting under a sense of this injustice when he gave expression to the above words.

But it is not our purpose to deal with Hamilton here as a Negro, but as a MAN,—for we admire

him for his manhood and not for his ancestry. And yet we will make no pretense of suppressing the genuine pleasure which these FACTS give us in confuting and confounding the race-bigoted, color-mad theorists.

Any one who is familiar with sketches and biographies of Alexander Hamilton has doubtless noted the obscurity that hangs about his parentage: some say that his mother died before he was old enough to remember her, others say that she came with him to New York when he was sixteen years old; it is pretty generally agreed that his father was of Scotch extraction and that his mother was a "native" of the Isle of Nevis in the British West Indies; but some assert shortly that he was the illegitimate son of a rich West Indian planter, and some, that his mother was a "French" widow of Huguenot descent, who for some obscure reason had been divorced from her former husband, and one of Hamilton's biographers (Lodge) says that he was "dark of skin." One well-known writer went to the West Indies to look up Hamilton's early life, with the intention of writing his biography, but finding on every hand evidences that he was a Negro, she fell into the mood of fiction and wrote "The Conqueror" instead.

Thank heaven, Hamilton's claim upon the gratitude and admiration of mankind rests in his life and deeds and not in his ancestry.

He was born in January, 1757, on the island of Nevis, the son of some man and some woman.

Like most creatures, plant or animal, of the southern clime, he matured rapidly. At the age of thirteen he was put to work in a merchant's counting house at St. Croix. His precocity and genius were at once recognized by his friends, and in 1772 they sent him to the continental colonies to be educated. In a school of Elizabethtown, N. J., he quickly prepared for King's (now Columbia) College in New York.

The anti-British sentiment was now growing hot and events were rapidly moving toward the Revolution of 1776. In the midst of the passions and excitements of the times it is interesting to see this lad of seventeen years deliberately reading the discussions and looking into the merits of both sides, preparing to make his choice. The colonies were not his home, their quarrel was not his quarrel; but he decided, spite of "Tory" offers, that justice and humanity lay on the side of the Patriots and espoused the cause of the latter.

And immediately that magnanimity and broadness of sympathy, characteristic of Hamilton's whole life, comes out in this ardent, high-spirited boy: he opposed the mobbish spirit of the "patriots," plead for justice and mercy, and endangered his life by interposing himself between the mob and the Tory.

At the age of seventeen he was writing anonymous articles in defense of the Patriot cause which the public mind was ascribing to the eminent and mature statesman, John Jay. He introduced himself to the public by startling his hearers

with his grasp of the situation at a political stump-speaking of the Patriots.

In 1776 he used his last "allowance" sent by his friends from the West Indies in fitting up a company of artillery, commissioned by the government of New York. Captain Alexander Hamilton of this New York light battery was now scarcely twenty, but his gallantry at once attracted the attention of the commander-in-chief, and in 1777, at the age of twenty, he became aide-de-camp to the most towering character of the eighteenth century, Gen. George Washington of Virginia. Hamilton was very useful to Washington, managing all of the General's tremendous correspondence with the multifarious state governments and with the long-winded and verbose but headless and factious "Continental Congress."

In personal character, self-control, and as a leader of the masses of men, Washington was Hamilton's superior, and the superior of every other American of his day. In the genius of government, constructive ability, and as a *leader of the leaders of men*, Hamilton was Washington's superior, and the superior of every other man of his day.

In 1780 Hamilton acquired the greatest fortune that can fall to the lot of any good man,—a good wife, in the person of a daughter of Gen. Philip Schuyler, a veteran of his adopted state.

The next year an incident happened which illustrates the difference between the characters of Hamilton and Washington. Washington ad-

dressed Hamilton with the authority of a commander and a superior and Hamilton resigned his staff position on the spot. Washington apologized, but the proud spirit of Hamilton would not again accept the position. This gives us a glimpse of Washington's true superiority. But fortunately for the American Republic the friendship of these two men was not broken or permanently strained. He was with Washington when Cornwallis surrendered and helped to carry that last great fight against the British.

But Hamilton was more a statesman and financier than a soldier, was admitted to the bar in 1782 and elected from New York to the Continental Congress,—a giant in a body consisting mainly of pigmies. He at once saw the weakness of the "confederacy" of states, that it was involved in financial chaos, had lost respect and confidence, and was in great danger of becoming a by-word among the nations. Congress could do nothing but talk and it did plenty of that: it voted the veterans of the war abundance of praise but not one cent of cash. Hamilton was not sorry to return to private life and the practice of law in 1783.

Meanwhile "Shay's Rebellion" and jealousies and commercial difficulties of the different states, were teaching the thoughtful what Hamilton's logic had not taught them: that the present government was weak and needed to be superseded by a stronger one. Clinton, governor of New York and leader of the destructionists, was trying

to break up the Confederacy, and did. But fortunately (and no thanks to him) this act of destruction made way for a better and truer Union. Hamilton was elected from New York to a convention to meet at Annapolis in 1786 and unify the commerce of the states. He went, when behold, there were the representatives of only four states,—such was the indifference of the times to anything like a national spirit or a centralized government. But this small meeting performed one service; it issued a call for another meeting which resulted in the famous Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia in 1787.

Hamilton a member of the minority party in New York, tactfully coerced his state to be represented at this Convention through himself and two members of the opposition party. At the opening of this convention he made the great speech of his life.

Great as had been his services to his adopted country theretofore, he now began the Herculean labors for which America and all her heirs should pay him everlasting gratitude. It is fitting right here to notice just what were his distinctive ideas of a general American government. His scheme might be briefly called an "Aristocratic Republic"; the President and Senators to hold office "during good behavior," the state Governors to be appointed by the President and to have absolute veto power over all state legislation. This, of course, would have made the central Government everything and the state nothing.

It can be readily believed that Alexander Hamilton was the only man in America who had both the physical and the moral courage to make such a proposition to the democracy-mad fathers of the American Revolution. His idea did not prevail to its full extent but it performed its mission in toning down the French-revolutionary sentiment of the times; it caused the government that was organized to be made stronger than it otherwise would have been. The first mad mutterings of the French reign of terror and rain of blood were arousing the hearts of men in the utmost limits of civilization; in France it was "liberty, equality, fraternity, or death,"—and the greatest of these was Death. Hamilton saw, or thought he saw, that the American zealots were tending rapidly toward the brink of the same abyss.

The Constitution was adopted as we know it. Hamilton signed it for all New York, as his two opposition colleagues refused their assent. And the next labor of the American Hercules was to secure its ratification by his stubborn and intractable state. In defense of the Constitution he published, with some assistance from Jay and Madison, the series of essays known as the "Federalist," which gives him a place in the literature of this country; and then he went into his state convention supported by a minority of only 19 out of its 65 members, and when the question came to vote, the Constitution was ratified by a majority of three. This is one of the greatest recorded victories of persuasive and argumenta-

tive oratory. Great was the joy of his heart in thus assuring the accomplishment of the ambition of his life,—the American Republic: for the strategic position of New York rendered it imperative that it be brought into the Union.

The new government was formed, and Washington was made its first Chief Executive. Here again we have a pleasing reminder of the masterful character of that great Virginian. His quick and superior knowledge of men always stood him in good stead. The greatest task of American history was to confront the first head of the United States Treasury: foreign and domestic credit were to be established, and order was to be brought out of general financial chaos. Washington accordingly selected for this post a man who Talleyrand afterwards said had the greatest skill "in the application of the elementary principles of government to practical administration," a man who was only 32 years old, Alexander Hamilton. The keen insight and statesmanship of the new Secretary were at once brought to bear on the condition of the new nation by his great report to Congress on the Public Credit. It will be remembered that at this time the Constitution was a mere body of rules in which every effort had been made by the jealous states to limit and throttle the central government; it was a mere lifeless form that could not even authorize the United States to levy taxes, until Hamilton blew into it the breath of life and made it the one supreme thing in this country. He advanced the

doctrine of the "implied powers" of the Constitution, and showed to the satisfaction of Washington that "to provide for the general welfare" could be construed to give the central government authority to establish a National Bank and to levy an excise tax. And when the levying of this tax caused a "whiskey rebellion" in Pennsylvania, he won respect for the Government by putting it down with a show of national troops.

He wished for honorable and respectable government and did not care to cheat the Revolutionary veterans out of their soldier's pay; so his financial policy embraced payment of both the Foreign and the Domestic Debt, and Assumption of the war-debts of the States. He advocated the "double standard" in coinage and originated policies upon which great political parties have since divided.

And what was Jefferson doing, the "father" of our present Democratic party? Jefferson was at this time Secretary of State, but whenever Washington had a difficult matter of state or foreign policy, he went to Hamilton, and not to Jefferson, for his solution. He wanted a man who had the energy to work out a plan from start to finish.

No clearer emphasis can be put upon a truly great and constructive genius like Hamilton than by showing his relation to a destructive and "opposition" nature like Thomas Jefferson. Hamilton's time was all spent in planning and building; the chief activity of Jefferson was in *opposing* what Hamilton had planned and tearing down

what Hamilton was trying to build. They respectively represent the positive and negative forces of early American history. It is significant that Hamilton's followers assumed the name of "Federalists," that is, constructive unionists, and Jefferson's party became the "anti-Federalists," that is, destructive disunionists. The successor to the Hamiltonian party is the present Republican party; and the Jeffersonian party survives in the present Democratic party. It makes us smile when we hear a "stumping" politician say, "I am a Jeffersonian Democrat," or that he believes in "the fundamental principles laid down by Thomas Jefferson." Do you know what these "fundamental principles" are? Stripped of all their cunning indirection and vituperation, and reduced to their lowest and simplest terms, they were simply this: "Down with Hamilton and the accursed Federalists!" The French fever in American politics rendered the populace violently hostile to anything that smacked of aristocracy or monarchy; Jefferson was cunning enough to take advantage of this passion and use it for all it was worth against Hamilton's centralization policies. For the sake of appearances he changed the name of his "anti-Feds" to "Republicans." It is the irony of fate that the party which he opposed has since acquired that name, and that the aristocratic republicanism which he so bitterly opposed in Hamilton afterwards attained its highest and most threatening realization in his own dear Virginia and the other slave oligarchies of the

South. Before Jefferson became such a bitter enemy to Hamilton he had made a political "deal" with him: he had secured votes for Hamilton's Assumption policy and Hamilton had secured votes to have the national capital located in the South. The success of Assumption was particularly offensive to the "anti-Federalists," and Jefferson explained his embarrassing deal by saying that he had been "duped by Hamilton." The truth is that an ingenuous man like Hamilton could succeed at anything better than at duping a fox like Jefferson. When duping was done Jefferson did it: he duped old man Madison into an essay polemic with Hamilton, a thing which Jefferson feared for himself. Madison was not a half match for Hamilton; Aaron Burr has testified that for a man to put himself on paper against Hamilton was to seal his own destruction.

When there was trouble between France and England in 1793 Hamilton inspired Washington with a neutrality policy on principles which gave rise to the "Monroe Doctrine," which could more properly be called the "Hamilton Doctrine." Jefferson on the other hand wanted this country to act in offensive and defensive alliance with France, a policy which Hamilton saw would have been dangerous for America. But Jefferson, who always influenced people through their prejudices, did not lose the opportunity to call Hamilton's sympathies "British."

Jefferson's narrow political ideas rendered him so uncomfortable in the Cabinet of Washington

that he was forced to resign his Secretaryship. Hamilton stayed at his post till 1795, when he resigned after demanding a full investigation of his official conduct, to justify himself against the many slanders and charges of his enemies. It is hardly needful to say that the investigation left his official integrity without a stain.

Hamilton now went back to the practice of law and to private citizenship, but he continued to be the influential adviser of President Washington. He was, in every good sense of the term, the political "boss" of his party. He supported the unpopular "Jay treaty" with England. And in the presidential election which followed, although Adams was not his personal choice he supported him as the regular nominee of the party. Jefferson, the nominee of the opposition, was defeated. Now, this man Adams was a small man in mental stature and statecraft. He hated Hamilton and Hamilton made the ingenuous mistake of letting him know that he was not his personal choice for President. This break between its two leaders sealed the fate of the Federalist party.

In our little war with France in 1798 Adams asked Washington to take command of the Army. Washington accepted only on condition that Hamilton be made chief of staff and be given the full commission for organizing the army and getting it ready for the field. This greatly displeased Adams but for fear of popular wrath he could not bicker with Washington, and yielded. Ham-

ilton soon had an army on foot which might have kept Austerlitz out of history, had Napoleon come to America. But amicable relations were re-established and the war cloud passed. But Hamilton's labors had borne abiding fruit in the establishment of the military school at West Point.

Hamilton was an imperialist: if hostilities had continued he intended to seize Florida and Louisiana, getting complete control of the Mississippi. Hamilton disliked France on principle, although the French soldiers with Lafayette had been much attached to Hamilton. His dislike of pure and unrestrained democracy caused him to support the ill-fated Alien and Sedition laws.

The above laws together with the utter lack of tact in President Adams wrecked the Federalist party. The death of Washington left Hamilton commander-in-chief of the Army, a thing which Adams was pigmy enough to ignore.

The quarrel of the leaders caused disaffection among the followers, and Pennsylvania was lost to the Federalists. Then the struggle was for New York. Now Hamilton had opposed to him in New York a cheap politician named Aaron Burr, a schemer and trickster, a master of little things. The noble mind of Hamilton could not stoop to Burr's petty methods of solicitation and vote-buying, and lost New York City. And so, then as now, that meant the loss of New York state, and the loss of political power for the Federalist party. And then came the one blot upon Hamilton's political escutcheon: he proposes to Governor Jay

that they secure the choice of Presidential electors through the old legislature before the new opposition legislature could convene, a plain proposition to *defraud* the will of the majority. In despair he saw the party of distruction headed by Jefferson coming into power and argued the damnable doctrine that "to do a great right one is justified in doing a little wrong."—Jay, to his everlasting honor, said, "I won't."

In the election which ensued it happened that Burr and Jefferson, men of the same party, received an equal number of votes and a higher number than Adams and Pinckney, which left it to the House of Representatives to choose between the two former. Hamilton knew the cheap and unprincipled man from New York and so used his influence and secured the election of Jefferson. This was the last great service which he rendered his adopted country; he afterwards did only one service which can in any way compare with this, and that was when he again thwarted Burr in his designs on the governorship of the state of New York.

Meanwhile the busy lawyer, Alexander Hamilton, had risen to the head of his profession in New York state. He was moving and swaying juries, not with his imagination, but by direct, impassioned, irresistible appeals to their heads and hearts. A small and narrow nature like Burr's was bound to become embittered, and to pass from bitterness into a mad rage against this man for whose

mind he was no match. He swells with vengeance and literally forces a quarrel with Hamilton.

The "code of honor" was in force at that day, and, strange to say, men obeyed it even against the express command of God. Burr sent the challenge, and Hamilton accepted, not as a believer in the duello, but that no imputation of personal cowardice might lessen his usefulness in those future crises in which he felt sure his country would need him.—His preparation for the duel was in settling up his business affairs and writing his condemnation of the "code of honor." Burr's preparation was in destroying his compromising letters from worthless women and practicing with his pistol.

They met on the bright morning of July 11, 1804, on the banks of the Hudson, the spot where Hamilton's eldest son had recently fallen in a duel. The son was 19; the father is 47. He falls mortally wounded at the first fire. And Burr becomes a leper and his name anathema to the American public.

They did not know that they loved him so until he was dead. And he blessed them even in his death, for it created the first solid sentiment for the abolition of the "code of honor."

He was under-sized, but erect and courtly in his bearing. No one could be indifferent toward him,—he must be either loved or hated with *intensity*.

He was a prophet: he wrote Washington in 1798 that even then could he see, in the action of the South, the fatal oncoming of sectional and

geographical politics,—how the country “from the South of Maryland” was becoming *solid*,—*and he was one of the founders of the New York manumission society* for the abolishment of slavery.

He made nothing for himself, he made everything for America. The Frenchman Talleyrand saw him, after his retirement to private life, laboring at night in his law office in New York, and said: “I have seen one of the wonders of the world. I have seen a man laboring all night to support his family, who has made the fortune of a nation.”

Chief justice Marshall, *an American*, says that Hamilton is next to Washington. Talleyrand, *a Frenchman* says: “I consider Napoleon, Fox and Hamilton the three greatest men of our epoch, and without hesitation I award the first place to Hamilton.”

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

We shall now essay the praise of "arms and a man." And in praising the wisdom of the man or recounting the success of the arms it is no part of our purpose to deride those who disagreed with that man nor to taunt those who were vanquished by those arms.

We are here in memory of the humblest citizen of a nation and in honor of the greatest statesman of his time. Abraham Lincoln's life ran the whole gamut of American society. He was born into the "poor white trash" of Southern backwoods; he was pioneer and frontiersman; he was rail-splitter and flatboat-man; he was champion wrestler, cock-pit umpire and saloonkeeper; he was merchant, surveyor and country lawyer; he was the leading lawyer and politician, the acknowledged head and the champion orator of a political party in his state; he was legislator, congressman, statesman and President; he was leader in the most remarkable war prior to the 20th century—he was the tallest figure of the nineteenth century—he was the liberator of a race and martyr to the life of his country. Abraham Lincoln was the first president of the United States who was characteristically American.

One hundred and seven years ago in what was

then Hardin County, Kentucky, Abraham Lincoln was born. In the aristocratic sense of the phrase, he was a man of "no ancestry." His father probably descended from people who came first from England to Massachusetts, thence to Virginia, thence to Kentucky. Abraham Lincoln's grandfather and namesake was a brother-in-law of Daniel Boone and was one of the pioneers of the middle West. This grandfather had been shot by the Indians when Lincoln's father, Thomas Lincoln, was about six years of age. Mordecai, brother of Lincoln's father, is reputed to have been industrious, but Thomas, the father of Abraham Lincoln, was what we might call, without exaggeration, lazy and trifling.

When we consider this man's ancestry and early surroundings, we are both enlightened and confused. We are enlightened in that we can see in his humble origin the source of his sympathy for his humblest fellow-man, in his frontier life we can see the cause of his manly independence, and in his early associations we can see the foundation of his firm faith in the "plain people,"—but we are confused in that we cannot find in his immediate parentage and environment the necessary stimulus and inspiration, and from his early lack of opportunity we cannot account for the development of mental power, tact and executive ability. In these latter respects the law of cause and effect is apparently broken.

