





# Shall the Negro be Educated or Suppressed?

## A SYMPOSIUM

### On Dr. Haygood's Reply to Senator Eustis's Paper on Race Antagonism,

BY

1072  
- PROF. WM. M. BASKERVILL, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.

HON. W. M. BECKNER, Editor *Winchester Democrat*, Winchester, Ky.

PROF. CHAS. FOSTER SMITH, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.

GEORGE W. CABLE, Northampton, Mass.

PROF. ROBERT T. HILL, University of Texas.

PROF. F. C. WOODWARD, University of South Carolina.

REV. JOHN H. BOYD, Durant, Miss.

JULIUS D. DREHER, Pres't Roanoke College, Salem, Va.

P. D. SIMS, M. D., Chattanooga, Tenn.

HON. SETH LOW, Brooklyn, N. Y.

JOSEPH HOLT, M. D., Portland, Oregon; late Pres't Board of Health  
New Orleans.

PRINTED FOR THE  
OPEN LETTER CLUB:  
NASHVILLE AND NEW-YORK.

1889.



ENCLOSURE  
E/85  
.61  
.061  
1889

SENATOR EUSTIS'S paper appeared in THE FORUM of October, 1888. Dr. HAYGOOD'S reply was printed in THE NEW YORK INDEPENDENT, Dec. 8th, 1888, and reissued in pamphlet form by THE OPEN LETTER CLUB.

Of the eleven letters printed here eight were published in THE INDEPENDENT—at whose invitation they were written—in February, 1889. The last three are printed for the first time here.

THE OPEN LETTER CLUB does not make itself responsible for the sentiments or principles expressed in the papers it publishes, but simply offers a medium for the interchange of information of every sort and from every direction, valuable to the moral, intellectual and material interests of the South.

WM. M. BASKERVILL.

NASHVILLE, TENN.

BY PROF. W. M. BASKERVILL.

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY, NASHVILLE, TENN.

With many Southerners the views expressed by Senator Eustis in *The Forum* for October are undoubtedly popular. But their number is yearly growing less. Those who believe with the Senator almost invariably pursue his plan of attack. Articles of this kind in which it is openly alleged or skillfully insinuated that the friends of the Negro are striving after social equality, might bring about race antagonism, if there were not still among us a leaven of common sense and of religion. Common sense says, with Dr. Haygood: "The social question I do not now, or at any time argue about; it is more than useless. It will adjust itself or else never be adjusted." Religion, too, joins her voice to his in saying, "If there be a Divine Providence no good man need to be afraid to do right to-day: nay, he will fear only doing wrong."

I am glad Dr. Haygood answered the Senator's article. He knows the Southern people and the Negro problem better than any other man in the South. Our respect and esteem he has always had. His bold and fearless attitude has commanded our admiration. His wise and steady course along this straight and narrow way has won our confidence and our trust. We now perceive that he is as wise as he is fearless. At first he met with what seemed to be general censure. But a far-seeing man, on being asked what would be the effect of this outcry against Dr. Haygood, said then, "It will only serve to make good and thoughtful men rally to him."

Giving the Negro the ballot—that dangerous weapon in the hands of the ignorant and the degraded—was one of the wisest blunders ever committed. As a political move it was a complete blunder. Reconstruction times first—then Democratic ascendancy. No wonder it made Republican *politicians* sick. But in the hands of Providence it will yet prove to have been consummate wisdom. It has placed a heavy burden upon us, it is true, the heaviest a civilized people ever yet has had to bear, but not too heavy for the American people. Now the whole nation is interested in preparing—nay, is compelled to prepare—the Negro for the proper use and appreciation of citizenship. Only two factors really enter into

this problem—religion and education. How best to promote the one and in what way to provide for the other, are matters of supreme importance to every Christian patriot.

---

BY GEORGE W. CABLE,

NORTHAMPTON, MASS.

---

I have already discussed Senator Eustis's paper in *The Forum* of last December. I do not think any utterance of mine varies in principle from any made by Dr. Haygood in his criticism. Yet I gladly accept the invitation to comment on Dr. Haygood's paper. I give my heartiest applause to his main statement, that it is folly for the South and shame for the North to call the Negro question less than national.

He seems to me quite as clearly right when he welcomes writers of Senator Eustis's kind into the arena of literary debate. I count it an incalculable misfortune that for twenty years the nation has left the discussion of this great question almost totally to the floors of Congress, where in the nature of the case it is bound to suffer fatally from heat, and to the columns of the daily press, where it is as inevitably bound to suffer fatally from haste. The difficulties of the problem demand that it be subjected to the most careful, dispassionate, studious discussion, a discussion purged of personalities, partisan rallying cries and unauthenticated conjectures and recriminations; especially a *progressive* discussion, where each particular division of the question once settled—once fairly taken prisoner and paroled, so to speak—shall not have to be fought over again. Such discussion it is reasonable to hope for only, or at least mainly, through the medium of the nation's more distinctively literary utterance, as it comes to us in the dispassionate columns of our magazines, reviews and periodicals not devoted primarily to news.

