

condemned to life imprisonment for the murder of Goebel, his conviction cannot be charged to partisanship. For on the jury were several anti-Goebel democrats and one republican. It was the republican who first spoke in the jury room, declaring his belief in Powers's guilt.

One of the incidents of the Powers trial calls for severest condemnation. The prosecuting attorney, in the course of his summing up, turned from the jury to the prisoner, and advancing step by step toward him until within two feet of his face, launched at him what the reporters called "a terrible arraignment." This is a common performance in criminal trials. But it is cowardly. The prisoner can make no reply, nor otherwise hold his assailant to account. He is shackled and gagged by the strong arm of the state. In these circumstances, though the prosecutor may be free to arraign the prisoner as bitterly as he chooses to the jury, a personal assault upon him directly is in violation of all principles of fair play. A judge sensitive to considerations of fairness would not allow it.

Dun's Review for the 11th gravely assures its credulous readers that "London sales of 40,000 shares of stocks and some bonds, and American purchases of the new foreign loan, explain why gold goes out in the face of foreign commerce returns." This Wall street jargon means that sales in London of 40,000 shares of stock to be paid for by Americans, and the placing in America of a little over half of the recent British output of \$50,000,000 of bonds, explains why we are exporting gold instead of drawing against our excessive exports of merchandise. But does it? According to the "Monthly Summary" of the treasury department for June, 1900 (page 3425) the excess of exports of merchandise for the year ending June 30 amounted to \$544,471,701. This was not paid for in gold and silver,

for on the same page of the same report it appears that the excess of exports of gold and silver amounted for the year to \$26,912,350. So the total excess of exports for the fiscal year—gold, silver and merchandise—amounted to \$571,384,051. Yet Dun's Review explains our continued exportation of gold in the face of this trade balance, by reference to the purchase of 40,000 shares of stock that could not at the outside exceed \$8,000,000, and part of a British loan amounting to less than \$28,000,000—\$36,000,000 in all. Let us put it in table form so that its absurdity may be obvious at a glance:

Excess of exports, (merchandise, gold and silver), for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900. ("Monthly Summary" for June, page 3425).....	\$571,384,051
London sales of stocks and British loan, paid for by Americans, which, according to Dun's Review, explain why we are sending out gold instead of drawing against our exports....	36,000,000

Excess of exports not explained...\$535,384,051

Partisan "business" papers are hard pressed to make their partisanship square with business records.

Utter weakness is the principal characteristic of the criticisms thus far published on Bryan's Indianapolis speech. That of the Commercial and Financial Chronicle of the 11th is typical, while also conveniently brief. The Chronicle regards this epoch-making speech as chiefly noteworthy for what Bryan omitted to speak about. Because he did not give the public even a hint of what he thinks of free silver coinage at 16 to 1, the Chronicle is sorry—not for itself, but for him. It is sorry because "such a performance does not comport with the reputation he has held of being a frank, honest man." Let the Chronicle read over the speech once more and wipe its weeping eyes. At the very beginning of his speech Mr. Bryan said he would deal later with the other issues of the campaign in a formal letter. When that appears the Chronicle, and all the carping press of which it is a type, may learn what he thinks of free silver

coinage at 16 to 1. Indeed, it need not wait; for the democratic platform, while asserting that republic or empire is the paramount issue, makes no secret of its position on the silver question. Mr. Bryan, it will be remembered, wouldn't allow it to make any. He demanded that the party declare itself definitely on the silver question or nominate somebody else for its candidate. There was in this no indication of lack of frankness or honesty on Mr. Bryan's part. On the contrary it went to prove what some millions of people believe, that he would rather be true to himself and his principles than be president. For this reason he can be depended upon if elected to make good his promise on the issue of imperialism. And how refreshing it will be, after four years of McKinley, to have in the white house a man who does make his promises good!

DEMOCRACY AND THE NEGRO.