His mother had been one Nancy Hanks, a woman of very humble origin and of a melancholy

disposition. His father Thomas was a thriftless, ignorant fellow who loved to tell stories. He seemed to lack the instinct or ambition to settle down and build a decent home, even after he was married. He moved and moved and moved, and like the proverbial "rolling stone," he gathered no moss. The ignorance and inconsequentiality of the Lincoln family may be gathered from the fact that it had no uniform way of spelling its name: sometimes it was spelled L-i-n-k-h-o-r-n, sometimes L-i-n-c-k-o-r-n, sometimes even L-i-c-k-e-r-n.

As is well known, such poor white people in the first half of the nineteenth century had very limited chances in a slave commonwealth, and so, to escape the condition into which slavery forced the poorer whites, when the son was but seven or eight years old, the happy-go-lucky, unprogressive father loaded all the family belongings on a boat of his own construction and floated down the Ohio to Indiana. This aimless traveler finally landed and constructed a rude camp in a wild, uninhabited region near the present town of Gentryville, Indiana. The structure which Thomas Lincoln here erected to shelter his wife and young children, cannot be named out of the terminology of the dwellings of civilized man. It was not a house; it was what was known in pioneer days as a "half-faced camp": that is, it was closed on only three sides and its floor was the earth. The bed was constructed from a number of poles fastened to the logs in one corner of this cheerless habitation, the outer corner of the bed being supported by a forked

stick. In this camp the wife and children shivered for one whole winter, before Thomas could rouse himself to provide a better dwelling.

The melancholy, feeble mother died in the boy's childhood; an event which is a great calamity to most boys but was a great blessing to young Abe, for it enabled him to acquire at the early age of ten a very capable, energetic and motherly stepmother. This God-sent stepmother treated Abe and his little sister with impartiality among her own children; she also aroused all of whatever human aspiration there was in the father Thomas. She became the boy's tutor and protector against the educational indifference and hostility of his father; for Thomas was quite willing that his posterity should forever go the way their father and their fathers had gone.

The neighbors say that the boy Abe was "awful lazy," by which they mean that he was fonder of thinking and studying and talking and reasoning and story-telling, than he was of physical exertion. But the sympathetic stepmother understood and fostered the ambition of the boy. He had been to school a little: all his schooling put together would not amount to more than one year, some say not more than six months. But this limited bit of schooling was spread over a period of nine years and the boy made good use of what he learned in school by self-culture in the intervals, all of which might teach us the important educational principle that it is not the quantity of schooling but the thoroughness of it. The boy even developed enough

of the poetic spirit to be the author of this stanza:

“Abraham Lincoln
his hand and pen.
He will be good, but
god Knows When.”

The neighborhood of Gentryville was very superstitious: it believed in the bad luck of Fridays and in the influence of the moon on crops. So Abraham Lincoln was superstitious till his dying day. He was an ungainly looking lad and did not arouse high expectations by his personal appearance. He was lanky in appearance, with a head of unmanageable hair, and had what at first struck one as a lazy, dreamy look about the eyes. His clothes were made of tanned deer hide, his trousers usually being several inches too short and his suspenders of the one-gallows kind. Thus endowed by nature and thus clad in the garb of frontier poverty, he was not an attractive looking youngster, and a lawyer of the time who saw him, described it as “the ungodliest sight I ever saw.” When Abraham was twenty-one his roving father moved again, still westward, and this time to a place near Decatur, Illinois. Thus at the legal age of manhood he entered, unknown and unrespected, the State which was to be the future theatre of his life—of the greatest life of that State, of that Nation and of that Century.

It is impossible for any fiction to be stranger than the subsequent life of this poor boy. It was now the year 1830, and in thirty years more he was to be the chosen executive of the greatest re-

public in history. He had worked at hard manual drudgery since his babyhood. Now legally emancipated from his father, he helped to build a house for the family, split rails to make fences, and with the small bundle of all his earthly possessions he set out into the world to pursue his ambition. He was physically powerful and wiry; mentally slow, but patient, persistent and sure.

The story of this man's rise from that time forth should make every American proud of American institutions and American possibilities. The fact of his rise is a proof of democracy, and the success of his rise is a justification of republican government. His first trip into the wide, wide world was taken in 1831 to New Orleans, where he met, saw and hated slavery. On his return to Illinois he out-wrestled Jack Armstrong, the champion wrestler of the frontier, and ran for the General Assembly in 1832. The fact that a man with Lincoln's antecedents and attainments could enter the race for legislator of Illinois, shows what Western politics meant in that day. In this his first political contest he announced a principle which became the leading principle of all his after life and the chief element of his great statesmanship: he said: "so soon as I discover my opinions to be erroneous, I shall be ready to renounce them." This was in New Salem. He was beaten in this contest, but he could say with pride in after years that it was the only time in which Abraham was beaten on a direct vote of the people. In this same year he had been a captain of volunteers in

the Black Hawk War, and this man who was destined to command an army of a million men, when he gave his first order to this little volunteer company, received for a reply, "Go to the devil, sir." Once forgetting the necessary word of command for swinging his company endwise so that it could march through a narrow gate, he simply shouted: "This company is dismissed for two minutes, when it will fall in again on the other side of the gate." After his political defeat he went into the store-keeping business and failed: his partner was too lazy and Abe himself was too fond of talking and reading politics to attend the success of the venture. He was also postmaster of New Salem in 1833, carrying the letters in his hat, and was assistant to the county surveyor.

All the while he was studying law, which seemed ridiculous to his acquaintances. He was successful in getting to the legislature in 1834, where he served four terms. His chief acts in this body were protesting against its pro-slavery resolutions and helping to enact some very disastrous financial legislation. He had been admitted to the bar in 1836 and moved to Springfield in 1837.

Being a very susceptible lover he first fell in love with a girl who died of a broken heart for another man. He wished to marry on the slightest provocation, and after a fruitless Platonic affair with another woman he finally married Miss Mary Todd in 1842, she declaring that she did not marry him because he was good-looking, but because she thought he would some day be President of the

United States. In 1847 he entered the lower house of congress for one term, where he again put himself on record against slavery extension. It was not until after this congressional term that he was finally able to pay the last of the debts occasioned by his business failure, and the faithful payment won him the useful title of "Honest Old Abe."

He now seemed to retire from politics and to settle down to the practice of law, when in 1854 the country became a volcano of political activity, and Abraham Lincoln was again aroused to take a hand in the greatest political battles in the history of free government. The repeal of the Missouri Compromise had aroused the latent anti-slavery feeling in the North to its highest pitch. This compromise had limited the northward spread of slavery to a certain parallel, and when it was repealed, even conservative men like Lincoln felt bound to cry out. Douglas, the Democratic statesman, had fathered this "repeal" and the enactment of the Kansas-Nebraska bill, which was to allow the people of those territories to decide for themselves whether or not they should have slavery. In 1854 Lincoln debated this question against the Democratic champion, and at Peoria he said: "Repeal the Missouri Compromise, repeal all compromises, repeal the Declaration of Independence, repeal all past history, you still cannot repeal human nature. It still will be the abundance of man's heart that slavery exten-

sion is wrong, and out of the abundance of his heart his mouth will continue to speak."

He at once became the recognized champion of those who were opposed to the "repeal" and the Nebraska bill. His oratorical powers had been wonderfully developed by his constant law practice since his retirement from congress. He had ridden the circuit and told stories with the Western lawyers and judges and could fairly "skin" his opponent in court. His method of argument avoided sophistry and lead straight to the heart of the matter. He was now well known in Illinois and was universally esteemed, and was at once accepted as just the man with the qualities to cope with the doughty Douglas, the famous "Little Giant." This Douglas was called "Little Giant" because of the smallness of his body as compared with the largeness of his mind.

Lincoln had been a Whig. In 1856 the Republican party was formed, which crystallized the opposition to the spread of slavery. In his state he became the undisputed leader of this party. Their nominee for the presidency was defeated and Buchanan was elected. Immediately followed Judge Taney's "Dred Scott Decision," which further drew the line between those who favored and those who opposed slavery. Lincoln's comment on the Dred Scott Decision is characteristic, showing how his mind penetrated sham and technicality and went straight to the fundamental justice of a case. He said: "It seems strange to me that our courts will hold that a man never loses his title to

his property if that is stolen, but that he immediately loses his title to himself when he is stolen."

The next year, 1858, is famous for the Lincoln-Douglas debates. Douglas's senatorial term was about to expire and the Republicans put forward Lincoln to contest for the prize. Lincoln had already magnanimously yielded one senatorial contest to secure the election of an anti-Nebraska Democrat, and he had lost a nomination for the vice-presidency. In the contest with Douglas he won the debates but lost the senatorship. This man's losses, however, later proved to be his greater gains.

It is interesting to compare and contrast these two champions. They were both conservative, sober-minded men. But Douglas was a recognized statesman, while Lincoln was but a *novus homo*. Few outside of Lincoln's own friends and better acquaintances expected him to come off with any honor against the fierce "Little Giant." Douglas was quick; Lincoln was deliberate. Douglas was polished and cultured; Lincoln was an uncouth, poor-mannered man, according to the tastes of polite society. Douglas was cunning and devious in argument; Lincoln was straight as an arrow. Douglas was a powerful intellect; and so was Lincoln.

The battle was eagerly watched throughout the North, which had become a sort of political caldron, because of what was felt to be the aggressions of the pro-slavery element. Like a knowing antagonist Lincoln attacked Douglas at his most

vulnerable point, assailing his record in connection with the repeal of the Missouri Compromise and the passage of the Nebraska Bill. Douglas, skillful sophist that he was, dodged and attempted to parry this blow by thrusting certain well-directed questions at Lincoln. Whereupon Lincoln became interrogatory himself and asked Douglas one question which destroyed Douglas, split Douglas's party in twain, and drew the issue squarely between the opposing forces of the entire country. He asked Douglas a question which, if answered in the affirmative, would offend the South, and which, if answered in the negative, would offend Illinois. Douglas wanted the immediate senatorship from Illinois, so he answered in the affirmative and gained the senatorship, but he offended the South and lost their support for the presidency two years later—just as Lincoln had calculated. The famous question was—“Can the people of a Territory, in a lawful way, against the wish of any citizen of the United States, exclude slavery from that Territory, prior to its adoption of a State Constitution?”

Douglas was re-elected to the senatorship by the state legislature, but Lincoln was from that day the chosen man of the people of Illinois. In a parade prior to one of the debates the Douglas men had carried an inscription which read, “The Little Giant,” and the Lincoln men carried an inscription which read, “Lincoln the Giant Killer.” Douglas had traveled on special trains, waving banners and beating drums; Lincoln had journeyed in the simplicity of the most undistinguished

citizen. Douglas had spent \$80,000 in his canvass; Lincoln had spent less than \$1,000. Lincoln had lost and Douglas had won; Douglas had grown weak, and Lincoln had grown strong.

Lincoln was now in the eye of the country and was invited to lecture in the East, which he did so acceptably as to utterly astonish all the bigots of New York and New England, who had not believed that anything very remarkable could come out of the West. Horace Greely and others who did not like Seward, began to see in Lincoln a "presidential possibility." In 1860 he was nominated and elected by the Republican party, the first Chief Executive to come out of the great North-West.

So slow is the world to believe, that even then there was scarcely anybody who thought Lincoln really competent to fill the office and accomplish the task before him. Six states had seceded before he could be inaugurated. The South was very angry. The Union was actually going to pieces. Europe was laughing and acting with the airs of one who feels like shouting: "I told you so!" And the greater sentiment in the North at this time seemed disposed to let the States secede without war; men were not inclined to fight, they were too busy in their shops and factories—they had no time to measure the world-wide, age-long consequences of the destruction of the greatest republic in the world. Men poked fun at the new president as an ordinary Western lawyer with no executive ability. Cartoonists vied with one another in cari-

capturing his homely looks, exaggerating the longness of his arms and legs, and size of his feet and the thickness of his lips. He was represented as subhuman, as a gorilla, some even charging him with the very heinous offence of being part "nigger." All this he bore with the steadfastness and courage of a man who knows himself. He never swerved from his position that the Union must be preserved, adding an element to our statesmanship by showing that the first and foremost duty of a government is to defend its own existence, and that the right to do this is inherent in the nature of government and does not have to be conceded to it among any delegated powers. If the government had, in any way whatsoever, either by grant or conquest, acquired the right to exist, that very right carried with it the duty of self preservation. On the question of slavery he was not an Abolitionist, by politics at least. It was his expressed wish that all men everywhere might be free, but as President of the United States he was not an officer of the Abolition Societies, but the chief executive of the American government under the Constitution—and the Constitution protected slavery. So, whatever were his private feelings on the question, he intended to sacrifice them to his solemn oath to defend the Constitution. He enforced the "fugitive slave law" and in his inaugural he had renounced any intention to interfere with slavery where it already existed legally. But he was against its further extension, and upon this he said he would "hold firm as a chain of steel."

So while the South was fast uniting and preparing for war, the North was rather undecided and hesitant, but the guns of Sumter, which were heard around the world and whose echo shall resound through all the future history of a great nation, did what neither Lincoln nor danger from the South nor a mere latent love for the Union could do—they absolutely united the North. Democrats and Republicans, the followers of Douglas and the followers of Lincoln, became of one mind to settle the question of the perpetuity of the Union; all Northern parties became one party, which might be denominated the War Party. A call for seventy-five thousand was answered by the willing voices of a million, and Massachusetts had a regiment on the way to Washington within 48 hours after the call.

Here again comes out the chief element of his statesmanship: he did not call until he knew that men were ready, and even anxious to come. If he had called for troops as soon as he was inaugurated, he would probably have received much the same reply as when he gave his first orders to the Black Hawk volunteers. "My policy is to have no policy," said he; he waited upon events and acted according to the great heart and the great will of the people. "Time was his prime minister." After deciding upon a course of action he never outran the opportunity: he made every effort consistent with the authority of government to win conciliation, but he called for troops when men were ready to fight; he revoked the emancipation

orders of his too hasty generals, but in response to the popular demand he issued his Emancipation Proclamation upon the heels of a Federal victory; he returned fugitive slaves, but when the Northern soldiers had become so weary as to be glad for anybody to help to do the fighting, he called for the black legions, whose appearance marked the turning point of the War.

And the guns of Sumter had no less effect upon the men of the South. Eleven seceded States formed themselves into a Confederacy. The border States of Missouri, Kentucky and Maryland were with difficulty kept in the Union, and such was the volcanic nature of the cleavage that the State of Virginia was finally divided against itself. Lincoln at once realized the strategic situation of the border states, and with the instincts of the great strategist that he was, he concentrated his first efforts upon their retention. So important was the task and so earnestly did Lincoln apply himself to it that some observer said: "Lincoln would like to have God on his side, but he *must* have Kentucky."

The line of cleavage did not limit itself to territory, but reached into the administrative branches of the government, into the army and into the navy. One-third of the officers, because of Southern lineage or Southern sympathies, left the regular naval and military forces of the Union. Among those who deserted the government was one of the ablest captains of history, Robert E. Lee. Many Southern men, however, preferred to stand by the

Government, notably among whom were Senator Andrew Johnson, Generals Scott and Thomas, and Commodore Farragut. And it is to be said of the common soldier and sailor that not one of them deserted his post before actual war.

Let us for a moment right here consider the relation of slavery to the dreadful war that was waged. Some say that slavery brought on the war, and others say that the war was not waged in the interest of slavery. Slavery was not the immediate cause, the immediate "bone of contention," but slavery was the underlying cause, the *cause of the cause* of the war. We can best explain by a parable. There are two neighbors living with no fence between them and no definite boundary line. One of those neighbors has a bad dog which the other does not like. They often quarrel about this dog. The one thinks that he has a right to keep him and let him run free; the other thinks that his neighbor has no right to keep that dog, or that, if he will keep him, he should keep him tied or in a kennel. Finally one of the neighbors decides to rid himself of the other neighbor by building a dividing fence. A fight grows out of their dispute about the right to build and the place to locate the fence. They are fighting about the fence. But it is not hard to see the relation of the dog to this fence. Well, slavery was the dog of the Civil War. Secession was the fence.

During the war there was a popular rhyme that ran thus:

“In sixty-one, the war begun;
In sixty-two, we’ll put it thru;
In sixty-three, the nigger’ll be free;
In sixty-four, the war’ll be o’er—
And Johnny come marching home.”

The prophecy of this popular doggerel was fulfilled, almost to the letter. In 1861, in spite of the president’s protestations of non-interference with slavery, war could not be averted. For the question had shifted from a question about the dog to a dispute about the fence. The price which the South demanded for peace was no longer slavery but secession. This price the government would not pay. The spirit of war was full grown; the *gaudium certaminis* swept the whole manhood of the nation toward the front. The first great shock at Bull Run resulted in a Northern defeat; which perhaps did more good for the North than it did for the South, for it filled the South with confidence, but it filled the North with caution. In “sixty-two” the war was literally “put thru,” and from the summer of this year till the appearance of black troops the outlook was very dark for the Union cause. In “sixty-three” came freedom and the Negro soldier, at the turning point of the war. The great commander thus brought up his black reserves just in time to strike the decisive blow. Lincoln had the felicity of doing the right thing at the right time. Negro troops would not have been welcomed by the Northern soldier before this time,

and even now Lincoln found it hard to get the Negroes into the government uniform; the white soldier wanted the Negroes to be dressed in a different color and sort of suit from his own. But the Union's need of the Negro overcame this prejudice. The Emancipation Proclamation was just in time, too—just in time to make the masses of foreign nations sympathize with the Northern side of the struggle, as being a struggle for freedom as well as for Union. If issued earlier, it would have been indeed a "Pope's bull against the comet." In "sixty-four" the war was practically over; even the Confederates had the feeling that it was simply a question of time and a question of terms. Lincoln steadfastly refused to consider any terms but the restoration of the Union and the authority of the government.