It may be said in reply that this is all very well for educated people, people of studious tastes. But in fact it is just the educated people that have first got to settle this great question. That done, there is no other question on our continent that will be so nearly settled altogether.

Let us rejoice in the New South of material development, and even read in our daily newspapers statistics without signature or official sanction and too often palpably padded; but neither official nor conjectural figures can tell the value it will be to the South and the nation, to bring into the clear light and air of a calm, friendly and faithful national literary debate the *principles* of law and order on which a New South must be founded if it is to endure.

---

BY PROF. CHARLES FORSTER SMITH,

OF VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY, NASHVILLE, TENN.

---

As to Senator Eustis's article, I think it is just about as good and as bad as Senator Chandler's "Our Southern Masters," and perhaps the best thing that could be done with both would be to print them together in one pamphlet and send them out to neutralize each other. I indorse the spirit and the matter of Dr. Haygood's reply to Senator Eustis's article. Dr. Haygood is the one Southern man whom I should be willing to follow blindfold on the Negro question. He understands the subject. What his heart prompts and his head approves he has the courage to do—always the right, as he sees it, in this as in all other matters.

The whole philosophy of the question and the germ of all the rules for its treatment lie, it seems to me, in Dr. Haygood's last paragraph:

"Whatever political theory men form or oppose; whatever their speculative opinions about the origin of races; whatever their notions concerning color or caste; whatever their relations heretofore to slavery and what went along with it, this is absolutely certain: *No question involving the rights and wrongs of men, civilized or savage, white or black, was ever settled so that it would stay settled by any system of mere repression.* And to those who believe in Jesus Christ it is equally certain that nothing can be rightly settled that is not settled in harmony with the Sermon on the Mount. If there be a Divine Providence, *no good man need to be afraid to do right to-day; nay, he will fear only doing wrong.*"

The conscience of the country, North and South needs to be quickened just here—that the whites must do right toward the Negro and grant him all that the law allows. And it will do no good to frighten our people with suggestions as to what may come

of doing right, the bugbear of "social equality", and all such. To all such suggestions there is one sufficient reply: "If I meet the responsibility of doing right, I can fearlessly accept the responsibility of the result."

The great trouble is that people are apt to assume that the Negroes cannot be educated, cannot be trained into good, intelligent, property-holding citizens, then to seek the facts to support the assumption. And, as facts of all kinds are always lying about loose, a man can generally find the facts he is after, especially if he is looking for that kind and no other. Moreover, most men begin with emancipation, and seek back for four thousand years, whereas nearly all the important facts lie this side of 1865.

All hope of solution of the Negro question lies in the hypothesis that it can be worked out by the same agencies that would be applied in the case of any other race. A study of the facts on this hypothesis brings me increasing encouragement from year to year. Education and property are good for the white man, and as a Tennessee mountaineer said to me last summer, "What is good for the white man must be good for the nigger." To stimulate and help the Negro to get an education, to encourage and secure him in the possession of property to grant him all that the law allows, is the least and the best that the white race can do. As to education he has shown an eagerness, a persistency, a success, which do him infinite credit: in point of property his record is not so good, yet, in places where he has had a chance, he has done surprisingly well.

It is not worth while to suppose that any of the Southern States would submit again to such governments as those of the "carpet-bag régime. But happily that danger is past in most of them, and I am far from believing that suppression of the colored vote is the only way to prevent anywhere a return of the horrors of the "carpet-bag" régime. Many of us can now believe that Governor Chamberlain meant to try honestly the experiment, whether honest government were possible in a state with a Negro majority, without suppression of the votes of any class. Whether he could have succeeded then, it is now impossible to say.

At all events, I believe in discussion of the question. If there is a right and a wrong in the matter, men's consciences must be quickened by discussion. It is still as true as when Pericles said



it: "The great impediment to action is, not discussion, but the want of that knowledge which is gained by discussion preparatory to action."

---

BY PROF. ROBERT T. HILL.

OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS, AUSTIN, TEXAS.

---

Dr. Haygood's reply to Senator Eustis embodies, in my opinion, the only logical conclusion which can be reached by any serious citizen of our nation who has rubbed against the Negro question, be he from the North or the South.