The republican party has ceased to be the guardian of negro rights. Of the truth of this assertion there can no longer be any question. Louisiana and Mississippi have disfranchised negroes without exciting any criticism from the republican party, its press, its platforms, or its leaders, or in the slightest degree arousing its rank and file. This is true also of North Carolina. A few days ago, by riotous and other lawless methods, the whites of that state adopted a constitutional amendment which disfranchises illiterate negroes while preserving the voting right to illiterate white men. It is in clear violation of the liberty amendments to the federal constitution. But the republican party has given no indication of any desire to prevent or set aside this action. On the contrary, its leaders hail the disfranchisement of North Carolina negroes as a prelude to that state's becoming republican. They argue that a majority of the white people of North Carolina, especially those of good business and social standing, are at heart republicans who have been prevented from joining the republican party

only by fear of negro domination locally, and that as that danger is now removed they will in future abandon their support of the democratic party.

This tendency of the republicans to allow the local democracy of the south to suppress the negro vote is strongly indicated in another and less negative way. Negro disfranchisement could be checked by reducing the representation in congress of the states that disfranchise; but the republican party refuses to apply that simple remedy. When Mr. Crumpacker, a republican member from Indiana, introduced a bill last winter which was designed, in accordance with the second clause of the 14th amendment of the constitution, to cut down the congressional representation of states that restricted negro suffrage, his party leaders promptly rebuked him. Both house and senate were republican, but the bill never came to a vote. It was not even debated. Mr. Crumpacker's congressional associates squelched it.

The republican party as at present constituted does not wish to prevent the subjugation of the so-called "nigger" in the south, for the excellent party reason that it is itself engaged in subjugating the so-called "nigger" in the Philippines. Imperialist republicans and "nigger"-hating democrats of the "better element" are at one.

Unfortunately we cannot say that as a guardian of negro rights the democratic party has taken the place once occupied by the republicans.

There are too many democrats, in the mere party sense of that term, who are strenuously opposed to the doctrine of political equality in its application to negroes. Most of these, it is true, are at heart imperialist republicans. Touch them upon any elementary test question and their real character comes out. They are not for the masses, but for the classes; they are not for rights and reciprocal duties, but for privileges and reciprocal profits; they are not for free trade, but for protection; they are not for democracy, but for imperialism. Of course, these men want to suppress

the negro. But there are also party democrats who oppose political equality for the negro, and yet who are not at heart imperialist republicans. Their case calls for special study. It is easy to understand the aristocrat, the snob or the imperialist who opposes negro suffrage; but the democrat who opposes it presents a problem for psychologists.

One of the best types of this order of democrat, perhaps the very best in American public life, is Benjamin R. Tillman, of South Carolina. Senator Tillman is at the core a democrat. The aristocrats of his state know this well, and they hate him for it. But his democracy does not extend to the negro. He believes in the principles of the declaration of independence in the abstract, and except as to the negro he believes in them in the concrete. He is on the whole a better democrat than some more dainty men who at a distance from the seat of race conflicts hold better views on the race question.

To realize the essential democracy of this man's character is to make his attitude on the negro question more enigmatical than Senator Hoar's on the McKinley question. The puzzle might be solved by assuming that he modifies his democracy to suit the public opinion of the community in which he lives. And there is plausibility about that explanation, when it is remembered that no man could remain in public life in that community if he became a champion of the political rights of negroes. But Senator Tillman is altogether too rugged a character to fit snugly into this explanation. It is hard to conceive of his making his convictions subservient to local prejudice. Any explanation of his hostility to political equality for negroes must go deeper. He must be accepted as a democrat with the full courage of his convictions, who, as a conviction and not from cowardice, excepts American negroes from the benefits of democratic principles.

Light may be thrown upon this peculiarity of that southern democracy of which Tillman is the type, by reference to a private letter from Mr. Tillman himself which has

come into our hands and the publication of which he authorizes.

By way of introduction to Mr. Tillman's letter, however, we shall reproduce from the Detroit News the able article of a Michigan negro, to which Mr. Tillman's letter is a reply. Not only does this article serve as an introduction to Senator Tillman's letter, but it is in some respects also an example of the power of insight into public questions generally which comes from a clear understanding of certain elementary principles of social-industrial life. To the Michigan negro who grasps these principles, a far reaching and luminous truth appears; to the South Carolina senator who does not grasp it that truth is sealed, and the questions it would illuminate remain in darkness.