Through it all Lincoln had been prosecuting the war with the energy of an experienced commander-in-chief. He had been sifting and shifting generals until he had finally brought out Grant. Pope, McClellan, Burnside, Hooker, had all gone before. Some of them were energetic and aggressive, but none of them could be a match for the genius of the Confederate captain, Lee. McClellan was a great organizer but lacked the ability for energetic command in the field. So hesitant and unaggressive was he that during his command there came into existence the famous phrase, "All is quiet on the Potomac." Somebody praised McClellan for being a great "engineer"; Lincoln said yes, but that he seemed to have a special talent for

developing a "stationary" engine. It is a remarkable thing to say of a man who was a civilian about all of his life, but Lincoln was a better strategist, excepting perhaps Grant, than any general that ever came to the command of the Army of the Potomac. By observation and study and sympathy, he learned more of the art of war than did his generals in the field. He warned Hooker not to have his army crossing the Rappahannock River in the presence of Lee, saying that Hooker's army would then be "like an ox jumped half over a fence and liable to be torn by the dogs front and rear, without a fair chance to gore one way or kick the other." He noted every detail in the movements of armies; he saw every opportunity to strike a deciding blow. Had he been in McClellan's shoes after Antietam, he would have injured Lee. Had he been in Meade's shoes after Gettysburg, he might have crushed Lee. He kept telling his commanders that the objective of the Army of the Potomac should be Lee's army and not Richmond. And when Grant came to command in the East he adopted the exact lines of tactics which Lincoln had been endeavoring to urge upon his other generals; and Grant's success attests the military sense of Lincoln.

In his relations with his cabinet and other public officials his justness and patriotism are plainly shown. He chose the members of his cabinet with a view to their fitness for serving the country, regardless of other considerations; he chose Chase, who was thinking that the country had made a

great mistake in electing Lincoln to the presidency instead of him; he chose Seward, who thought that he knew much more about the presidential office than the inexperienced Illinois lawyer, and was not kind enough to hide his opinion even from Lincoln himself; he chose Stanton, a Democrat, who had personally insulted Lincoln as a lawyer a few years before, who had despised Lincoln the President as a frivolous story-teller, and from whom the president had sometimes to compel subordination. It is a marvellous record of tact and patriotic devotion how he harmonized and ruled these conflicting and contending spirits; how he remained both master and friend.

But be it said to the undying honor of all these men that they were devoted to their country and rendered invaluable service in her defense. Especially Stanton: he was a tyrant and a relentless prosecutor,—and that is well, for he was a good check upon the over-mercifulness of Lincoln. These two characters complemented each other in the great task of the administration: Stanton was the grim, relentless Mars, the god of war, caring more for the business than either for the sorrow or for the joy of battle; while Lincoln was the superior divinity, unlimited in power but preferring mercy to justice, and restraining with patient but authoritative hand, the too furious course of the subordinate war-god. He sometimes referred to Stanton as “Old Mars over there at the war department.”

Lincoln also had many puny but pestiferous

politicians on his hands. When asked how he managed these, he told the story of an old farmer who was a neighbor of theirs when he was a boy. When this old farmer was asked how he got rid of a bothersome log that lay in his field, he replied: "I jes' ploughed around it!"

This great man also found it often necessary to "plough around" the disaffection or the apathy of the "plain people," in whom he had such noble confidence. This is not better seen anywhere than in his relation to the slavery question. On this question he was too slow for some and too fast for others; he was too cold for the Abolitionists and too hot for the pro-slavery faction. It is the lot of a great, level, even, balanced man like Lincoln to be censured by both extremists. So normal was he that we find different persons applying exactly opposite epithets to him: some say that he was too radical, others that he was too conservative; some that he was too partisan, others that he was too liberal; some that he was extremely democratic, others that he was a tyrant; some say that he was too subject to sentiment, others that he was as feelingless as a stone; while his friends were charging him with being too lenient and too merciful to the enemy, the enemy was painting him as the incarnation of devilish malice. So it is not surprising that while some say that the whole purpose of his war and administration was to free and elevate the Negroes, others declare that he would never have issued the Emancipation Proclamation if he had not been compelled to do so. The true posi-

tion of Lincoln is to be found about half way between all of these extremes. Personally he despised slavery. But as President of the United States he had sense enough to see that it was his duty to look out for the interests of the government, because the Negroes and all others would be lost without the government. He would interfere with slavery only when such interference was somehow connected with the welfare of the Union; he would save the Union either with or without slavery. What he did for black men, he did because he saw that it was good for all men, white and black. Said he: "In giving freedom to the slave, we assure freedom to the free—honorable alike in what we give and what we preserve."

He was perfectly clear as to his personal inclination, saying: "If slavery is not wrong, nothing is wrong." He hated slavery most because of its demoralizing effect upon white men; because it compelled white men to engage in too many sham arguments in their efforts to defend it; because it often made them attack the very foundation of human liberty; because it made them attack even the Declaration of Independence. He issued his proclamation of freedom deliberately and without compulsion, because he saw it would be a winning card in the great game of war which he was playing for the prize of a united country. There is no doubt about his estimation of the act; he called it "the central act of my administration and the great event of the 19th century." He also said: "It is a momentous thing to be the instrument under

Providence of the liberation of a race," and "If my name ever goes into history it will be for this act." The most valuable possession of all that he has left us on this question of the Negro is his willingness to learn and change his mind; he at first thought that the Negro soldiers would not fight; but when they fought, he acknowledged it; once he thought that only white men should vote, but later he acknowledged that to say that self-government is right and to say also that for one race to govern another against its wish and without its co-operation is likewise right, are as opposite "as God and Mammon."

By 1865 he had overcome opposition in America and had outlived the sneers of Europe, and was the most powerful man in the world. His favorite general, Grant, by literally battering the Confederate army and pounding the defenses of Richmond, with repeated strokes like the blows of Thor's hammer, had finally opened the gates of Richmond and compelled the retreat of the outnumbered and outdone, but not outgeneralled, Lee. Lincoln had entered Richmond, not as the conqueror enters the fallen stronghold of the enemy, but as the sympathetic man enters the scene of the common scourge of his country. The Negro troops who were among the first to enter Richmond, fed and watered the starving Confederates from their canteens and acted more like a rescue party after an earthquake than a victorious army after a stubborn siege. On the 9th of April Lee surrendered an army of the most nervy

and long-suffering soldiers that had ever followed an Anglo-Saxon captain. On April the 14th, after a long season of the clouds and thunders and indiscriminating fires of war, glad for the returning sunshine of peace, filled with the milk of human kindness, and with the tenderest feelings of mercifulness and pardon, the Great President was slain by the bullet of a misguided zealot. The foolish man expected some men to praise him for the deed, but the whole world abhorred him, hunted him, and killed him like a dog. Grant, himself a man without the passion of hate, said of Lincoln: "In his death the nation lost its greatest hero; in his death the South lost its most just friend." At the funeral, immediately behind his coffin, marched a detachment of the troops of the race he had emancipated.

He was buried in Springfield, Ill., which had so long been his home. No one knew his birthplace, but the whole world knows his grave. At his death he was just fairly entered upon a second presidential term. Lowell calls him "the first American." He was the first president of the Republic who was American through and through. There was not one foreign element in his bringing up; he was an unmixed child of the Western plains, born in the South, reared in the North. Most of the presidents before him being reared nearer the Atlantic, had imbibed more or less of Eastern culture and had European airs. This man Lincoln was so thoroughly democratic as to astonish both Old and New England. He never acted "the

President," and was always a man among men, the honored servant of the people.

From a five dollar fee before a justice of the peace, he had risen to a five thousand dollar fee before the supreme court of Illinois. From a study of "Dilworth's Spelling Book" in his seventh year, he had risen to write, in his fifty-seventh year, his second Inaugural, which is the greatest utterance of man and yet all of his days in school added together, are less than one year. His pioneer life had given him a vein of humor which became his "Life-preserver" in times of stress; it had also given him a love for human liberty that was unaffected. He felt that the enslavement of some men was but the advance guard, the miner and sapper, of the enslavement of all men. He respected, even revered, the Constitution of his country, but he would violate a clause in order to save the whole instrument—just as a good surgeon will amputate a limb to save a life. From a poor captain of volunteers in the scandalous little Black Hawk War, where he jokingly said he "bled, died, and came away," although he never had a skirmish nor saw an Indian, he had risen to the chief command in a war that numbered three thousand battles and skirmishes and cost three billion dollars. Having no ancestry himself, being able to trace his line by rumor and tradition only as far back as his grandfather, he became, like George Washington, the Father of his Country. Born of a father who could not write his name, he himself had written the Proc-

lamation of Emancipation, the fourth great state paper in the history of the Anglo-Saxon race,—the others being Magna Charta, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. If we accept the statement of Cicero that the days on which we are saved should be as illustrious as the days on which we are born, then Lincoln the Savior must always remain co-ordinate with Washington, the Father of his country. Jackson was "Old Hickory," Taylor was "Old Rough," and there have been various names given to the other presidents, but Washington and Lincoln were the only ones whom the American people styled "Father."

Nature tried herself in the year of 1809; many great and varied geniuses were born. Charles Darwin and Abraham Lincoln were born on the same day, one to the mastery of nature, and the other to the mastery of men; both circum-polar stars that never set.

European people could not understand how a man like Lincoln, who was born what they call a peasant in Europe, could wear supreme power as lightly as Lincoln wore his. They had been used to Cromwells and Napoleons, who rose to rule and not to obey, to enslave and not to free, the people. A Frenchman could not understand why a ruler like Lincoln, in command of a million armed men, would jeopardize his tenure of office by holding a presidential election in 1864. A European might have declared the whole Constitution suspended and himself Dictator during the remainder of the war. But the Republican form

of government was more respected by Lincoln in time of war than by some other presidents in times of the greatest peace. In this he rendered a great service, not only to his country but to the whole liberty-loving world; for he showed the ability of a Republic to save itself in a life and death grapple without abating the freedom of its citizenship. After his death the French Liberals sent Mrs. Lincoln a medal to the honor of the deceased president, part of the inscription being: "Saved the Republic without veiling the Statue of Liberty." For the first time in the history of the world democracy had demonstrated its right to a place of respect beside the more ancient form of government.

Again it is to the everlasting honor of the American people that the death of a man like Lincoln in a time like Lincoln's should cause such a little stir and no revolution in the government. The vice-president, a man who did not possess the entire confidence of the party in power, was allowed to assume the office of president without a struggle. And it is a marvel of patriotism, of order and self-control, that an army of a million men, who held within their hands the nation's fate, should march down Pennsylvania Ave., in review before this new president, lay down their victorious arms, and return to the fireside and to the toil of factory and field. It was a sight for the gods, the demi-gods and the crowned heads of the ancient world. It was the triumph of democracy.

Child of the American soil, cradled and nursed in the very bosom of nature, he loved his country with the passion with which most men love their human mothers. He could not bear the thought of one iota of detraction from her honor, her dignity or her welfare. Against her dismemberment he was willing to fight to the end of his second administration or till the end of time. He might tolerate anything else except disunion,—even the right of some of his fellowmen to enslave others. Of every concession which he made during his administration, to friend or foe, the *sine qua non* was Union. A house divided against itself cannot stand. In this he left us a great heritage; it is a lesson for both sections, and all races of any section. White men of America, black men of America, by the eternal God of heaven, there can be no division of destiny on the same soil and in the bosom and in the lap of the same natural mother. Men may attempt and accomplish discrimination in a small way, but Almighty God and all-mothering nature are absolutely impartial. They have woven the fabric of life so that the thread of each man's existence is a part of the whole. He who sets fire to his neighbor's house, endangers the existence of his own; he who degrades his neighbor's children, undermines the future of his own. Together we rise and together we fall is the plan of God and the rule of nature. We must lean together in the common struggle of life: the syncline is stronger than the anticline.—In a great nation with an

increasing fame, the lesson of Lincoln's life must grow in importance. Long as the human heart loves freedom his name will be a word on the tongues of men. His name will be a watchword wherever liberty in her struggles with tyranny, lifts her embattled banners. No man of the ancient or the modern world has a securer place in the hearts and memories of men than this man Lincoln, who was born in obscurity, who died in a halo, and who now rests in an aureole of historic glory.

INDUSTRY

For over three hundred years the "lazy" Negro has done the hardest work in America. Theoretically freedom would keep any lazy being from work,—that is, freedom from chains and the whip. The Negro was expected to almost die of starvation rather than work in a state of freedom. But to-day out of seven million colored people above the age of ten years, five million are at work,—two million women and three million men. They are still doing the hardest work in America: farming, gardening, dairying, fishing, mining, milling, and all sorts of domestic and personal service. There are nearly a million Negro farmers and two million farm laborers; a million Negro women are working on the farms.

In the main the Negro is doing the work which the white people wish most to shun. In slavery he did the drudgery under compulsion, and the white man naturally reasoned that the Negro would escape from such work at all costs as soon as he was set free. On the other hand the Negro took advantage of the hard lessons he had learned in slavery and began to lay his economic foundation deep and firm in all the avenues of hard work to which he was admitted. He had worked two hundred and fifty years for board and clothes,

and very poor board and clothes at that. He is the one element in America to whom America owes a large past debt, never to be paid and perhaps absolutely unpayable. The African Negro was the forerunner of American civilization in the South; he was the army which attacked the forests, the canebrakes and the swamps.

Instead of taking his freedom as a good opportunity to quit work and starve to death, he has become such a competitor to those about him that every possible effort is made to handicap and check him. Only menial and hard work have been opened willingly to him, and efforts are being made in some places to push him out of even the higher forms of menial service,—such as hotel waiters, porters and barbers. Under the pressure of late economic conditions, white men have become more and more willing to do such work. Twenty-five years ago it was a disgrace to a white man to be seen shaving another white man; Booker T. Washington said that the white man in the chair did not feel that it was safe to let another white man get a razor under his throat. Many Negro men on the other hand got really wealthy at the barber's trade. In the South white men have lately entered into sharp competition against colored men in this field, especially in the larger cities and in connection with the hotels.

Again, the Negro worker is handicapped by inferior sanitary conditions of work, as a rule. In print it is merely proclaimed that the Negro is

physically unfit and inferior to other peoples, but in practice it is taken for granted that the Negro can live under conditions that would kill a white man. It always seems strange to me that anybody could express surprise that the Negro's death rate is higher in America than that of white folk; and it seems even stupid to hear some ascribe it to the Negro's color or race when it can be amply explained by the unsanitary conditions of his life. The house which the landlord or employer usually offers to the Negro tenant or workman, is usually nothing but a bare shelter for the animal, often one or two rooms and without sufficient breathing space for the family. All modern sanitary arrangements are conspicuous by their absence, often even water is scarce. The great army of Negro prisoners in the South is kept under conditions which impregnate them with diseases, and when their terms expire, if they are alive, they are sent back among the masses of colored people to scatter these diseases. The greater part of the living condition of Negroes in the South is in the hands of white people, but the general unsanitary living of the Negro masses and the rate at which they die are often held up as the fault of the Negroes alone. It is significant that a recent publication by the United States Census Bureau shows that the Negroes live better and their death-rate decreases in proportion as they gain possession and control of their own homes.

Again, the Negro laborer is practically everywhere underpaid. It is said that his standard of

living is lower. It is forgotten that the standard of living is as much an effect as a cause; poverty and low wages keep down the standard of living. Is the Negro expected to raise his standard of living before his wages are raised? Great organizations of white men have gone on strike to compel the employer to pay the Negro workmen lower wages for the same work for which they themselves were getting a higher wage. In Georgia there was a great strike of the white railroad men for *lower wages*—for black railroad men. It seems to us that this will ultimately work against the interests of white men, for if soulless corporations are compelled to hire colored men at lower wages, they will find every excuse possible to hire more of the cheaper labor and less of the higher labor.

This question of pay reminds us that it is often said that white people prefer Negroes for certain forms of work and service: colored men for porters, butlers and house "boys,"— and colored women for cooks, maids, laundresses and even sick nurses. This matter of pay has largely determined that preference. The Negroes are not preferred because they are black, certainly. But the Negro servant can be had for lower wages, or what amounts to the same thing, he will do more work for the same wages. The Negro trained nurse is expected to be the chamber maid also, to empty the slops and clean the room. They have even been required to serve meals to the family. If a white woman is hired as cook, she

will want a boy to bring in the wood and draw water from the well. Or what amounts to the same thing still, the Negro servant will work longer hours and take more mistreatment and accept inferior accommodations from the employer, not because the Negro prefers these conditions but because of his disadvantages in the struggle to live and because his other avenues of employment are largely limited by prejudice and labor unions. In short, the preference for a Negro servant or workman is by no means a preference for the Negro. The Negro is such a large competitor in some fields, like mining and smelting, that he is admitted to the unions, usually in segregated organizations, however. It is the general practice of white labor unions to admit Negroes wherever it is vitally necessary to protect the interests of the white workingmen, and to exclude the Negro whenever his membership would benefit the Negro alone.

We must speak of the perils that beset the Negro woman and child, especially as domestic servants. In many communities we have found the white people complaining that it is getting harder and harder to persuade the "lazy" Negroes to work as cooks, house-servants, washerwomen and chamber maids. This is true, all except the question-begging word "lazy." The reason is not laziness: it is the unprotected condition of colored women and girls. A Negro girl has little enough protection against the stranger in the streets, and when she goes into domestic service there is no

protecting law that follows her; she is entirely at the mercy of the honor of the white male members of the household, and bitter experiences have shown that in many, many cases *that* cannot be relied upon. Consequently, whenever a colored man can earn enough to barely keep his wife and daughters at home, he does so. The truth about the rapacity which the colored female has had to withstand will never be fully told; and if told, it would be incredible to most of those who had not first-hand knowledge of conditions. if one white female were outraged by a black man to every ten black females that are outraged by white men in America, the ninety millions would start a war of extermination against the ten millions. And yet the Negro is the one who has been advertised to the world as the rapist. What a powerful agent the associated press is! It can literally make black white and white black. White men own and operate practically the whole of the free press in this country. The Negroes with a few limited weekly and monthly sheets dare not speak the truth on this subject.

In spite of these hindrances the Negro has developed a large industrial class and some business organizations. The colored people have in the main worked willingly at whatever their hands found to do. Contrary to the popular impression, they have not rushed heedlessly away from lower forms of employment toward higher forms before they were prepared to do so. Many of them have left the farms, but not nearly in so large a propor-

tion as the white people of this civilization have left the farms. And besides the Negro had not only the normal industrial development but also abnormal conditions, political, civil and educational to drive him from the country.

