

ers of Europe ought to remain impassive spectators of the conversion of Macedonia into a shambles at the hands of the revengeful Turk. Whatever other motives may have prompted the uprising of Bulgarians in Macedonia, there is no doubt that one ground for it was avowable, adequate, and righteous. We refer to the failure of Sultan Abdul-Hamid to introduce the reforms to which he pledged himself by the Treaty of Berlin a quarter of a century ago. Had the reforms been carried out, there would have been no pretext for an insurrection in Macedonia, but Greek, Bulgarian, and Servian Christians would have dwelt side by side in peace and amity with the Moslems, under the Sultan's suzerainty. Whose fault is it that not even a pretence of fulfilling the promise has been made? It is the fault of the same Christian powers, co-signatories of the Berlin Treaty, which refrained from exacting the fulfilment of a similar pledge in the case of Turkish Armenia, and which, when Armenian Christians struck a blow on their own behalf, looked on unmoved while the insurrection was put down by appalling massacres. Does anybody doubt that if Mr. Gladstone had been Prime Minister in Great Britain England's duty as one of the guarantors of the Berlin Treaty would have been performed? Does any one doubt that he would have forced the Sultan to keep his word, both in Armenia and in Macedonia?

The truth is that the public conscience, throughout central and western Europe, is now, and has been for some time, torpid; that it needs to be electrified; shocked into recognition of its duty to compel the enforcement of international compacts and to alleviate human misery. Because Greek Christians have been foolish enough to be so swayed by racial or political jealousy as to profess a preference for Ottoman over Bulgarian ascendancy in Macedonia, it does not follow that enlightened onlookers should permit Bulgarian, Greek, and Servian Christians alike to be subjected to nameless outrages, and decimated or annihilated at the hands of the Turkish soldiers. This is the twentieth century—an epoch at which barbarism is supposed to be far behind us—and it would evidently be the duty of Christian powers to obey the plainest dictates of humanity, even if they were not bound by treaty to exact from the Sultan the immediate concession of reforms promised long ago.

The New Negro Crime again Considered

SINCE we suggested that the perpetration of assaults by colored men upon white women might fairly be described as "the new negro crime," and that the cause of the phenomenon seemed to require investigation, the question has received a good deal of discussion in all sections of the country. That the premise is sound there seems to be an agreement of opinion. The only person disposed to dispute its soundness has asserted that he has found two examples of the crime under the slavery régime during the two or more centuries that preceded the civil war. Even if conclusive proofs of the authenticity of the two instances alleged had been produced, which is not the case, it is plain enough that they would not have sufficed to impugn our averment that the crime was practically unknown in slavery times, either at the South or at the North. We now purpose to make another averment, as to which, also, we challenge contradiction. Not only was the particular crime, of which we are speaking, practically unknown in the South under the slavery régime, but it continued to be unknown there until about twenty years after the negroes were emancipated, or until a generation had grown up which lacked the respect for white women which had been ingrained in the blacks of the preceding generation. We desire to submit a third assertion, namely, that the crime which we call new did not exist in the Northern States either, until very recently, although for many generations the negro there had borne something like the same numerical proportion to the whites that he bears now. We would make still further additions to our original premise. What we have termed the new negro crime seems to be confined to the United States. At all events, we seldom, if ever, hear of it in the British West Indies—except, of course, during the frightful uprising of the blacks against the whites in Haiti—or in the Spanish or Portuguese speaking countries of Central or South America. If it be true, as we allege, that the crime is practically unknown in the other American countries just named, the query will at once suggest itself, Does the crime there fail to exist because in those countries intermarriage between whites and blacks, or, in a word, amalgamation, is allowed by law?