The article from the Detroit News appeared over the signature of Frank H. Warren, a well-known negro of Mackinac Island. We give it in full:

Perhaps the very fact that such a man as Benjamin Tillman had received an invitation to address the Good Government club in University hall, here among the good liberty-loving people of Michigan, is what emboldened him to make an address on that occasion, which was both frank and characteristic of the man. He knew that his unsavory reputation as a negro-hater must have long since been known to the people of Michigan, therefore, he construed the invitation as a license to unfold the unholy plan of campaign of men of his ilk in the south, and to make a scurrilous tirade against an oppressed and defenseless people who are at least deserving of better treatment.

My first impression of Mr. Tillman came from his public statement, as governor of South Carolina, that he would head a mob to lynch any negro that was accused of outraging a white woman, but he said nothing of the white men who outrage colored girls with impunity.

In the constitutional convention to which Mr. Tillman in his Ann Arbor speech referred, and of which he was a member, one of the negro delegates made the statement that "if every white man was lynched that had outraged negro girls, this convention would not have a quorum." "This statement not only went uncontradicted, but only caused laughter among the white delegates."

The negroes have absolutely no protection of law in the south against

the white men who thus debauch their wives and daughters, and they never did have. I have often wondered how (if the intense race hatred in the south was bona fide), the white women there can take white men for husbands, who, they must know, certainly before marriage, and in many instances after, committed crimes against black girls.

I say emphatically then, that the character of the southern black is what the white made it, no more and no less.

Mr. Tillman gave his whole case away when he said: "It is the fate of the negro to hoe and pick cotton always." Let's see; I believe it was Robert Toombs, of Georgia, who said about 40 years ago: "I will yet call the roll of my slaves at the foot of Bunker Hill;" but instead the good people of Boston built near the spot a monument to William Lloyd Garrison.

In both of these assertions the wish is father to the thought, and the Tillmans may as well disabuse their minds, for the negro as a race will not always be "hewers of wood and drawers of water." Again he says: "We say in South Carolina, that the negro is not the equal of the white man and, by the eternal, never will be." Now the negro cares nothing about whether he is the equal of the white man or not, all he wants is an equal opportunity to earn and enjoy a living from the earth that the God of nature provided for every living thing upon it, the negro included; and further, they demand the equal protection of the law, to the end that they may improve the moral condition of their people, which I admit is much in need of improvement in the south.

I deny that the southern negro is the black villain he is painted by Mr. Tillman. It was proven during the civil war that he was the very essence of honor itself, when he was left at home to guard, not only the property, but the wives and daughters of the confederacy, and never is there an instance quoted in history where he betrayed his trust.

The hardships of poverty go to make criminals and bad citizens generally of the individuals of any race, and the negro is no exception to the rule, except that inasmuch as he is barred out of many avenues of employment, his opportunity for earning a living is thereby diminished, and his poverty correspondingly more acute than is the case with the white races in America. If he shows a greater percentage of criminals, it may be traced directly to this cause of excess poverty.

Mr. Tillman told the truth when he said: "The war freed the slaves and it settled nothing else." When the slaves of the south were freed,

they were as infants, knowing absolutely nothing about self-reliance, much less the use of the ballot, and the government was very remiss in its duty, that it did not provide them with sufficient land to maintain themselves with and succor them until they had established themselves in their independent manhood. I have always held the Hayes administration blameworthy for withdrawing the troops from the south until this was accomplished. If the war had settled the question of the negro's self-maintenance as thus outlined, there would be no race question now. In proof of this, I point to those communities here in Michigan, Ontario, Indiana and Ohio, where the colored people outnumber the whites, and yet live in perfect harmony. "In Cross county the colored people nearly all own their own farms," and are happy, prosperous and contented, and withal good citizens. Neither are they shouting from the housetops that they are as good as the white man; in fact, that is something they care nothing about, and the whites would not be disturbed about "equality," if there was neither poverty nor fear of poverty resulting from competition between the races for the limited opportunities to earn a living.

The race question of the south is nothing more than the same old question of land monopoly vs. labor, miscalled capital vs. labor, and if our iniquitous laws of land tenure and taxation are ever properly adjusted on a basis of equity to all, the poverty and race problems would soon disappear.