The Negro is going forward also in business organizations, especially in those sections where prejudice is most unreasonable. Race prejudice is responsible for many a Negro drug store and other merchant businesses. The race is continually trying by indirect routes to get around the obstructions that are put into its pathway. Sometimes, as in the case of these business enterprises, it seems to reap a temporary benefit from the very fact of the existence of the obstruction. Therefore even some Negroes have made the mistake of crediting race prejudice with race prosperity,—which is about as logical as giving credit to war for general prosperity because it temporarily stimulates the iron industry and raises the price of shares in the steel corporation.

In the South as a whole, it is a fact, to be variously explained of course, but it still is a fact that the Negro laborer is preferred and that the white people would not substitute for him the laborer of any other race in the world.

EDUCATION.

The foundations of Negro education in the South were fortunately laid by generous and fair-minded people of the North and East, through church organizations like the Freedmen's Aid Society, the American Missionary Association and the Baptist Education Society, and through independent schools like Hampton and Tuskegee. Such organizations and institutions have created leadership for the race and made the education of the race possible; but if such organizations and schools were many times multiplied, they could not educate the American Negro. That can be done only by the public school, the biggest university of them all. These private efforts have created a leadership and made the public school possible, but the public school must do the job of educating the Negro. As a rule in these essays we are considering the Negro in his relations to the body politic, rather than in relation to any private interests. We wish to speak now especially of his public school education.

What is the "public school?" For it seems to be a prominent and permanent part of modern education, and like all human institutions it must have had a beginning and a sufficient cause for its instituting. We speak of "the public school

system," meaning sometimes the *machinery* of public education, but often alluding to the *type* of education as distinguished from that of sectarian and private schools. The Greeks were the first to develop a system of education distinct from theology and priestcraft, and they recognized at once the necessary two sides of a complete system in mental and physical training, which they termed respectively music and gymnastics. But altho the Greek and the later Roman systems recognized these two sides, still the Greek ideal was self-culture, while the Roman ideal was what we would call self-sacrifice, if that word were not too specific in its meaning, and so we will call it self-putting-forth or self-action. The Greek looked upon the soul and wanted an ideal man of well-defined principles and lofty virtues,—and then trusted the results of his action. The Roman looked out upon the world and wanted a practical man of efficiency and power to manage that world,—and trusted the fate of his soul. But no system of education is complete which does not consider both,—the *ideal* and the *opportune*.

In the Middle Ages there had grown up two educational institutions, the monastery and the castle, for the training of monks and knights, and learning was the jealously guarded privilege of the classes until Martin Luther did for education what Socrates is said to have done for philosophy,—brought it down from heaven to dwell in the huts of men. Luther contended that the child of the humblest peasant was entitled to the best

learning that his country could afford. That was a great step forward, for it had been thought that a book in the hand of the peasant would not be a torch but a firebrand.—But still this did not make a “public school:” it meant only that the peasant should not be forbidden; it was not yet the “golden rule” of education.

And thanks to the genius of the common people, when once they were admitted to membership, education got closer to real things and real life. Teachers began to develop maxims and principles: “Teach a thing first and then the reason for it,” said Ratke. There grew up a co-operative and mutually helpful companionship between theory and practice, learning and wisdom, the mother tongue and the other tongues. But there was still no “public school system,” except that the general public was nominally entitled to learn. Education was not a state concern, being controlled not by the statesman but by the priest and the pedagogue.

This was, however, a good foundation and preparation for the public school. With the growth of knowledge the spirit of freedom grew, and the spirit of freedom is the creator of the public school. Be it remembered to the honor of America that she was the first to reach the public school stage; for she was first to have the necessary cause,—*universal suffrage*. Universal education is as necessary to popular self-government as air is to life. New England recognized this early and established the “public school,” making it as vital

an interest of the community as war and real estate. We now reach what I choose to call the "golden rule" of education: not that any man may be schooled, but that *every man must be educated*. Education had been a private matter, to be had or done without according to the means or fortune of the individual—like an automobile or a diamond pin. The state had not been interested. but when manhood suffrage is attempted, either ignorance or intelligence must rule. Democracy is the condition of the public school and the ballot is its *causa essendi*.

At present all civilized nations, whatever their form of government, are interested in public education. A kingdom, like Prussia, may be in the front rank. Such government is democratic in spirit tho monarchic in theory. And the late advent of the public school into the Southern part of the United States was due to the persistence of slavery. Under the slave regime the state government was democratic in theory but oligarchic in spirit and in fact. This explains, too, the comparatively slow development of our Southern schools: they have suffered in the struggle of democracy against oligarchy. If the few are to rule, what is the need of universal education? Besides, the rule of the few is precarious under even the rudiments of popular instruction. But we have advanced somewhat with the general educational advancement: we have public schools maintained by the state and supported by public taxes; and public lands and certain fines have

been diverted to school purposes. The system has grown up through graded school and high school even into normal school and university, so that it is possible for one to acquire even the highest professional training under non-sectarian, civil authorities.

And how has the Negro fared in this battle of democracy and education against oligarchy and ignorance? He has been the objective position of much of the fighting; and his situation has been all the more critical because the forces on both sides have been not only in earnest but in many cases sincere,—some believing that he should not be admitted to full membership in the democracy and therefore not to the fullest education, and others believing that the destiny of democracy and education and even of Christianity depends upon their ability to meet the challenge of the Negro and take him in. All the prejudices and passions which the classes have always had against the advance of the masses were aggravated and enhanced against the ex-slave, who was not only of a different class but of a different race and even of a different color. This badged him to the very eye of the jealous civilization that surrounded him. His color had been the mark of enslavement and was taken to be also the mark of inferiority; for prejudice does not reason, or it would not be prejudice. If, for example, the slaves had been white but only five feet high, for generations afterward there would have been in this country a strong prejudice against all short people. This

element cannot be ignored if one would understand the development and the present condition of Negro education in the public and largely in the private schools of this country.

At first very few of those who opposed and not many of those who favored his education believed him really capable of much education, and so the debate was not interesting. As time went he took the question out of debate by demonstrating his capacity, and the opposition became more determined. It was argued that the Negro's educational advancement threatened the economic well-being of the South, that what this section needed was an unthinking mass of common laborers and farm-hands,—not artisans and farmers, mind you, but laborers and farm-hands,—and that education was spoiling this class. But it has been shown, not only in other countries like England and Prussia where the people are educated, but even in those parts of the South where the Negro is better educated, that an intelligent workman is better than a laborer and an intelligent, self-directing small-farmer is more economical to the state than a driven, irresponsible farm-hand. Besides, the more intelligent the working class, the more they want,—better shoes, better clothes, better houses and more comforts,—and the satisfying of these wants stimulates trade and lifts the general level of living. It pushes those who are up further up. When you raise the bottom of society you push up the top, you do not overturn it. In a democracy individuals will naturally find

their way from the bottom to the top, and inferior individuals will sink from the top toward the bottom. But this is the reason for democracy and the strongest argument in its favor; and there is but one way to prevent this, and that is to have no democracy.

Some say that the education of the Negro tends to pull him away from the farm and deranges the economic system of the South, and that the city Negro is not worth as much to the (white) South as is the rural Negro. These views consider the Negro in his relation to white people only as a commodity. Suppose we consider the city Negro from the standpoint of his own interests. Would it be better for the American Negro if all Negroes stayed in the rural districts and none went to the cities? The Negro as a whole has been advertised in his worst phase, but the city Negro, being under the whiter light of the centers of civilization, has had his baser and uglier traits more than exaggerated. Most of what the world has been told about him is half truth. Everybody knows that cities produce the most criminal Negroes, but few know that they produce the most intelligent; all have heard of the moral and physical disease and death, but few have been told of his admirable organizations to promote material, moral, and intellectual health; it is bruited abroad that he fills proportionately more of the prisons and convict stockades, but there is absolute silence about the fact that he supplies by far the greater number of teachers, professional and business men and

the more competent preachers. If he fills the city slums, he also fills the greater proportion of the best homes of the Negro race; if his life is shorter, it is more interesting; if he is weaker, he is wiser. Better 20 years of Atlanta than a century of the semi-slavery of the "Mississippi bottoms." As is true of all races, the height to which the Negro has attained is to be measured in cities rather than elsewhere. This is due to better educational advantages and to the fact that city life tends more to inspire independence of character.

Another argument which lends itself much more to passion than to reason, is that the advance of the Negro threatens race integrity,—that is, the integrity of the white race. But experience, which is the most reliable teacher in such matters, has shown that ignorance and weakness in the one race constitute a far greater danger to the integrity of both than intelligence and strength could possibly become. Put a poor, ignorant and defenseless woman in the presence of a rich, powerful and wicked man, and the only salvation for their races is to educate that woman and her race. Ignorance and weakness are fertile soil for bad fruitage. The white race can never be strong and intelligent in the midst of a weak and ignorant race. God never intended that a man should get entirely free from the character of his neighbors: he must always be in part at least what his neighbors are. If we are surrounded by weak and ignorant neighbors we are constantly tempted to cheat and

oppress them; sometimes we yield and sink. The most helpful environment that a strong man can have is to be surrounded by other strong men whom he can neither cheat nor wrong. The race is as the man.

But the economic and race-integrity arguments are aimed against the progress of the race in general, while there are some special charges against its educational progress in particular. It is charged that the Negro does not pay taxes; that education makes him more criminal and less useful; and that his inferiority in general causes and justifies the indifference and opposition to his education.

Does the Negro race pay taxes? Does it bear its share of the financial burden of state government? In the matter of tax-burden the just measure of a man's share is the measure of his ability,—and I have never heard that the officials of any state have even pretended to say that their colored people do not pay as taxes the same proportion of their possessions as the white race pays. This could not be otherwise, for white people assess and collect the taxes,—and it is generally understood that the Negro who owns real estate and other visible property, is assessed in a higher valuation than anybody else. If the man who owns a million dollars pays the same number of mills out of each one of those dollars as the man who owns one dollar pays out of his single dollar, the millionaire bears no greater burden of taxation than the man of a single dollar; and

indeed our new inheritance and income tax laws, in their graduated scale of assessments, recognize the truth that in such case the man of many dollars is not burdened as much as the man of few dollars. All of the widow's mite is more than a tithe of the rich man's hoard. In South Carolina, where the Negro child receives two dollars for its education to fourteen dollars for the white child, it was proven one year on the authority of white investigators that the Negroes paid by direct school taxation every cent of the money that was spent on their own schools and twenty thousand dollars of that which was spent on white schools.

That is direct taxation. But what about indirect taxes? Society has other ways of collecting taxes than by a visit of the tax-collector, and more people pay taxes than ever see the inside of the tax office. The great indirect tax, the most important tax-burden of all, is paid by every man who eats food, wears clothes and occupies a rented space upon the ground. A landlord with a hundred tenants is but a tax-agent appointed by the laws of society to gather the taxes of those tenants and turn the same over to the tax-collector. He raises rents or lowers wages in proportion to the taxes he must deliver to the state. The man who has the title to the property enjoys this vantage and honor; he does not bear the burden,—the worker and the consumer have the honor of doing that. If we count only direct taxes as taxes, the cause of the non-landholding element will be helpless and hopeless. Take our Southern rail-

roads: in proportion as the Negro uses them, in that proportion does he pay the company's taxes. But a white man hands the money to the tax-collector and gets the receipt, and it is recorded among white men's taxes. The Negro customer pays the merchant's taxes: the prices include both license and tax. Your very servants share your tax-burden. The man who blacks your boots help to pay your taxes: he pays the tax on the blacking when he buys it, and if the state would forgive you your taxes you would gladly pay him a dime where you now pay him a nickel. He pays through the merchant and through you. It is as impossible to live in the state and not pay as to live in the air and not breathe.

Does education make Negroes more criminal and less useful? If this were true, the Negro would be a contradiction to the experience of all mankind in all previously recorded history. And whoever makes the assertion should be required to prove the proposition beyond the slightest shadow of a doubt,—else we should continue to expect the same thing of the American Negro that is true in the lives of all the peoples of the past, namely, that they became better and more useful as they gained more knowledge of man and God. They have always fallen when they have forgotten God and oppressed their fellowmen. I will not beg the question by saying that education itself means making the man better and more useful, but I call for the facts. The records of our schools harmonize with the experience of

mankind: do the graduates of Negro schools furnish a bigger proportion in our state penitentiary than do those Negroes who have never seen the inside of any of these schools? No man is bold enough to affirm a definite thing like that, and yet men assert in a general way that education makes Negroes criminals. If there is a greater proportion of our colored population than of our white population in the state penitentiary, it is partially explained by the fact that it is easier for a Negro to get into the penitentiary than for a white man. Our white sheriff, white judge, white jury and white lawyers are so partial to the Negro who applies for admission to our penal institutions that they never want to exclude him, while in the case of a white man there is more deliberation, demurrer and objection. If you put black men into these official positions and give the accused white man a fair chance to get in, I dare say that within a very few months he would demonstrate his equality with the Negro in this important particular. In the case of the school it is easier for the white man and harder for the Negro to get in, and consequently there is a greater proportion of the white race on the inside. The law of least resistance is a partial explanation of these phenomena.

As to the question of usefulness the opposition also states its case in a general way, but coming down to specifications, are the untrained farmers and ignorant unskilled laborers of the Negro race more useful to the state than his business and pro-

fessional men, his teachers and the trained graduates of his industrial schools? I admit that an ignorant man may be more profitable to some individual employer who likes the advantage, but his ignorance is unprofitable and expensive to society as a whole. And when it is said that education "unfits" the Negro, perhaps it is meant that it makes him less fit to be cheated and abused. It makes him less fit for individual exploitation but more fit to serve the common interests of a civilized community. How long will some of our white people continue to think that a wasteful, shiftless Negro is a good economic asset simply because he will take kicking and "cussing?"

Again, those who are responsible for the poor schools, few teachers and scant appropriations, seek to ease their consciences and justify their ways by charging the Negro race with general incapacity and inferiority. There are seldom offered any definite facts in support of this theory. Sometimes it is said that Negroes do not deserve or appreciate any better opportunities and almost that they do not want them. In one of our largest Southern cities, when an organization of colored women went to complain against the barbarous treatment of their public schools, one of the officials met their complaint with the significant statement: "You have already gotten much more than you ever asked for." And so the impression exists that not only the Negro's needs but even his wants are inferior: that an uncomfortable and unequipped schoolhouse will do for the Negro

child, and that one dollar suffices for the Negro teacher where three or five dollars are needed by the white teacher. There is no surer way of destroying sympathy for a man who is being mistreated than by establishing the belief that the man himself does not care, that he is satisfied and incapable of appreciating better treatment. We feel different when the same thing happens to a man and an animal. But there is a commonsense philosophy which believes that men are more alike than different, that they are differentiated by the modifying influence of circumstances, and that they cannot be classified *a priori* from the color of their skins or the shapes of their noses.

Is not the inferiority of the Negro's educational status and progress amply explained by the inferiority of his educational advantages? Let us look at a recent annual report of the Superintendent of Education in the state of Alabama and see what it reveals concerning the Negro. There were more than 328 thousand Negro children of school age and about 399 thousand white children. In other words about half, or strictly more than 45% of the children to be schooled were Negroes. In the first place just six schools were provided for each thousand of these colored children, while twelve schools were provided for each thousand whites. The property valuation of the white schools was more than ten times the value of the Negro schools; the equipment on the inside of the white school was worth more than the land, buildings and all the total property of

the Negro school. If all went to school each Negro teacher would have 138 pupils, and each white teacher 56 pupils. But the Negro teacher is saved by the fact that the people are so poor and the schoolhouses so uncomfortable and inconvenient that only 41% of the colored children can attend, while 73% of the whites attend. The average salary of rural white teachers is about \$300,—the average of rural Negro teachers is less than \$150 a year. In our cities also the average salary of the white teacher with fewer pupils is more than double that of the Negro teacher with more pupils. The white schools have 20 times as many libraries as the Negro schools. The state has no higher education for Negroes; for the whites there is the university with colleges and normal schools. There are white high schools for over sixteen thousand pupils. The figures given for Negro high school grades is 1,476. All the agricultural and county high schools are white. All the school officials are white.

What a fearful thing it is to be a superior race! How much it costs to maintain that superiority! I almost believe that the Negro race would be tempted to retrograde into a superior race if it could get hold of the money, the machinery and the offices. To cope against an inferior race in education, a superior race must have more than ten times as much money, more than twice as many schools, two or three times as many teachers, 36 more of school days in each year, fifteen to twenty

times as many auxiliary books,—and all of the management and say-so.

The race which enjoys all the advantages of official position and emolument, should be scrupulously just if not generous to the cause of the race that has none of these advantages. It is said that the legislature in its annual appropriation counts all children, white and black, and votes the same number of dollars for each head. That is but half the truth; the more important half of this truth is in the apportionment of this appropriation. What earthly good is done the Negro child by being counted equal in the voting of the appropriation, if it is counted only one-tenth in the distribution of the funds? The Negro child simply helps the white child to get a few more dollars than the white child would otherwise get. One might as well try to justify disfranchisement on the ground that every Negro in the state is counted in the basis of the state's representation in Congress: the Negro population is counted to the advantage of the state of Alabama, but when the representatives are elected they are all white and represent white people. It might be better for the Negro if his share of the representation were disallowed altogether, for it only increases the power of those who oppose him. The equal count in the legislature will do the Negro child no good unless he is counted equal by county boards and local trustees.

Nobody will deny that in the payment of taxes and fines the Negro race in America is treated as

if it were absolutely the equal of any race. They are assessed and fined as much as anybody. To say the least they are given as long terms in our penitentiary and on our convict farms as any white man is given for the same offense. A people who are required to bear equally the burdens should be permitted to share equally the benefits of government. To get a given amount of education the Negro child needs at least the same amount of money as the white child,—for the black race can hardly be expected under the circumstances to be very superior to the white race. Equal sharing in school funds would be no favor to the Negro race, but simply justice: his direct taxation is proportionately as high as that of the white race, and his indirect tax is almost always higher,—for example, on almost every railroad in the South the Negro pays proportionately much more for what he gets than does the white man. Every landless Negro in the state is paying taxes for some one else, usually for a white landlord.