So much for our premises. If the truth of all of them be conceded; if it be acknowledged that the crime which we are discussing is, not only modern, but also local, in the sense of being confined to the United States, it obviously follows that it must be the outcome of conditions peculiar to our own country, and to conditions, moreover, affecting the present, but no previous generation of negroes in the United States. What are those peculiar conditions? We have been able to discover only a single cause for the phenomena. That cause may be thus stated: The whole system of reconstruction devised by Thaddeus Stevens (who carried out his principles in private life) and by other leaders of the Radicals, who dominated Congress under the Johnson administration—the system

embodied in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments of the Federal Constitution, and in the Congressional and State legislation growing out of them—was based on the fundamental idea of absolute equality, social as well as political, between the white and the black races. Following the lines of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments of the Federal Constitution, and, in some cases, perhaps, preceding the definite adoption of the last-named amendment, a number of so-called "civil rights" acts were passed by Congress. The reconstruction, or "carpet-bag" Supreme Court of Alabama decided that one of these "civil rights" laws, the validity of which was disputed, dominated and abrogated a State law forbidding the intermarriage of whites and blacks. These reconstruction judges assumed, and they were undoubtedly correct in the assumption, that the theory on which their Radical masters at Washington had proceeded was favorable to amalgamation. Upon no other theory can some of the civil rights acts be explained, for their tendency to bring about absolute social equality between the black and the white races is obvious and indisputable.

There is, in a word, no doubt that the idea of absolute social equality between the black and the white races, to which amalgamation was the logical and inevitable corollary, pervaded the atmosphere of Washington during the reconstruction period, and that of all the Southern States under the carpet-bag régime, so far as the blacks and the white emigrants from the North were concerned. That idea was inhaled with the air when the present generation of negro was growing up to puberty and entering on adult life. They became infected with the belief, and the belief was justified, that if the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Constitutional Amendments, and the civil rights acts founded thereon, had any theoretical basis, and pointed forward to any ultimate consummation, that basis and that consummation must be looked for in the intermarriage and eventual fusion of the two races. Amalgamation, therefore, instead of being regarded with loathing and abhorrence, as it had been by the Southern whites, was held up to the *post-bellum* generation of negroes by their radical teachers at the North and by their own common-sense interpretation of constitutional and statute laws, as at once lawful, proper, and desirable.

Not many years elapsed, however, after the emigration of negroes from the South to the North began, before the opinions and the feelings of Northern whites regarding the expediency, or even the permissibility, of intermarriage between the races underwent a profound and startling change. Startling in the sense that Northern radicals themselves were shocked at the logical consequences of the theory that had inspired their reconstruction legislation. As for the Southern whites, we need not say that they had never ceased to view amalgamation with disgust and horror. What we would here indicate, however, is that, in the new negro crime, we behold the fructification of the idea planted in the minds of colored men during the reconstruction period, an idea which we cannot expect to see instantaneously uprooted, merely because the Northern radicals who planted it have begun sincerely to repent of having done so. Finding, to his surprise and bewilderment, that the fundamental theory on which the constitutional and statute legislation of the reconstruction period was founded is in process of extinction, if not utterly extinct, and that the faces of white men at the North, as at the South, are set like flint against the intermarriage of the races, a negro is now and then provoked to assert by violence the right to a cohabitation that is either forbidden by law or prohibited by public sentiment.

In this way only are we able to explain the phenomenon presented by the crime that we are discussing, a phenomenon which is at once modern and local. It is modern because, before the reconstruction period, the black man never looked upon marriage or cohabitation with a white woman as conceivable, much less as warranted by the theory of law. It is local, because in the Spanish and Portuguese speaking countries on this side of the Atlantic, it is unnecessary for a negro to resort to force, for the reason that the intermarriage, or voluntary cohabitation of whites and blacks is neither prohibited by law nor condemned by public sentiment.

If we are right in our diagnosis of the conditions under which the new negro crime arose, we may reasonably expect to see it vanish when those conditions shall have disappeared. As we have formerly pointed out, it has vanished already in Mississippi, where the negro has learned that, whatever may have been the theory that inspired reconstruction legislation, the black man in that State is not the political, much less the social, equal of the white. The crime is likely to vanish elsewhere when the same hard, but indispensable, lesson is driven home.

Exports versus Imports

THE fiscal inquiry has brought one lasting benefit to England: it has cleared up, once for all, the cloud of mystery which for years has hung over that most mysterious matter, the balance of trade. We have all read a hundred times that England was going to the dogs, because her imports every year enormously exceeded her exports, which showed that she must be living on her capital,