Mr. Tillman seems to have threatened his audience with the "bogie man" of intermarriage with some success, but it is the rankest nonsense to believe that any great number of whites and blacks will ever intermarry. Jews and Gentiles seldom ever intermarry, yet there is no proscription against such marriages.

Forty years ago my father married one of the fairest belles of Pontiac in Canada, and the event created much excitement, and was used as an argument against freeing the slaves. It was said that they would marry all the fair daughters. My mother was the pioneer white woman to marry a colored man, 40 years ago, and I can count all such marriages on my fingers that have taken place in Michigan since then; so that argument proves to be nothing but a "bogie."

The land monopolist of the south wants the negroes to do all the work, while he retains all the profits, and when the negro aspires to rise above this condition the policy enunciated by Mr. Tillman is resorted to to force him back into what they are pleased to call "his place."

There are two remedies that could

be effectively applied to the southern race question: The first, and the one I should advocate, would be the single tax; the second would be the emigration to Africa of a sufficient number of negroes to bring the whites to a realizing sense that they were not only losing their laborers, but also the profits from their lands with them. This would at least insure those that remained better treatment.

Mr. Warren's article was called to the attention of Senator Tillman, by Edward Osgood Brown, a democratic democrat of Illinois, who vouched for Mr. Warren as a negro democrat, of light and leading in his race, and told Mr. Tillman of the puzzlement and distress that are felt by declaration-of-independence democrats in this part of the country about his attitude concerning negroes. Mr. Tillman's reply was not intended for publication, and on that account it is an index to his point of view all the more valuable. It follows:

Trenton, S. C., July 23, 1900.

Edward O. Brown, Esq., First National Bank Building, Chicago, Ill.

Dear Sir: I have your letter of July 16, and mainly for your own satisfaction I reply at length.

The letter in the Detroit paper by Frank H. Warren is a fair sample of the garbled and distorted extracts and misstatement of facts such as one would expect to find in a republican organ. You say that Mr. Warren is a democrat, but that does not prevent his being deceived and having a great many false ideas about the race question in the south.

In the first place, my address before the Good Government club of the University of Michigan was never reported, and only a few distorted paragraphs taken out of all connection with the balance of the speech were printed for purposes which must be apparent. Mr. Warren takes these for the basis of his attack, and couples with them many other misstatements of fact derived no doubt from similar distorted representations of my utterances.

To begin with, Warren says that while governor I declared I would head a mob and lynch any negro who was accused of raping a white woman and said nothing of the white men who raped negro women; and he states that they can be raped with impunity. What I did say, and have repeated time and again and still say, is that I would head a mob and lynch any man, white or black, who would rob any woman of her virtue.

Mr. Warren next declares that a negro delegate to the South Carolina constitutional convention made the state-

ment that if every white man was lynched that had raped negro girls this convention would not have a quorum, and goes on to say that this statement not only went uncontradicted but caused laughter among the white delegates. I do not recall any such incident in the constitutional convention, but I do know that I led the fight to increase the age of consent to 16 years in that convention, and while we only succeeded in increasing the limit from 12 to 14, that was a great gain.

It is needless to follow Mr. Warren through the various accusations against southern white men, but an intimate knowledge of the facts will warrant the statement that southern white men do not ravish negro women once in a thousand cases. Whatever may have been the condition prior to emancipation, no such crime is ever committed now, or if so it is never heard of. The only case in my recollection is of a white man in this state who committed an assault of the kind and was lynched by negroes without his white fellow citizens attempting to protect him, or to punish the lynchers afterwards, for they were acquitted in court.

In declaring that it is the fate of the negro to hoe and pick cotton always, I only expressed an opinion based on personal knowledge of the conditions. There is no field in the south for any great number of mechanics or artisans; and if there were a thousand instead of one institution like Booker Washington's, the graduates would have to go to the cotton fields, for there is no opening for them in other lines of work, and no opening for them should they emigrate north, because the northern people do not permit negroes to compete in most lines of work, while in the south there is no objection, but the colored men can enter any profession or calling without let or hindrance.