The South is now coming into the era of compulsory education. We believe in it with all our soul, but the reform will miss more than half of its great opportunity if it is schemed so as to leave out the Negro race; if the law is so worded that the proposition can be juggled in the case of a Negro child. If we want to be a civilized nation, we must civilize all the people; for we shall always be barbaric in proportion as we have an ignorant and barbarous population in our midst.

Vocational training is now occupying a large

place in the program of our Southern states. This is more fortunate for the Negro than even some of the promoters suppose. There is but one kind of education, and that is developing in a man his individual possibilities. But there can be no doubt of the value *right now* of vocational training for a race economically situated as the Negro race is in this country and having the industrial opposition which it has, and which in many instances must fight first to save its body in order to give its mind a chance. But when I speak in favor of industrial and vocational training I am not speaking in favor of the shams that are to be found in many of his schools. Saws and hammers and rulers hanging on the walls of some public schoolrooms do not always mean training of any sort, except training in the bad habit of wasting precious time. It is sometimes simply a game between the superintendent and the colored principal: the superintendent trying to graft another system on the already too meagre system of academic instruction, and the colored principal trying to satisfy the white superintendent without really doing the thing supposed. The chief sufferer is the helpless Negro pupil: in this sham battle between his superiors his chance for any sort of effective training is utterly lost. He not only fails to get efficiency, but he gets a bad moral lesson: he thinks he has found out that the way to manage white people is to keep them fooled. Surely our larger cities should maintain distinct courses, and if possible

distinct school buildings for academic and industrial work. And there should be special teachers for each class of work. Periods of handiwork might accompany all the grades, but serious vocational training should come after at least a good graded school education. This will strengthen the foundation, on which the student can build a better vocation; and at any rate a man should be a man before he is a piece in the world's machinery.

What is the Negro going to do about it? He must convince the white man that the education of the Negro is worth while; that it will not only not hurt white people but will help them. It is not enough to convince the well-disposed white man only, but the average white person. What is the white man going to do about it? We are all in the same boat, and when this civilization reaches its destiny we are all going to arrive together. The slower the machinery works in any of its parts, the slower will be our progress, and the later the day of our arrival at a more perfect social adjustment. The two races must see each other less as competitors and more as co-workers, more as fellow travellers on the road to destiny.

It is true that the untutored Negro has been useful to American white people: he has been the instrument by which they have felled their forests, drained their swamps, tilled their fields and piled their fortunes. Tho poor, he has made them rich. He has been no burden: in the name of God he has paid every cent of his "keep" with interest. On his back their civilization has been stable, and in

his hand their life secure. He was not objected to until he changed from an instrument into a co-worker.

For nearly three hundred years in America the Negro was chiefly an implement, the white man supplying the thought. Upon this historic relation is based the extraordinary question as to whether the free Negro should better be trained in mind or in hand. I will tell you which the American Negro needs more, his mind or his hand, if you will tell me which he can dispense with. It reminds me of a debating society which I once ran across in the backwoods of the Alabama "black belt," in which the subjects for debate on the regular meeting nights ran like these: "Which is the more useful to man, the steamboat or the railroad?" or "which is the more necessary to man, air or water?" It is hard for some white men to think of the black man other than as either a useful thing or a nuisance. They cannot conceive him as a thinking, self-active agent pursuing his own ends. As a free man he must put thought in front of his work and industry. He must think first and act afterwards. As a member of the body politic, instead of a mere tool thereof, he must cultivate the intellect, which is the guide both to the hand and to the heart. The intellect is the dynamo, the hand is the motor; it is also one of the eyes of conscience. The mind of man is his pathfinder in industry and in moral prudence: it is the most lordly and admirable thing in the human world. Nothing is great in the world but man, nothing great in man but mind. It has

searched the inscrutable past and prophesied the unsearchable future. It has delved to the center of the earth and mounted to the invisible star. It has taken the rocks of the earth as the pages of a ponderous book and has read therein the history of the prehistoric age and the records of a manless world. From the scattered bones of the solitary plains it has reconstructed, clothed in flesh and revived the ancestor of man and beast. With its daring hand it has caught the loud-threatening thunderbolt, tamed it and made of it a willing messenger. In its magic hand it catches the ray of light that has fled from the verge of the universe and compels it to "reveal the secrets" of its far-off home. Standing in the present it links the past and future, projects and extends the life of an individual man over milleniums of history, and it re-thinks the very thoughts of God.

FROM THE CHRISTIAN VIEWPOINT

"Whom the gods would destroy they first make mad." That is the method of inferior "gods" and devils. But whom the true God loves and whom he would make great, he challenges, he tries, he tests, he proves. The Negro race in America is God's high challenge and supreme test of American Christian democracy. Will it accept the challenge? Can it stand the test?

There are other tests which America has met and is meeting, but this is the supreme test. The question is not whether we can receive from foreign lands multitudes, who are of the same race and color as ninety per cent of our American population, and assimilate them to our civilization,—but here is a people who are a part of America's own history, speaking her language and knowing only her institutions, differing merely in race and color, or, to speak more truly, differing only partially in race and color,—and the question is: Can American Christianity and democracy cross this imaginary line, or is it easier to cross the ocean? Will the American religion be exclusive like Judaism, but without having as good reasons for its exclusiveness? Judaism could justify its narrowness on the deep grounds of national history and self-

defense. The best test of American Christianity is not whether we can send the most missionaries, count the most converts and spend the most money in India, China and Japan or even Africa, but what can we do and what are we doing for ten million Negroes in America. It is not whether we can preach brotherhood to all the world, but whether we can practice brotherhood in our neighborhood.

With neither hope nor intention of detracting from the glory and goodness of foreign missionary work, we say that the spirit of the Founder of Christianity is opposed to a sentiment which makes it easier to practice Christian brotherhood through the collection box, the mails and the missionary magazines than to practice the same across the street and over my neighbor's fence. The meek but fearless Jesus of Nazareth would have called such inconsistency the *ne plus ultra* of Pharisaism. The principles of Christianity are pre-eminently suited to a solution of our domestic problems. Its teaching is necessarily democratic; it was founded by a democrat. Whatever the outward government of the community, its Christianity must be a democracy,—a democracy of souls. It is a radical doctrine, and compromises are conspicuously absent from its fundamental teachings: Love thy neighbor as thyself — Love your enemies — The gain of the world will not compensate the loss of a soul—All nations are of one blood—and in that sheet which Peter saw let down from heaven there

were not only beasts and birds but toads and snakes.

Such is the doctrine that has proved to be of greater vitality than any other in the history of human nature. For nearly two thousand years it has met no condition or phase of society where it proved to be inapplicable. It includes Jew and gentile, Greek and barbarian; it began in the lowest ranks of society, but has long ago reached the highest. What will this simple doctrine mean if applied to American race conditions without adulteration? Let us consider its application: in Industry, in Politics, in the Church, and in our social relations generally.

There is need of a higher ideal of Christian brotherhood in the industrial forces of this country, not only as between employer and employed, but also between different groups of the employed, and especially between different race groups. In all industrial pursuits race lines should be obliterated. How can one laborer consistently or safely deny to another the right to earn his bread in the sweat of his face? Labor unions should be principled not on social equality but on the equality of labor. Christianity is utterly opposed to denying the black man the right to work in any sphere or calling for which he is individually fit: for if colored folk are brothers in Christ, why are they not also brothers in the machine-shop and the factory? Besides, it is against the interest of the labor unions themselves to exclude the Negro: if there is any need for the union of labor, there is the same need

for the union of all labor, white and black. When the black man is excluded he is made a strike-breaker and wage-reducer; he is forced into war upon organized labor, and the fact that this war is marked by the color line causes discord to grow between the races. Some shrewd and unscrupulous employers will foster race dissension in the laboring forces, and thus keep all labor as near as possible to starvation wages by the strategy of "divide and conquer." But the Christian religion, which was founded by a laborer and originated among the common people, should be the means of bringing the industrial element of the two races into closer fellowship and co-operation.

Christianity is opposed to any effort to restrict colored people to any certain sphere of employment, be that sphere high or low. Not all Negroes are fit to be lawyers, and not all Negroes are fit to be farmers. The Negro race has a varied genius, especially in America, where it seems to be a part of all other races; and it is uneconomic and wasteful of human energies to attempt to force any race into any limited number of occupations. The only sensible reason for engaging in any line of work is individual fitness. For the useful activities known to mankind, color neither fits nor unfits. The color line in work is not natural and the race test is artificial; and segregation on this artificial line, rather than on the natural basis of individual fitness, not only wastes human energy by keeping men out of activities for which they are naturally fit, but, as in the case of the exclusive labor union,

it sows the seeds of discord and postpones the day of race adjustment. And besides all this argument on the lower plane of industrial and economic welfare, we can say in a higher plane that Christ recognized the value and the rights of the individual, so that the whole circumscription, restriction and segregation idea is most cruelly unchristian.

The same logic and the same sense of justice should forbid "colored wages," as well as "women's wages." Workers should be rewarded for work, and not for sex or color. Wage discrimination on race and sex is a relic of barbarism, attesting the former enslavement of color and of women. When white workmen combine to compel the employer to pay Negro workmen a lower wage for the same work, they throw a boomerang: they force into the employer's hand a weapon to cut down their own wages, and they justify the Negro in accepting lower wages to secure employment,—all of which disturbs our interracial peace. And when the employer deliberately and of his own accord pays "colored wages," he not only commits legalized robbery against the Negro, but he lessens the motive to work in his white workmen who come to feel that the margin of extra pay which they receive is not for any extra work which they should do, but only the privilege of their birth and caste. He sows the dragon's teeth of discrimination and reaps repeated crops of demands for more privilege, more immunity, less work and more recognition of mere color. And he is constantly tempted to meet these demands in so far as possible at the

expense of the "colored wages." But what can be expected in the lower walks of life, if in the the United States Government, in some church organizations, religious societies and schools there are special salaries and fixed places for the colored co-laborer? Will not this tend to demoralize the youth of both races? They will see that the value is placed, not on individual worth and attainment, but on the accidents of privilege and caste, and they will feel in their hearts that our religious professions and democratic declarations are largely a sham. The white boy will strive less, thinking that striving for him is less necessary; the black boy will strive less, thinking that striving for him is in vain.

And now we come to politics. We are not talking about demagogism and petty trickery, but politics in the noblest sense of that honorable word. There are those who admit or concede that the Negro should have the privilege of work: that he should be allowed to labor in any industrial and some professional lines, to receive equal pay for equal work and accumulate property to any amount,—and still they say that he should not take part in politics. This position is inconsistent: half freedom is half slavery, half civilization is half barbarism, and an intentional half truth is a whole lie. These people assume the impossible: that there can be secure democracy in industry alongside of oligarchy and repression in government,—that the right of property is safe when the right of self-government is denied. They forget that

the power to tax is the power to confiscate, and that taxation without representation is tyranny and an irresistible temptation to legalized robbery. Is it not the purpose of votes to defend and advance the interests of those who vote? Can it be that people who would deny a man the means of self-defense and advancement would still be willing that he should be defended and advanced? But, they say consolingly, with the privilege of work and the accumulation of wealth the political rights will come. Will they? Do rights ever "come?"—or must they be gone after and repeatedly gone after until they are got? Has the accumulation of dollars brought political rights to the Russian Jew, or has it made him a richer prey for the oppressor and a quicker temptation to the leader of pogroms? Growing wealth without the capacity for self-defense is an increasing menace to the lives of those who possess it and to the character of those who covet it.

But when we speak of the Negro and politics there are some who always speak of reconstruction days; they talk fifty years behind the times,—as if the inevitable condition of the Negro fifty years ago were proof against the Negro of to-day,—as if the consequences of ignorance were an argument against undeniable intelligence. Does such a man not know that the Negro's condition has changed in fifty years, and that if he could even prove that the race should not have been enfranchised fifty years ago, the proof would have little bearing on the question of to-day? The present

unreasonable opposition to an intelligent Negro vote proves the wisdom of providence: providence foresaw that if the Negro were not enfranchised in the day of Sumner and Stevens, he could not be enfranchised in the day of Vardaman and Blease. The Negro cannot be normally included everywhere else and excluded from politics. And the brotherhood of Christ and the "Golden Rule" would deter any Christian group from placing such a heavy handicap upon another and taking such serious advantage.

Any attempt to exclude the Negro from politics and equality of citizenship could be defended only on some such assumptions as these: that the white race is so highly developed morally and spiritually that it can justly take absolute and unchecked control of another people, and that the Negro if admitted to self-government would make it worse for himself and others. But, indeed, the Anglo-Saxon race, which is somewhat new in the walks of civilization, has nowhere shown such superhuman capacity for self-control as is implied in the first assumption. Wherever it has been in control of other peoples it has proven itself thoroughly human, and it would be unfair to the destiny of the American white man to subject him to any such temptation. The second assumption is rendered unnecessary by the fact that the Negro can be admitted under fair, just and equal tests for his qualification. There should be no "grandfather" tests, —altho many of those who voted before the war were grandfathers to the present generation of

Negroes. The tests should apply, not to the conditions of a previous generation, but to the attainments of the present generation,—to the man who wants to vote and not to his grandfather. As to the severity of the test the Negro has no specification; whatever education or other attainable qualification the white race may feel able to require of itself, the Negro will not murmur if the same, no more or less, is required of him. Less than this no race with a sense of its own manhood and interests could ask. Less than this no Christian-spirited people would grant.

And we come now to the church itself. And by church here we mean everything there is to it: spiritual body, membership, organization, and whatever else the term may connote. If the Negro is to be counted as an equal in anything with which Christian people have to do, surely that equality should begin in the Christian church. But we find church leaders, some of eminence and influence, trying to twist the simple and straightforward gospel of Jesus Christ to the support of color-prejudice and race injustice. There is nothing in any religion that is clearer than the attitude of Jesus Christ on the relation of his church to all men and the universality of its principles and privileges. The true Christian church is the best authorized and the most inclusive democracy in the world. But there are not wanting among its leaders men who think behind the age, mediæval-minded men, who would make the pulpit the mouthpiece of Mammon and the church the citadel of privilege

and caste. Can the American church stand for righteousness as applied to the Negro in America? Or is it easier to cross the ocean and help the Negro in Africa, where Mammon and the oppressor have less objection? Jesus Christ would have made a parable on such weakness and inconsistency. If the church believes in itself it must believe in the black man in this country, for there is no possible interpretation of the teaching of Christ which would exclude the American Negro or any other race.

It has been hinted that church leaders do not find it easy to stand by the Negro outside of the church because they have not yet whole-heartedly accepted the Negro on the inside of the church. Some seem to think that we can be separated on earth but united in heaven,—or they take the attitude that the church is primarily a white man's institution and that the Negro is to be tolerated only in so far as will not seem inconsistent with what they conceive to be the best interests of that institution,—somewhat as the politician relates the Negro to state government or as the educational authorities relate him to the public school. If any church or religious organization takes this attitude toward the rising generation of American Negroes, it will seem hypocritical, it will lose them, it will fail,—and it will create about the most serious danger that our civilization has yet had to face. The Christian church which lays so much stress on the value and importance of the soul and relatively so minimizes the importance of every other thing,

even the human body, can have but one consistent attitude on the question of the degradation, segregation and "jim-crowing" of colored Christians.

And now we come to the phase of the question in which men usually deliberate with their prejudices and decide with their passions. But we believe that even this matter is amenable to reason and commonsense and to the principles of Christianity. Some say: We know that the Negro must work and that he should be secure in his property; that it is inconsistent and perhaps even dangerous to our own liberties to attempt to exclude him from the democracy; and that without him the church cannot really follow Jesus Christ; *but*, they conclude, we imagine and fear that the advance of the Negro threatens race integrity. Let us look this matter squarely in the face. We hold no brief either for or against race integrity: we do not now argue whether it is a good or a bad thing; for present purposes we can grant anybody's opinion on that question. We ask this question: Whatever may be the correct position in that matter, will not two educated, elevated, Christianized and mutually respectful races be better able and more likely to assume that correct position than two degraded, un-Christian and mutually hateful groups? If the Negro is civilized and Christianized he can be all the more readily brought to understand and agree to his proper relation to the white race, whatever that may be. To take the opposite view is to indict civilization and Christianity. The case may be without exact precedent,

but any other assumption contradicts commonsense and arises from unreasonable fear. Commonsense lighted by the torch of experience is our only guide in a new matter. And if we must proceed at times without experience, is not the kingdom of heaven of as much concern to the church as the distinction of race types? Is the salvation of the world of less account than the preservation of an aquiline nose?

The bases of co-operation are these: identity of interest, mutual understanding, mutual respect and mutual trust. As to identity of interest,—God never bound two races more firmly to the same destiny than the white and black people of this country: we are all in the same boat, and when we land we are all going to land together, however much we may delay the journey by mutual bickering and useless hostilities. And there must be mutual understanding: naturally misunderstanding destroys co-operation, and the failure of co-operation begets new misunderstandings, so that our mutual troubles chase each other in a never ending, self perpetuating cycle. When two differing parties come thoroughly to understand each other, in that moment do half of their differences dissolve, or rather are found to be non-existent and imaginary. To know each other we must cross the line,—or come near enough to it to shake hands and talk. And mutual respect will increase with mutual understanding: we cannot be just to a man whom we do not respect, for he will not let us,—he will resent disrespect and that will embitter us. But


mutual trust like a well-nurtured plant, will grow out of understanding and respect,—and on trust will blossom the flower of Peace!

But, think some, that means equality. Exactly! Equality in the truest and noblest sense of the word. The equality of manhood does not mean that you are as tall as I am, that you weigh as much, that you have as good health or that you can commit a dozen lines of Homer's Iliad as quickly. All men, as individuals, are unequal in those respects. But it means that you are as free to do what you *can* do as I am to do what I can do, and that we are equally accountable to the laws of man and the laws of God. There is no other equality worth the mention. This is the foundation of real friendship and lasting peace, and on such basis we can co-operate. But if we approach each other in different planes there will not be co-operation, tho there may be a more or less distressing *operation* of the one upon the other.

But perfect understanding, sound respect, mutual trust and ideal co-operation are largely a matter of growth. In the meanwhile what is our duty to each other? The Negro of brains and character must not only feel responsible for his individual conduct, but an interest amounting almost to a sense of responsibility for the rest of his race. It is not enough for him to say simply that he does not condone the criminals of his race and to abjure responsibility for their conduct: he must show an active interest in their reformation. For, whether or not as a matter of right, they do

as a matter of fact affect him. It is God's way of keeping us interested in the lower element, by weaving our destiny with theirs. On the other hand, it is not enough for the enlightened and conscientious white man to say, when others kill or degrade or plunder the Negro, that "they do not represent the best white South." The worst white South will help to make destiny for the best, in this world certainly, and I expect in the next; for before God we are all responsible to the utmost of our ability. The best white people of the South are therefore more responsible than any other single element, for they are the ablest and have the greatest circumstantial advantages.

Finally we aver our faith in the Christian religion and its fitness to bring these two races into a right and peaceful relationship. Christianity has met and overcome hard things in its history: the corruption of empires, the stubbornness of superstition and the night of heathendom. It has brought truer freedom and stabler self-government than the world has ever known before. It is the faith of the buoyant Negro race that this most vital of all reforming and informing forces will ultimately help us, white and black in this country, to lay aside the sin of prejudice that doth so easily and so sorely beset us and run with courage and endurance the race of civilization which God has set before us.



LYNCHING

The individual lyncher should be treated as a lawbreaker and murderer. But the ultimate removal of any such evil must come through the evolution of public opinion, the persistent combating of lies and the gradual bringing out of truth. No law and no executive can do away with such evils until these civilizing influences have done their work; but a good law and a strong executive are powerful elements behind this evolutionary process. They help along the evolution. But our purpose here, as generally in these essays, is to make the condition known. Our only apology is the fact that *conditions are not known* to the American public as a whole. Ignorance is the trench through which all this deviltry has sneaked up close to the very life of our civilization. The average American white man does not know how distorted, how absolutely false often, are the reports of the causes which lead to a lynching. If the average American knew, he would be opposed to lynching; else the average American is not human. If a man reads the press dispatches about the causes of lynchings and thinks he is reading the truth even in one case out of many, he is a novice, he is indeed very, very "green." If he should witness one or two such cases and then compare what he knows

with what he reads in the newspapers, he would be cured. These fabricated reports, however, have fashioned public opinion. The pitiful and almost helpless ignorance of this public opinion is shown by what the good white man will usually ask or say whenever he talks on lynching. "Well, why don't the Negroes stop committing crimes?" Think of the wisdom of that question! If some malignant power should decide that white people must be hanged and burned without trial until the white race "stops committing crimes," for how many thousand years do we suppose the hanging and burning would continue? Again we are asked, "Why do colored men keep on assaulting white women?" This question is asked in spite of the fact that all the evidence of a decade proves that such crimes are very exceptional, that criminal assault is not the cause of the lynching of Negroes, that only a small per cent of those lynched are even so much as charged with any kind of connection with women, and that in the South (as has often been found after the Negro was dead and buried); "charged" does not mean *proven*. One who lives in the South for many years where Negro men are in daily contact with the white race in private life, is impressed with the fact of how exceedingly rare it is for a colored man to impose in any way upon a white woman. But the few scattered cases are gathered together by the white press and hurled into the ears of the innocent outside world with great effect.

If only colored women could be equally safe in

the hands of white men! The writer has lived nearly all his life in the heart of the Southern South. In all of that time he never stood face to face with a case or personally knew of a case, in any of the many communities in which he lived, of a colored man committing assault upon a white woman. But in the same time and in the same places he knew of so many cases where white men forcibly outraged colored girls that he cannot now recollect or count them all. He knew of cases where colored men suffered violence for protecting the females of their families, and of a few cases of colored men who were forced to leave the community because they were vaguely suspected of intimacy with white women. But the average colored woman of the South thinks that our moral world is upside-down indeed when she hears that colored men are lynched for offering indirect verbal insult to white women.

The cause of lynching is not Negro crime of any sort. The temptation of the lyncher is the weak administration of the law when the Negro is to be protected and the helpless position into which the colored race is forced by disfranchisement and other forms of oppression. The ultimate motive is human greed and the desire to keep the Negro economically dependent. Lynching is one of the necessary products of the general repression of the race. In short, the Negro will be lynched and brutally handled by the lower elements of the white race as long as he is disfranchised and pushed down by the upper elements. The

one thing which the Negro's white friends and the more friendly statesmen seem not to understand, is that no people could be held in the position in which they wish to hold the Negro without being made the prey of the baser elements of the stronger race. It is hard really for even the best white people to tell just exactly what position they do want the Negro to occupy. But this seems true: that the majority want him down and under, but do not wish to brutally mistreat him in any other way,—they would not hang and burn him without law. They fail to see, however, that brutality and murder are the necessary sequel to their own finer forms of repression: if the better whites keep the Negro down, the inferior whites will take care of the hanging and burning. The only way in civilization to save the American Negro is to permit him to save himself,—to enfranchise him and give him otherwise a full man's chance in America.

We will give a few illuminating cases, the truth of which we learned in spite of the newspapers.—In one Southern town where we lived for a number of years, a Negro was brought in from a neighboring state to work in a new industry. He was an expert at what he was to do, and the management could not find a white man in the community who could do the work as well. His wages were accordingly above that of the white men. He was a genial fellow, was liked by the superintendent, but was the object of frequent petty insult from his fellow workmen. One day they

removed the dipper from the water-bucket so that he could not drink. The Negro complained of this, not in the presence of the men, but in the presence of the boy who brought the water. The boy told the men. They immediately began to threaten the Negro, one of them actually telephoning to the town for one of his friends to come out and help kill a Negro, saying that there would be "hell to play." This friend coolly announced to others what was going to be done and got into his buggy and went out. Meanwhile the Negro had gotten anxious for his own safety, and had brought back his revolver when he returned from noon lunch. When the mill closed and he was emerging from the door the white man and his friend, who had been drinking preparatory to the deed, opened fire on the Negro. The white superintendent testified that the Negro was shot in the hand before he took his own revolver from his pocket. But by good luck, and by virtue of not being alcoholic, his first shot killed one of his assailants and his second shot wounded the other. A clear case of self-defense, but the white men of the town rode out with dogs and guns, and the Negro was only saved by the fact that he fled, covering his retreat with his Winchester. For defending his life he had to leave his employment and his home.

But the local newspaper, anticipating the possible capture of this man, prepared in its very next issue a most perfect case against the Negro, in terms that would not only tend to justify but even to inspire his lynching if caught. The paper told

how the Negro had *sent* "insulting remarks" to white men who had done nothing to him, how these innocent white men had gone peaceably to this Negro to "talk" the matter over, and how the vicious Negro, without provocation, had jerked out his Colt's pistol and shot one of the gentlemen dead before the unsuspecting whites could even think of their guns, which, by the way, they only accidentally had in their pockets. Thus the local newspaper which controls the associated press dispatches, made out a most flagrant case of viciousness and aggression against the Negro. But for the Negro's immediate flight from the community and the Winchester which he was reported to carry with him, he would have been done to death before sundown, and good white men away up in Maine and Minnesota would have read their newspapers and said: "Too bad, too, too bad—but what are they going to do with such Negroes?"

Now for one or two little tales of horror from the northeast corner of Texas and from famous old Shreveport, La. These little stories are facts, not fiction; they did not happen "once upon a time" but most of them happened in the years of our Lord's grace, 1914 and 1915.

The writer lived for a while in the northeast corner of Texas. In the memory of men who had lived there for a quarter century no white man had ever been punished for shooting a Negro, altho the killing of Negroes by mobs or by individual white men is one of the commonest criminal occurrences of the community. The Negroes of this

locality are by no means backward or troublesome or criminal. The two best institutions of learning for Negroes in the state of Texas are located in this section. But in the county there are two blacks to one white. This causes the lower instincts of the whites to resent any, even the most legitimate, effort of the Negro to hold up his head. I have found it to be the rule in the South that more meanness and murder are done the Negroes wherever they are ambitious and outnumber the whites, causing a certain element of whites to feel that they hold their own position in the community by virtue of a fraudulent exercise of power.

One such white man was riding around to hire some "field hands," and came to a cabin where a young Negro lived and supported his mother. The young man informed him that there was no one there but his mother whom he supported and that he did not allow her to work in the fields. Whereupon the white man remarked: "She's no more'n any other damned wench!" The young man resented this insult by mere verbal protest, and in the ensuing quarrel and shooting scrape the white man was killed. When the mob had the rope over the limb of a tree, and all was ready to draw the Negro up and shoot him, they first gave him a chance to "speak," as he stood with hands tied behind him and the noose around his neck. Those witnesses who were unsympathetic with the mob, say that he began thus: "You are nothing but a lot of damned cowards! And this is what you call a white man's civilization, is it? Hun-

dreds of you with guns, ready to shoot one poor Negro with his hands tied behind his back, and simply because he defended his own mother and his own life——.” “Pull him up!” yelled the mob, who could not stand the sting of such words.

In this same community, a little colored boy was playing with white children. They all became fond of each other, and as children use, they kissed,—the little Negro boy finally kissing one of the little girls. These children were not old enough to be wicked or to understand the meaning of the color line. But they were observed by some older person. This child was advertised in the press as a “young Negro,” committing “assaults” upon little white girls. Finally he was taken in charge by a mob, marched through the streets of the little city toward midnight, and set on the top of a huge pile of drygoods boxes and other combustible material that had been assembled in a public place to burn him alive. It was so late and so far past his bedtime that the little fellow sat on top of the pyre and nodded in sleep. This phenomenon touched the heart of one member of the mob, who had little ones at home, and he suggested that the little “nigger” be not burned but be taught a lesson in some other way. Being persuaded to mercy, the mob simply cut off his ears and mutilated his body in other unmentionable ways and turned him over to his parents. One year later a black face was seen to be hovering at nightfall about certain premises where white women lived. He was watched, and

when he entered, the mob rushed in, seized him and mutilated his body in the same way in which they had mutilated the little Negro boy twelve months before. But when they brought in more light, the smut was seen to be rubbing off the victim's face. He was one of the young white men of the town. Not a word of this got into the associated press.

While I was in this northeast corner of Texas, so much hanging and burning of Negroes without trial was going on in the neighboring parts of Louisiana, in and around Shreveport, that I decided to go over there and find out some of those whispered things which colored people always know, but which they dare not tell in public. The following is what I discovered and wrote at the time, and which none of the newspapers to which I sent it, in or out of the South, found it profitable to print.

When one endeavors to find out the occasion, motives and method of any particular lynching, he is impressed with the difficultness of the task. This is due, first, to the fact that the white people who know about it are either too much interested or too indifferent to talk, and, second, to the fact that the colored people who know about it are afraid to talk. Fear makes the colored people more absolutely silent than guilt and indifference make the white people. Consequently the advertised reports are usually endorsements of the lynchers or excuses for them. Some colored men in Shreveport, La., tried to find out the facts con-

nected with some of the numerous lynchings in and around that city. A colored man teaches school in the locality where the aged and probably innocent colored man was burned,—and when asked to tell what he had learned about it, replied that the school superintendent for his county or parish had ordered him to keep his mouth shut and attend to his own business. Fear for his person and for his position reduced him to silence.

The following, however, was learned. A white storekeeper a little way out of Shreveport was robbed and murdered by unknown party or parties. Three Negroes were arrested on suspicion,—the suspicion being based solely on the facts that they were customers of the murdered man and that some of them were supposed to have traded at his place on the evening before he was murdered. Then an aged Negro was arrested,—the suspicion against him being based solely on the fact that he was acquainted with the white man and had sometimes done odd jobs for him. The little money of which the murdered man was robbed seemed to be a more tempting object of the mob's pursuit than was anything else, and for some reason the old man was suspected of knowing the probable whereabouts of the cash. A detective was jailed with the old man, and playing the part of another wronged prisoner he wormed himself thoroughly into the old man's confidence, but only secured from him a stout denial of any connection with or knowledge of the murder. This seemed to prove even to the sheriff that the old man was innocent,—for when

a Negro is arrested under such circumstances it is his innocence and not his guilt that must be proven. The sheriff is reported to have said: I believe the old man is innocent and I am going to take him to Shreveport and put him into jail there for safe-keeping, but, "you all can have those other three Negroes." Whether he said this or not, this he did: he took the old man to Shreveport and left the other three who were promptly lynched.

But the mob did not agree with the sheriff: the mob did not think that a Negro who had committed the awful crime of being arrested under suspicion of having known about the hiding place of the money of a murdered white man should be let off, —even if he seemed not to know. So after lynching the other three the mob marched into Shreveport, was joined by some of the gallant citizens of that place, broke into the jail, took the old man out, and in order to repay him for the extra trouble to which he had put them they gave him an extra-horrible lynching in the style of being burned alive.

Whether any of these men had any part in or any knowledge of the murder of that storekeeper, only God knows.

It is significant that a few days after the murder two white tramps, accompanied by a woman in male attire, were discovered in this locality. It is further significant that a few days after the Negroes were lynched another white storekeeper near Shreveport was similarly murdered. The real murderers had perhaps been encouraged by the ease with which their tracks were covered by

the blood of the innocent and helpless. What happened then? Again several Negroes were arrested on suspicion, for having lived in the neighborhood of the murdered man. Lynching was threatened, but as the attitude of the grand jury toward the previous lynching was still a little uncertain, the affair was postponed. Meanwhile detectives secured what they called good evidence that certain white neighbors had murdered this second man, but this evidence failed to convince the district attorney, and at last accounts the whites had not been arrested and the Negroes had not been released.

What will the courts do? Who runs the courts? Who elects the courts, and who will elect the next court if that court condemns those lynchers? We cannot fail to observe that the Negro is most peculiarly helpless where he is disfranchised.

The coroner, a Jew, is said to have reported that he saw some prominent Shreveport citizens emerging from the woods where the old man was burned, but not even the coroner has dared to make those names public. Some business men also admitted that they went out merely to see and enjoy the affair, but that they were not personally acquainted with any of the performers. It is evidently very hard to get evidence against a white man and very easy to get evidence against a Negro, —and yet the Negro has been given a reputation for hiding his criminals. A few nights after the murder of the second storekeeper a white girl was frightened by some one at night, and she said

that it was so dark that she could not see him, but that she *felt sure* that he was a "Nigger."

Another case. A white man was killed somewhere in the oil fields near Shreveport and several Negroes were arrested and brought to Shreveport. Late one night the officers were seized by a sudden humane inspiration that the Negroes ought to be taken to Mansfield for safe-keeping from mobs. Those who know Mansfield say that it is a great joke to take a Negro even from Shreveport to Mansfield for the Negro's safety. At any rate five miles out of Shreveport a mob was waiting, which took the Negroes and lynched them. The officers were not hurt.

Whether the officers knew of the presence of this mob, I do not know. But I do know that most of the Negroes who are lynched in the South to-day pass conveniently through the hands of the law into the hands of the mob. For some reason mobs prefer not to capture Negroes themselves, but to wait until the officers have arrested, disarmed and tied the Negro or cooped him up in jail. This not only undermines the mob's respect for law, but it undermines the Negro's confidence in the officers of the law,—so that there is surely coming into the hearts of sound, sensible, peace-loving colored folk in the South a conviction that in all cases of color-line troubles the officer is but the agent of the mob. This is a planting of "dragon's teeth!"

It is seen that none of these seven or eight murdered Negroes had done any kind of personal wrong to any woman. Readers of the *Crisis*,

which has become the most reliable authority on American Lynchings and other color-line questions, must be impressed by the small proportion of mob victims in any year who have done or who have even been suspected of doing any wrong to women. Beyond a doubt, if the editor of the *Crisis* could learn the particulars in each case, even that small percentage would be greatly reduced. The term "rape" has been greatly widened in the mind of the South where a black man and a white woman are concerned. The same term has been greatly narrowed in its meaning when a white man and a colored girl even in her earliest 'teens are concerned. In the case of the black man and the white woman every possible relation that involves a matter of sex is covered by the word "rape."

Shreveport furnished a good example in the middle of the year, both because of the unprovable nature of the case and because of the savagery attending the lynching performance. It seems that a colored boy, of whom no one reports any previous wrong, was the janitor in a local theatre. A white girl was the ticket-seller. One morning before ticket-selling time the girl came in while the boy was cleaning the floors. They quarreled about something. Those who know say that the boy and girl were friends, and that it was only a friends' quarrel in which the girl was the aggressor. She was evidently the aggressor, having gone in where the boy was at work. Some say that the quarrel was overheard, others say that she reported it. At any rate the boy was arrested and

jailed for rape. A great crowd of men, women and children gathered in the midday, nobody wearing a mask. A few officers were there to protect the crowd but evidently not to interfere with the performance. By accident, of course, the jailer had placed the boy in a cell by himself and conveniently located so that no other prisoners would be released with him. And by accident again, the mob battered in the jail walls at the very spot where this cell was located. In their zeal some cut his face, stabbed him in the back and made him a bloody spectacle before he was led forth at the end of a long rope. It seemed that some ferocious wild beast had been captured. They led him to the most prominent city square, and tied him to a telegraph pole near the court house, the temple of justice. There he was further cut and tortured, while the women and children jabbed him with their umbrellas and spat upon him, till he died.

The next thing on program was to be the burning, but a severe rainstorm prevented this. A few days later one of the police officers was heard to do himself credit with this remark: that it was he who really forbade the crowd to drag the body through the streets and burn it,—because he did not think it would look nice before the women and children.

It is plain that those spectacles are degrading our white people and embittering our colored people.

This is the truth as best I could discover it at the time. But who is going to tell the truth about

such matters? Truth is powerful, but not when it is unknown. Undiscovered gold has no market value. It would make a great difference in America if only these things could be rightly reported and represented. For white men and black men are alike human, and the truth would influence them. But the telling of the truth is not a profitable business for any paper now. It will have to be done largely as a missionary work, as a philanthropy. through some such organization as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and its organ, the *Crisis*. It will have to be paid for largely by the Negroes themselves, but by white people also. On the race question the average newspaper does not take up the facts and draw the necessary conclusion from those facts. That is ordinary logic; but logic does not work that way on the Negro. Just as there are colored schools, colored churches, colored cars and colored wages, there is also a colored logic, which interested parties use when they reason about the Negro: in which they take the conclusion first, and then go hunting for facts that are agreeable to that conclusion. There is need of organized propaganda to make the truth known along the color line. The best protection of wickedness is the darkness, its worst enemy is the light.