As to the equality of the races, that is a matter of opinion based on history as well as personal contact. The feeling of caste or race prejudice will always make of the colored men underlings. It will always be so because it has always been so.

I did not declare that the southern negro is a black villain. On the contrary I bear willing testimony to the general good behavior and the kind-heartedness of the southern negroes; and I also gave the fullest amount of acknowledgement of what the south owed the race for their good behavior during the war. I venture to assert that three-quarters of my hearers at Ann Arbor will bear willing testimony that my address was liberal and fair, while it contained many unpleasant truths both to them and to the colored race. For instance, pointing out the magnificent record made by the slaves whose masters were absent in the

confederate army, I compared that record with that of the negroes of more recent birth and I asked the question: "If the slaves were not of a higher type of men than the freed men of to-day, and if the iniquities and crimes perpetrated on the slaves were greater than those which the negroes now suffer, why did those slaves not rise and wreak their vengeance on the helpless women and children left in their care?" If it be true that the negroes endure greater wrongs now than they did during slavery what a commentary on the civil war! Then slavery was better than the existing conditions as a moral factor, or else the negro is degenerating and this is what I asserted to be true.

Poverty alone does not breed the crimes with which the south is rife. The criminals are almost wholly from the class of young negroes who have grown up since the war. They are the direct product of that era in which the negro was taught to regard liberty as license. The pernicious doctrine of social and political equality, coupled with the habit of these young bucks of tramping from one community to another without fixed occupation or purpose except to indulge their coarser appetites as opportunity offers, is not productive of any good.

Mr. Warren is evidently not much of a negro. If his father was a full-blood when "the belle of Pontiac" married him, then he is a mulatto; but it is more likely that Mr. Warren is a quadroon tainted with enough negro blood to find it a bar to social intercourse, and is therefore driven to defend the people or race from which his father sprung. I do not blame such men and have only pity for them.

Mr. Warren will never get any considerable number of negroes to leave the south to go to Africa. South Carolina alone would willingly see the departure of a quarter of a million to emigrate to Michigan or any other place. That would leave the races here balanced so far as numbers are concerned, and it would improve our present condition.

In conclusion allow me to say I would not hesitate to repeat the lecture I delivered in any northern city, and feel sure it would open the eyes of many who would hear it, while not one would accuse me of narrowness or bigotry.

B. R. TILLMAN.

For all the purposes of our present inquiry, brief quotations from Mr. Warren and Senator Tillman would have been enough. But the publication in full of what they say is required to give the atmosphere and background necessary to understand them. It is not our intention, however, to consider the views of either in detail. We may leave that

to our readers without suggestion. What we aim to do is to find an explanation for the false note in Senator Tillman's democracy. And we believe it is to be found in his letter.

Mr. Warren points it out in advance. When Senator Tillman asserts that there is no industrial opportunity for the negro except as a field hand; when he follows with the prediction that race prejudice will always make the negro an underling; and when, finally, he says that South Carolina would be better off if a quarter of a million negroes were to leave the state—when with these expressions he discloses the operation of his mind with reference to the negro question, he puts in one form what Mr. Warren, from the opposite point of view, puts in another and truer form. According to Mr. Warren, all the negro wants "is an equal opportunity to earn and enjoy a living from the earth that the God of nature provided for every living thing upon it, the negro included." Senator Tillman does not believe that there are enough such opportunities to go around. Consciously or unconsciously he is a Malthusian. Whether he reasons it out or not, he feels that there isn't room for everybody. The earth is overcrowded. But for that feeling it could never have occurred to him that South Carolina, a sparsely-settled state, would gain by the loss of a quarter of a million of her working population. And like all Malthusians Senator Tillman inconsiderately regards the working classes as the crowding classes. This explains his variation from democracy when he confronts the negro question. In his Mind, both by tradition and education, negroes constitute the working class. They are in his community the lower class, being to him what the peasant is to the German aristocrat, what the serf is to the Russian nobleman, what slum dwellers are to the thrifty city classes, what Irish immigrants used to be to native Americans, what the "dago" and the "Hun" became to the Americanized Irishman, what the Chinese are to the workers of the Pacific coast, what the "mas-