THE ULTIMATE EFFECTS OF SEGREGATION

From a moral point of view the Negro question is the most important question before the American people. And in the long run the morale of a nation will be chief among the factors of its destiny. In none of our problems is there more need of the scientific spirit, which seeks the facts, all of the facts, and faces the full meaning of those facts, regardless of prejudice or preconception.

One of the greatest defects in the reasoning of many who have dealt with this problem is the lack of adequate knowledge of the Negro's real interest, motives and opinions. On this question it is very probable that colored people know the opinions of white people much better than white people know the opinions of colored people: The Negro reads the white man's opinion in the daily, weekly and monthly press; he hears it reiterated in the debates of Congress and in a dozen state legislatures; he hears the white man talk much oftener than the white man hears him talk. The inevitable result is that the Negro knows his own opinion and the white man's too,—while the white man as a rule knows only his own opinion. This lack of contemporary knowledge concerning the Negro causes many white speakers to appeal to far-

etched evidence, even to the foreordainments of providence: ever since my childhood I have heard it said that providence ordained the Negro for such-and-such a destiny, and that God created the Negro to be so-and-so. I learned later that the creation antedates all history and all human experience, so that its facts and motives are inadmissible evidence. My faith has been further shaken by the gradual discovery that those who quote providence are almost without exception the Negro's most active enemies,—and the Negro should be very suspicious of a providence that reveals its will concerning him only to his enemies.

In our present discussion we aim to state plainly the ultimate meaning of segregation and discrimination in the life of the American Negro; and we make less appeal to providences, which we understand not, than to the evidences of our senses, and to the ordinary everyday arguments of justice and humanity.

THE NEGRO OPPOSES

Jim Crow Cars,
Residential Segregation,
Civil Service Segregation,
Separate School Laws, in large Nothern cities
with large Negro population,
And Laws Forbidding the Intermarriage of
the Races, in places where such prohibition
has not heretofore been established.
And finally, the Negro wants full, voting
citizenship.

How many of the Negro's friends know the

motives behind his attitude? I admit that I have great patience with those who are shocked at his position on the intermarriage question, and that is just why I shall state plainly the motives which hold the Negro to this position, so that his sincere friends may judge for themselves whether there be any justice in his contention. I have learned through my acquaintance with some of these friends that the shock which they feel arises not from the Negro's real motives, which they know not, but from motives which their own imaginations postulate in the Negro. I have even seen some shocked in the opposite direction when they first saw the thing from the Negro's standpoint.

*1. In the
regard*

But first as to separate railway cars. The Negro opposes them, and the real motive of his opposition is wrongly assumed to be a desire to ride with white people. The fact is ignored that on every separate car system white people are given superior accommodations and black people are given inferior accommodations. Reverse the conditions and black people would prefer to ride with black people,—and some white people would too. In Europe there are first, second and third class accommodations on the railroads. In America the difference between white and black accommodations is often as great as the difference between first and third class in Europe,—but in Europe the fares are as different as the accommodations, while in America the fares are the same. Now let an American white man imagine that in Europe he is compelled to ride in third class but

to pay for first class, while all other travelers, even yellow and black, are admitted to first class for the same fares. When he opposed this arrangement as legalized robbery, what a joke it would be for the yellow and black folks to ask, "Why do you want to get away from your own people?" The truth is, he would want to get away from that injustice and carry all of his "own people" away with him.

But suppose the Negro were given absolutely equal accommodations, what then? That would be a decent supposition if human nature and all of the facts were not against it: nowhere in the whole separate car system has there ever been systematic equality of accommodations. In the majority of cases colored men and women are put into one end of a smoker, not always fully screened off from smoking white passengers. This is just as if the law required white people and black people to pay three dollars for each pair of shoes, but allowed the merchant to sell the Negro, for his three dollars, shoes that were worth only one dollar. In that case a merchant with a large Negro trade could afford to sell to a hard-to-please white customer shoes actually worth more than the three dollars which he paid. The Negro would pay the difference. The passenger in the "jim crow car" supplements the luxury of the "parlor car,"—and the same principle of indirect robbery pervades the whole system of jim-crowism and segregation in public conveniences.

This glaring financial and material injustice

makes it hardly necessary to mention the Christian-democratic argument. But if a people were singled out from among all the other peoples of the world for public stigmatization, that people could hardly be expected to accept it cheerfully even on a plane of absolute equality. An insignificant right becomes important when it is assailed: you do not much value your right to walk the streets bare-headed, but you would claim the right if it were denied. If such a right were successfully denied, the more vital rights would be exposed to attack.

Now, as to segregating Negroes into restricted areas of our cities. Why are Negroes not willing to live by themselves? To live by themselves would be more comfortable for the Negroes, all other things being equal. But there's the "rub:" all other things are not equal and will not be, wherever segregation opens the door and lays the temptation to inequality. To make segregation just, conditions would have to be equal; especially would the Negro's representation in the government have to be made consistent with his ratio of human interests: to make segregation impartial in Mississippi every other alderman or commissioner should be a Negro, every other governor, every other legislator, every other tax officer, and by all means every other member of whatever board or commission might have charge of public improvements. We speak now of segregation by law; segregation *in fact* has existed since the day of the "slave quarters." Since emancipation this segregation has been more or less continued by buying out the

Negro, outwitting his ignorance, and even by violently forcing him out. But against this economic and brute-force opposition the Negro had hope, based on at least a fighting chance. He could "fight it out on this line," if it took generations. But the opponent, in spite of his overwhelming advantages in the struggle, has appealed for laws that will eliminate the Negro from the contest altogether.

And why does the Negro oppose legal segregation? Because a generation of experience has taught him the meaning of successful segregation: a general absence of improvements in the Negro sections,—sometimes no pavements, no lights, no sewers, and no police protection against brothels and saloons. The Negro section is equally taxed: They must pay taxes on all the city improvements and bonded indebtedness. This injustice is similar to that imposed by the jim-crow car, for the Negro is constantly paying to improve other people's property. If he could live on any street anywhere, this discrimination would be impossible; but legal separation is a devil which drags in its tail a host of petty discriminations. Some fail to see the difference between segregation by law and the actual segregation which already exists in all cities where there is a large number of Negroes. But there is a vast difference: under the present system the Negro has at least one chance,—he can persuade the authorities to improve his section, to provide lights, sewers and police protection; for in order to *persuade him* to stay where he is, they

must make the necessary improvements at least. But if he be shut in by the bars of legislation he will lose the advantage of even this mutual *persuasion*.

To ask the Negro to accept this ghetto and do these things for himself, would be a capital joke if it were not so serious a matter. The Negro could only do that if his section were set apart as an independent municipality, with its own mayor and government and the control over its own taxes,—and this will not be allowed. But, says the opponent, the law is just and equal and constitutional, is it not? It does not discriminate: it says that blacks shall not move in where there is a majority of whites, but it also says that whites shall not move in where there is a majority of blacks. That is constitutional in letter and equal in phraseology, but I believe it is unconstitutional in spirit and I know it is unequal in effect. The effect of a law and not its rhetorically balanced phrases, should be the test of its constitutionality. It may be literally constitutional to make a law that the rich shall not lend to the poor, nor the poor to the rich,—that the intelligent shall not teach the ignorant, nor the ignorant the intelligent. It should not make a law constitutional to thus simply convert its terms in successive phrases. The segregation law *in effect* means that those who have no homes shall not acquire homes of those who have homes; and aspires to constitutionality by adding that those who have homes shall also not acquire homes of those who have them not. The segregation

law is an effort to keep the Negro and the white man where they *now are*; but it always looks suspicious for the fellow who has a tremendous advantage to try to make a hard and fast law to forever maintain the *status quo*!

As to civil service segregation. The Negro's opposition to this type of discrimination, which is new, is not based directly on experience; but is based indirectly on his experience with other forms of segregation. But his reasoning by analogy is being justified: in the Carolinas, as soon as it proved possible to segregate the Negro railway mail clerks, on one line they were given the hardest runs and put on mostly at night; when bathroom segregation appeared in one of the departments at Washington, it proved convenient to assign the colored women a toilet that faced the one assigned to white men. Nowhere in this country have the results of segregation inspired the Negro with the hope of a "square deal."

The undermining of the democratic foundation principles of a great government may be even more serious than the injury done the Negro in particular, but in this discussion we are taking up only the Negro's independent case against segregation policies.

The separate school and intermarriage questions come up chiefly in Northern communities where there is not yet a rigid opinion on these matters. Let us feel, if we can, as if we have no interest in the whole matter and are now examining the Negro's side of it for the first time,—not what

others said about him, but what the Negro says for himself.

The Negroes in Northern communities are generally opposed to the separate school idea and face the usual accusation that they "do not want to associate with their own people," which ignores the more positive reason which the Negro himself advances,— the universal temptation and tendency of the school authorities to degrade the Negro schools wherever they have been successfully segregated. The separate system prevails in the South, and in many of those states the neglect of the Negro school is a disgrace to civilization. Besides, there is perhaps not a state in the Union, certainly not in the South, with a segregated school system which gives the Negro an absolutely equal chance for public education. The legislature may determine the amount to be appropriated by a per capita reckoning including black and white, but when this appropriation is expended the Negro child may get only one dollar out of eight or ten, on the same per capita basis. By having been accounted equal for appropriation purposes he has helped the white child to a per capita expenditure that is higher than the per capita appropriation. I heard a state supervisor of education say to Negroes that whenever retrenchment was necessary the Negro's share was always trimmed down first. He said that the white officers dislike to do this, but he defended it on the plea of "human nature." Perhaps the Northern Negro who opposes the separate school movement, has reckoned on

this same *human nature* and has little hope that mere geography will modify it. He knows that where black and white attend the same school this discrimination is forever impossible. The Negro pays an equal rate of direct school taxes, and where other forms of discrimination exist, like jim crow cars and exorbitant rents, he pays a higher indirect tax. A man may pay a tax without knowing the tax exists: the buyer pays the seller,—the consumer pays the retailer. Besides, a percentage paid out of poverty means more as a sacrifice than the same percentage paid out of wealth. By the law of marginal utilities, ten per cent to the possessor of a few hundred dollars may mean more than ten per cent to the possessor of thousands.

Cincinnati, Washington and St. Louis have the best separate schools for the Negro in the United States, and it is significant that the percentage of attendance of colored children at these schools is lower than at the mixed schools of Boston, Cleveland and New York. The percentages of attendance of Negro children from ten to fourteen years of age are these—

In the segregated school: Cincinnati, 93.1; Washington, 90.5; St. Louis, 89.4.

In the mixed schools: Boston, 95; Cleveland, 94; New York City, 93.1.

These figures made from the United States Census, indicate at least that even the best separate schools are unfavorable to the attendance of colored children. The figures for divisions and states show that the percentage of the Negro's school

attendance is higher in the schools that are open to all than in the segregated schools. It is not to be supposed that colored children simply enjoy going to school with white children, where in fact they are often woefully ostracized, but it is rather to be supposed that the white school attracts colored people for the same reason why it would attract any people, because of its superior location and equipment. The low public school attendance of colored children in the South is largely due to the inconveniently located and miserably equipped school houses.

And now we come to the most interesting question of all,—the one on which more passion is felt, more opinions expressed and less investigation and thought are put than on any of the others. Why under heaven do Negroes oppose laws forbidding white to marry colored and colored to marry white? Is it not simply because the Negro wants to marry a white person? Some say, the Negro may be right on other questions, but surely he is wrong here: this law cannot possibly discriminate, it always concerns both a white and a colored person, and squares absolutely with the 14th and 15th amendments. Let us see if the Negro has any decent motive to state for himself. The literal constitutionality of such a law must be admitted; it would also be constitutional to make a law to hang children of six years or to grant divorces for poorly prepared meals,—but it would not be humane or wise. It would be a mad legislature that considered only the constitutional-

ity of a bill; bare constitutionality is no proof of its wisdom, its morality or its justice. The ultimate test of a law is its effect,—and the Negro claims that the effect of a law forbidding intermarriage is to lower the status of colored women, without raising the status of white women, and that it protects and fosters miscegenation and bastardy. Such a law promotes the very thing it intends to defeat, race intermixture, by giving perfect immunity to the men of the stronger race. It is natural and logical to ask—Does it not give like immunity to the men of the minority race? No. For not since the foundation of human society has any serious problem existed between the men of a weaker and the women of a stronger group. The weak are never tempted to impose upon the strong, and a prohibition of marriage simply further protects the strong in its impositions upon the weak, by nullifying the traditional rule of objective morality which compels the man to accept his mate and acknowledge his offspring. The intermarriage law is in effect a discrimination against the women of the weak. And wherever any race is ninety millions and rich and powerful, while another race is ten millions and poor and disadvantaged, the case will be the same.

The constitutionality of a law, I suppose, can be taken care of in its phraseology, but its wisdom and justification must exist in the conditions to which the law is to apply. This is the special nature of laws intending to regulate the relations of a stronger and a weaker group; for here the

actual conditions, the laws of human nature and the laws of relative power must be figured into a fair equation. It is said to be one of the worst methods of partiality and injustice to deliberately treat unequals as if they were equal. A color-line law is not fair simply because it has "black" written into one phrase and "white" written into the homologous part of the next phrase. It may be unconstitutional in spirit and effect. To show the insecurity of mere verbal equality: if the weaker race were put temporarily in charge of Congress it might think out a law on this very question of miscegenation which would be absolutely "constitutional" in a literal sense and yet bear harder upon the stronger race—for example, "Be it enacted that when a white child is born into the colored race, or a black child is born into the white race, the father of such child is to be immediately hanged." Such a law would not hang one Negro in a hundred thousand, and I know communities, *where the Negro does not vote*, and where such a law would be so unpopular as to be overwhelmingly defeated in a referendum. Why would a law to hang the father work a special hardship upon the white race? Because it would be based on the false assumption that white men in general sustain the same relation of innocence to colored women which colored men in general sustain to white women. Why, then, is a law forbidding intermarriage unjust to the colored race? Because of the unfair assumption that colored women are as well protected against

the lower instincts of whites as white women are protected against the lower instincts of blacks. And "there is no greater inequality than the equal treatment of unequals."

The primary motive of the black man is not a desire for a mixed family but for the protection of his own colored family. He believes that a law to compel fathers to marry the mothers would break up more miscegenation in a week than a law prohibiting marriage will break up in twenty-five years. This motive is proven by the fact that the Negroes who oppose the prohibitive laws are already married, and would not consent for their children to get into the trouble which it costs to marry a white person in America, legally or illegally. Again the Negro's contention is supported by the United States Census. Listen,—in forty years the mulatto part of the population has increased

In Michigan, where there are no laws against intermarriage, 48 per cent,

In Arkansas, where there are strict prohibitive laws, 559 per cent.

It is further noticeable that in Indiana, just over the line from the South and where a considerable sentiment is prohibitive of lawful relations, the increase of mulattoes was still only 107 per cent,—while in South Carolina, where strict law is added to the most violent sentiment, the increase was about 383 per cent. In whatever way the figures for mulattoes are manipulated, they always tell the same story:

namely, that there is more miscegenation in those states which degrade their colored women by laws forbidding intermarriage than in the states which offer equal protection to all women. This appears whether we consider the mulattoes in the rate of their own increase or in their increasing proportion to the whole Negro population. The law seems to help the violator of "race integrity;" for the mulatto is not a theory, he is a fact. According to these figures, while one mulatto is being added to a given number of Negroes in Michigan, about twelve mulattoes are being added to the same number of Negroes in Arkansas. And the still more impressive consideration is, that the one mulatto in Michigan may be legitimate, while the twelve mulattoes in Arkansas must be illegitimate. Which would civilization choose? Which should the opponent of miscegenation prefer? What is the difference between Michigan and Arkansas? In Michigan the man of the stronger race is faced by at least the legal threat of compulsory intermarriage, if he crosses the line, while in Arkansas he is so far protected by law. I ask in the most solemn earnestness, might it not prove more sobering to a white youth to be directly told, "You would have to marry your colored associate,"—than to be indirectly informed that he will have immunity in that case?

We have purposely confined our discussion to the Negro's vital interest in this question, and have avoided its wider phase,—the revolutionary, or the devolutionary, idea of taking marriage, the

most honorable institution of the human species, and putting it on a legal plane with fornication, adultery and all the other most horrible sins catalogued in the Old and New Testaments. Such a subversion of objective morality may have far-reaching consequences, indeed, in which white and black will reap equally.

These are the opinions and the arguments of practically all of the most intelligent Negroes in the United States, many of whom I know personally, and if they do not convince the race's avowed enemies they should at least cause the impartial to believe that the real motives are not what they are popularly said to be. The intelligent Negro, in his arguments against segregation and discrimination, seldom sinks to the level of mere "social equality" consideration.

Finally, is the reason not now apparent why the Negro wants to vote? Is he after "black supremacy" in a country where his ratio is one to ten and growing less all the time? Segregation and discrimination are a sufficient justification of his desire for the ballot; these evils get their greatest support from disfranchisement, and they vary directly as the Negro's unjust exclusion from participation in self-government. A minority group in a democratic-republican form of government needs the ballot more desperately than the majority group needs it. It is unfair to expect a white administration to protect the Negro when the Negro has been stripped of his only power to support or check that administration. Neither

first

education nor money will settle the question without the ballot: for a ballotless group cannot command the resources of public education, and a subject and helpless class by growing richer only endangers its life by becoming a more tempting prey to any powerful oppressor. The officers of the law could not, if they would, be impartial to a decitizenized people: the elected are obligated to the electors. A disfranchised group could fare much better under hereditary independent rulers than under elective obligated officers. The very advantages of a democracy make disfranchisement therein the worst of tyrannies. This principle will be true as long as human nature is human and not divine. The only way to insure the Negro against injustice in other particulars is to remove the most effective defense of injustice,—discriminatory disfranchisement. The Negro does not object to impartial disfranchisement, incident upon a failure to meet prescribed and attainable qualifications; the white man may prescribe a college education, if he deem it reasonable and make it impartial. Besides, the white population outnumbered the Negro population ten to one, and according to the census it is outgrowing the Negro population by immigration and natural increase; so that the statesman does not have to look out for "white supremacy,"—the history of three hundred years has already looked out for that. What the statesman does need to look out for is justice to the Negro and the avoidance of national moral degeneration because of injustice to the Negro.

Impartial suffrage cannot mean "black supremacy" in America, but would mean healthier self-government by giving the Negro here and there a better chance to speak for himself and locally to defend his nearest and dearest interests. Suppose the Negro should be given his full ratio in the Congress of the United States: at present there would be one Negro congressman to nine white congressmen. What could the white lose? Nothing. They would still have the vote and the real power. But what would all gain, white and black alike? The blacks would gain voice, hope, a high sense of American justice, patriotism,—civilization. And the white would gain a sounder knowledge of the Negro's condition, needs, thoughts and aims, so that on bills affecting the interests of the Negro race the white majority would vote more wisely than it now votes. One of the greatest handicaps to our mutual adjustment is the American white man's general ignorance of the Negro race.

THE NEW NEGRO

What I aspired to be,
And was not, comforts me:
A brute I might have been, but would not sink i' the scale.
—From Browning's "Rabbi Ben Ezra."

The "new Negro" is not really new: he is the same Negro under new conditions and subjected to new demands. Those who regret the passing of the "old Negro" and picture the "new" as something very different, must remember that there is no sharp line of demarcation between the old and the new in any growing organism like a germ, a plant or a race. The present generation of Negroes have received their chief heritage from the former and, in that, they are neither better nor worse, higher nor lower than the previous generation. But the present Negro is differently circumstanced and must be measured by different standards. He has not less fidelity to duty than had the old Negro: the present Negro soldier is just as true to his uniform, his flag and his country as was the old Negro slave to his master's family. He is not more indolent: certainly the present Negro does a great deal more of voluntary work than did the Negro slave. He is not as much more criminal than the old Negro as his criminal *record* would seem to indicate: the present Negro gets into jail for offenses and

charges for which the slave received thirty-nine *unrecorded* lashes. Besides, a repressive attitude toward a man in freedom subjects him to worse temptations than a bond-slave is subjected to. Furthermore and quite as important as anything else, there has been some change of attitude in the white people among whom the Negro lives: there is less acquaintanceship,—less sympathy and toleration than formerly.

The average white man of the present generation who sees the Negro daily, perhaps knows less of the Negro than did the similarly situated white man of any previous generation since the black race came to America. This lack of knowledge has a fearful influence on the judgment: it is both history and psychology that where knowledge is wanting, imagination steps in. What naive explanations men once gave of natural phenomena, what odd shapes they ascribed to the earth, and what erroneous proportions and fanciful relations they imagined among the heavenly bodies. The most serious handicap to the creation of a wholesome public opinion on matters affecting the Negro, is the ignorance of the better class of white people concerning the better class of colored people who live in their community. They often know the other classes: the servants through their kitchens and the criminals through the newspapers. In a large Southern city lived the most experienced Negro banker in the United States, with his bank, for twenty-five or thirty years; but, excepting the few bankers and others with whom

he came into business contact, practically the whole group of intelligent white people in that city were ignorant of the fact that this Negro existed. In another Southern town of seven thousand people, half white and half colored, an elderly, cultured, Christian white woman, who had lived there all her life, did not know that the Negroes were not given a public school building by her municipality, and had supposed that a primary school for Negroes which had been maintained by a missionary society for thirty or forty years, was the Negro public school. From an old Maryland community a young Negro went out, got an education in some of the best schools, took a course in theology at Yale, and then returned to that community to pastor a church. He worked with great energy, aroused his people to build a fine new church, and awakened so much enthusiasm in the colored masses that finally some inklings of his success trickled in behind the ivied walls of an old mansion where lived two wealthy white ladies of the "good old days," when the Negro was so much better than he is now, as they could well testify from the superb character of the "black mammy," now dead and gone, but who had been for many years an indispensable part of their household conveniences. Hearing of the fine new building, for the first time in their lives they decided to attend the dedication of a Negro church. On learning the name and antecedents of the young pastor they found him to be the son of their be-moaned "black mammy,"—him whom they sup-

posed had long since gone to the dogs, whither their daily newspapers were saying all the young and aspiring Negroes were bound. The mother had been a "member" of their family, but the son had struggled against poverty and prejudice, had got his education and done his work without any encouragement from them, without even so much as their confidence or their knowledge. How can a people so hedged about by tradition and handicapped by prejudice "know the Negro" as he now is, even though they be good people and knew him as he once was?

Not only does this ignorance of the Negro prevent many white people from sympathizing with his condition and struggles, but it does a mischief more positive than that: it prepares them to believe any charge of crime or viciousness or depravity which may be brought against the race. They will not analyze the evidence. If it is said that in proportion to their population there are four or five times as many blacks as whites in a Southern penitentiary, men will conclude at once, without thought or investigation, that such is the ratio of the criminality of the Negro and the white man. They overlook the multitude of other differences which may account for this difference in criminal statistics: the poverty, the ignorance, the homelessness and helplessness, and the very sort of prejudice which they themselves are substituting for thought. The ease with which a Negro can be lynched in the South should make them know how much more easily he can get into

the penitentiary. Another thing that largely accounts for the Negro's superior numbers among the prisoners: most Southern states allow the discretion of the court a very wide latitude as to the number of years for which the condemned is to be sentenced. The law is often like this: a fine of so many dollars, or ten years in prison, or both. The Negro usually gets the limit, perhaps "both." To make an extreme but simplifying case, suppose one Negro and one white man commit a certain crime every year; if the white criminal is either fined or given only one year in prison, while the colored criminal is given ten years, in the tenth year when the visitor goes to that prison he will find nine or ten Negroes there for a certain crime, but only one white man. The easy-going investigator might conclude that the Negro is ten times as criminal in that respect as is the white man, while as a matter of fact both races would have committed exactly the same number of crimes. The long-term sentences of Negroes cause them to *accumulate* in prison. There are much more scientific ways of explaining the Negro's situation in this country than by reference to an unprovable something like innate depravity.

One of the greatest handicaps under which the new Negro lives is the handicap of the lack of acquaintanceship between him and his white neighbor. Under the former order, when practically all Negroes were either slaves or servants, every Negro had the acquaintance of some white man; as a race he was better known, better under-

stood, and was therefore the object of less suspicion on the part of the white community. But under the present order there are many Negroes who are independent, in occupation or in fortune, doing business for themselves, rendering professional service to their own race or living independently at home. These Negroes, unknown to the white mass, are the objects of its special suspicions and distrust, for they are "something new under the sun." When riots break out, this unknown Negro, well-to-do and equally well-behaved, the one who ought to be safest, is the one most liable to attack by the mob. This is because ignorance and prejudice have made the very things which pass for virtues in white men, seem like vices in the Negro; pride, ambition, self-respect, un-satisfaction with the lower positions of life, and the desire to live in a beautiful house and to keep his wife and children at home and out of "service." There can be no sympathy where there is no knowledge, and the Negro of this class, being rather a stranger to his white neighbors, is regarded as a bad example to those humbler and more helpless Negroes who are servants. This is not so in every case, but this is the rule, and the rule is the thing. And we are not talking hearsay but speaking out of the experiences of our lifetime.

If prejudice could only reason, it would dispel itself. If it could think, its thoughts might run like this: If it be true that the Negro is innately low and criminal in his instincts, then the Negro

must be the same in all places,—but the Negroes of other countries do not bear this reputation; those of Brazil and the rest of South America, of Central America, of the West Indies and of Mexico, are not distinguished as criminals. There are great numbers of Negroes in parts of these countries, and being in many of them unrestricted as to the position to which they may aspire in society and state, they would have a better chance to demonstrate any essential inferiority in those lands than in the United States. The truth is, that if the Negro be inferior, in the United States he has never yet had a chance to prove his inferiority. But prejudice does not investigate or reason.—What we are trying to do in this essay, concerning the new Negro, is to tell what *is*, and not what *ought to be*, though the latter would make a more pleasing story than the former.

Another thing which gets the better of our normal psychology and causes us to believe almost any wild report about the Negro, is the free and superior advertising given Negro crime above that accorded to any other form of Negro achievement. Booker Washington used to tell with great amusement how he entered a little town and spoke to a large gathering, making as good a speech as he was capable of. The next morning he picked up the town paper, expecting to see himself and the meeting given considerable and prominent space, but found only an inch or so of recognition on the last page. He had made a successful speech, but the whole front page was given to a

Negro who at the same time had made an *unsuccessful* attempt to snatch a woman's purse. An unsophisticated outsider, reading that paper, would have concluded that the constructive work which such Negroes as Booker Washington are doing, is of small consequence as compared with the failing efforts of a Negro criminal. Again, when a white person commits a crime, the papers say simply that a burglar was caught, a man shot a woman, or a highwayman has been sentenced,—not *white* burglar, not *white* man and woman, and not *white* highwayman. In the case of colored people, however, it is reported as *Negro* thief, *Negro*, loafer, *black* brute, *Negress*. This forms in us an association of ideas: *black* and *Negro* are made to suggest *crime*. The one term calls up the other in the public mind; they are tied together by as definite a law as the law of gravitation. If the word *white* were written with every Caucasian criminal, it would be as bad for the word *white*,—or worse. We might say that we also give the Negro credit for his good deeds by attaching the word *black* or *colored*. But do we, with the same emphasis and persistence with which we link him with his bad deeds? Booker T. Washington was given an inch on the last page, and the Negro purse-snatcher was given the whole of the front page. I know a black Negro who did well in a Northern University, and I have his picture from some newspapers wherein they deliberately lightened his complexion, straightened his hair, peaked his nose and labeled him thus as a mulatto. And

often we refuse to mention the racial identity at all when the Negro's deed is good. While we write, every newspaper in the United States is mentioning the good work of the Tenth Cavalry in Mexico, but very few of the dailies take time to say that the Tenth Cavalry is a regiment of black men. When the Negro soldiers were discharged for shooting up Brownsville, Tex., not a newspaper in the whole Republic failed to mention the race to which they belonged. Suppose we pursued the same policy with respect to the red-heads among us: whenever a black-haired, brown-haired or gray-haired person committed a crime, we should say simply that a man or woman did this or that, but when the hair was red, should say red-headed burglar, red-headed embezzler, red-headed murderer, red-headed rapist,—very soon the red-haired would be marked as criminals among us and we should be prejudiced at the very sight of them.

It is an interesting inquiry as to how the Negro stands to-day as a patriot. In that regard he is still one of the soundest classes in America, but he does not stand to-day where he used to stand. He still loves America, his native land,—it is the only country he has or knows anything about,—but he is more prone to-day to identify "the country" with the powers who happen, for the time being, to have control thereof. One hears expressions from individual Negroes now which were not to be heard twenty years ago: that the United States needs humiliation; that it would "help the

Negro if any foreign power should humble this country;" that the Negro has "nothing to fight for" in the United States, and "nothing to defend;" that he (the individual who may be speaking) "would not volunteer;" that it would be "inconsistent for the Negro to fight the Japanese, who have done nothing to him, and in behalf of American white people;" that no foreign conqueror could possibly "make conditions any worse for the Negro here;" and many other expressions which show that the Negro is beginning to look for deliverance from abroad rather than at home. This is a small and at present impotent beginning, but it is foreboding. And it is too bad that some American newspapers and congressmen are seconding these thoughts of the Negro by proclaiming a "white man's country" and a "white man's war," and by obstructing the enlistment of patriotic colored people in the army and navy. How different is the present Negro spirit from that of 1898 when his youth, wherever admitted, rose as one man to meet the Spaniard; from many of his Southern schools the whole male student body who could qualify as soldiers went into the camps. That is not because the Negro was not mistreated or oppressed at that time, but because he still looked upon "Uncle Sam" as being some personality separate and apart from the oppressor. He then regarded the oppressor as a merely local character; but he looked up to the great Nation with hope and confidence, as the embodiment of rigid justice and high ideals. He thought that

the spirit of the Emancipator and of the defenders of the Union still ruled in the highest councils of the land, and he swore by "Uncle Sam." He hoped, too, to better his local conditions by this opportunity to show his patriotism at San Juan Hill and in the Philippines. But since that time one or two weak Republican administrations and a very hostile Democratic term have made him identify his former ideal of the nation with the oppressor himself. This impression has been deepened especially by lynchings, segregation and discrimination in the North, from which he once expected ultimate justice. We fear that the extent and importance of this new feeling is not generally understood by white people. The foundation of preparedness should be laid in the mind and the heart. As we write, the newspapers are full of comments on the fact that a little black boy of Des Moines, Iowa, refused under threats to salute the American flag, on the ground that it meant nothing to him and his. Some are advocating punishment for this lad as the remedy. That reminds us of the "remedy" offered by the little boy who, when he was frankly told by the little girl that she did *not love* him, replied, as he sailed into her with his fists: "When I get through beatin' the stuffin' out o' you, I bet you'll love me!" He was adopting the method which would not only fail to change indifference into love but would finally arouse hatred and hostility. The Negro will not fail to love the flag and be its staunchest defender, if it means to him a reasonable measure

of protection for life, liberty and property and civil and political rights. If these things are denied him, no amount of preaching or cussing or killing will make him love America. He could be compelled for the time being to employ the weapons of the weak,—pretense and cunning.

But the colored soldier and the masses of the race are still loyal. There is no hyphen in the short word *Negro*; he is every inch American; he is not even Afro-American. One Negro regiment beat all records by not having a single desertion in twelve months. Nobody has any doubt as to what the Negro soldiers are doing in Mexico now; that they can be relied on implicitly to carry out orders and serve the interests of the American people. During our strained relations with various European nations there have been frequent expressions of doubt as to the loyalty of many elements of our population, but never one word of doubt as to the Negro's loyalty has parted the lips of even his fondest enemies. He is loyal and is understood to be loyal, but a continuous adverse pressure will finally break even the strongest bar,—or bend it.

At present the Negro would stand fast and firm by America against any European state; but on the other hand when the Negro goes into any European state he finds himself better treated and freer from insult than in any state of the American Union. How long will his loyalty last under that test? The Negro abroad in any of the other really civilized countries of the world, is practi-

cally never insulted or treated as an inferior unless he runs into a party of his own white fellow-citizens from the United States. There are Americans, of course, to whom this inconsistent attitude toward one of the most loyal classes of all our citizenry is a shame and a distaste.

Naturally it proves disagreeable, at first, for many American white people to turn from the old to the new Negro: from the patient, unquestioning, devoted semi-slave to the self-conscious, aspiring, proud young man. It always shocks our psychology to have our old and accustomed ideals contradicted. The changes from tallow candles to oil lamps, to gas lights and to electric bulbs must have been unpleasant experiences for many of the older members of the community. The older folk did not want to put pipe organs and other musical instruments into the church service. It is a plain matter of psychology: the old ideal was being smashed by something new, which is disagreeable even when the something new is something better. Nearly all concede that there are good Negroes, but they are very slow to revise their ideals as to what constitutes a "good" Negro. To some it means the old "uncles" and "aunties" or the present usable servants. It is difficult for them to conceive of an independent, self-respecting, self-directing Negro as good. There is a great motion-picture film, the chief fault of which, aside from its perversions of common history, is the fact that it attempts to teach that the Negro is good only as a slave or servant,

and that every intelligent and aspiring Negro in society, law or state, is bad and criminal. This hoary prejudice is our great stumbling block: it causes intolerance and opposition to the rising and aspiring but perfectly human and normal younger Negroes. There are white people, apparently fair-minded, who probably wish the Negro well, and who can stand or sit and talk for a long time with a dirty, ignorant and comical Negro, but who could not have five minutes of patience with one that is clean, intelligent and self-respecting. I heard a Negro say that it mystified him how white people would hire as servants in their homes, or nurses for their children Negro men and girls whom he would not permit to touch his children. In the other direction, too, the thing often runs to the ridiculous: a young Negro was to be ousted by his white associates from a certain position; they admitted that his morals were sound, that his education and general qualifications were all right, that his logic was good and his arguments irrefutable,—but, they explained, when he talks on some phases of the race question he sometimes *clinches his teeth!* They evidently preferred that when he talked of the great injustices he would *not* do what Horace says the speaker should always do (show the feeling himself which he would arouse in others), but that he would rather show his teeth in the conciliatory, apologetic grin of the old-fashioned Negro.

The greatest risk that the strong have to run is the risk of their morals and ideals. The white

people of America are in a position to be greatly tempted to regard the Negro only in the light of his usefulness to them,—only as a utility, and not as a personality to pursue his own ends and fulfil his own destiny. This little drop of selfishness is likely to vitiate a great many efforts “on behalf of the American Negro.” The Negro is beginning to insist, however, that he must be regarded first as a man and only incidentally as a usable article. For example, the Negro really believes in all kinds of education, and especially in those forms of training which will best fit the masses to become independent workers and of the greatest service to themselves and others. But that little drop of gall has caused many of those who are trying to educate him, to view their mission exclusively from the selfish-utilitarian standpoint. These enthusiasts have themselves put the Negro on the defensive as to his right to pursue other forms of culture. And that is why many of his best friends and the ablest thinkers of his own race have insisted and do insist that the race needs *not only* farm-hands, domestic servants, carpenters and other industrial workers, but also business men, doctors, lawyers and well educated preachers. The white people who desire that the Negro be a separate race in America, often fail to see that this very separateness would make it more imperative that the race develop all occupations and professions and advance along all lines. I heard a white speaker, at a great missionary meeting held “on behalf of Negro education,” say:

We want the Negroes to produce farmers and other industrial workers,—we already have plenty of lawyers, doctors, historians and poets. His “we” could not really include the Negro, about whom he was supposed to be speaking, for the Negro has very few lawyers, doctors, historians and poets,—and the white historian and poet will not really write the Negro’s history nor sing his songs.

The new Negro is a sober, sensible creature, conscious of his environment, knowing that not all is right, but trying hard to become adjusted to this civilization in which he finds himself by no will or choice of his own. He is not the shallow, vain, showy creature which he is sometimes advertised to be. He still hopes that the unreasonable opposition to his forward and upward progress will relent. But, at any rate, he is resolved to fight, and live or die, on the side of God and the Eternal Verities.

“For thence,—a paradox
Which comforts while it mocks,—
Shall life succeed in that it seems to fail.”

FINIS.

UNIVERSITY OF N.C. AT CHAPEL HILL



10000364348