Senator Eustis's article was not only an attempt to clog the progress of the only solution of the problem—education, technical and moral—but also a dangerous torch which may have been influential in inciting the present reaction upon the part of certain of my misguided fellow-countrymen against the Negro, as seen at Wabalak.

The young white men and women in the South are the real sufferers from the race prejudices so boldly championed by Senator Eustis; for so poisonous is this evil of continual nursing of an obsolete civil position which we must sooner or later abandon, that it seems to me immoral that our young Southerners should be forced out of contact and sympathy with all the grand scientific, economic and social impulses that have made the quarter of a century since Appomatox most truly great.

There is but one solution to the Negro problem—he must be helped and educated into intelligent citizenship. Lack of Christian sympathy and the toleration and instigation of opposition to this end are the most cruel indictment that can be made against us, and one for which there is no apology except that Dr. Haygood's leaven is surely working.

The time has not arrived anywhere for miscellaneous social mixture, and a mingling of the two races in public schools in the South would be inexpedient; but if helping, protecting, educating and elevating the Negro out of savagery be a crime, what is humanity?

The Southern people, who give millions to Christianize foreign

people, must take the Negro by the hand of sympathy as well as form, and help him from the degradation into which, if left to himself, he will fall deeper and deeper. Our apathy ill becomes our professions, and, viewed from any standpoint, will dwarf and retard our progress in every direction.

---

BY PROF F. C. WOODWARD,  
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

---

*Sir*:—Dr. Haygood in all his utterances on the “Negro Question” holds the vantage-ground of an unprejudiced thinker. This cannot be said of most deliverances on this subject: the discussion seems to have fallen, ordinarily, to men too interested or too biased to see any other than their own side, and has had less the appearance of an effort to reach light on the issue, than of a hot political tilt in the arena of dialectics. Half the difficulties hampering the situation are the result of the well-written articles and eloquent speeches with which every sore spot on the question has been unremittingly rubbed to acute rawness.

There has been too much confidence in patent remedies; an unreasonable expectation of a quick settlement of the question. It was hopeless to expect that either black or white could, in two or three decades, solve the sphinx riddles of the war, and fit themselves to a radically changed order of things. In normal and favorable conditions, the wished-for equality of civil and political rights should hardly have been looked for under a half-century or more. Were it not for the heat of war still quickening all pulses, still unsettling judgments, still putting sentiment for common sense and prejudice for sound policy, all would regard the present state of the case as a satisfactory advance toward settlement. The trouble is that we are still applying war methods to the development of peace measures; the vanity of this attempt is seen in the fact that these measures are growths, and not manufactures. Not all the compulsion of science can hurry an oak-bud to maturity—a hapless turn of the foot may crush it.

It is noteworthy that nearly all agree to let the social evolution of this matter alone; and that, since the decision of the Supreme

Court on the civil-rights bill, most disputants have consented, apparently, to leave the adjustment of these matters also to time and education, and like agencies. No one, however, seems to think of applying these striking analogies to the settlement of the Negro's political status—the one phase of the general question still under treatment. Why should controversy and denunciation be expected to help the colored man to an intelligent exercise of the franchise, and not to the enjoyment of social and public privileges? Why may not time and education and experience be relied on to bring about the adjustment of his political relations? If any phase of this question is liable to natural and peaceable methods, this, more than any, demands the application of such methods.

This is no appeal for *laissez-faire*, but for reasonable and judicious treatment of an acute disorder. The South could not, if she would, smother this issue. She would not! No one need doubt her anxiety to settle it for the good of all concerned. She has brushed the tears and blood of the four years' agony, and the grime and sweat of the succeeding struggle from her eyes, and has fixed them intently on the problem she must solve; let faith and hope and love stand by and encourage, and all will be well.

Even from Southern lips the cry is not infrequently heard: "O that this too, too solid South would melt!" But heretofore the chill blasts of the north wind have forced the South to draw her mantle close about her for protection; she would gladly welcome the warm, cheering beams of a new rising sun!

By Hon. W. M. BECKNER,

EDITOR OF THE WINCHESTER DEMOCRAT, WINCHESTER, KY.

The Negro population of Kentucky is of a better class than that of the Cotton States: but even here it presents problems not easy of solution. That these will be worked out, however, none who believes in God and in the adjusting influences of American institutions can for a moment doubt. The circle of those who recognize the "Brother in Black" as a useful element in the social forces of the South, is widening from year to year. It is idle to talk about sending him away. He does not want to go, and we

could not afford to give him up. Even if it were desirable to get rid of him, where is the power to effect his removal?

His mission on this continent may be inferior in scope, but it is no less manifest than that of the Caucasian. He has a record of moral and intellectual improvement without a parallel in the history of the world, but I am not one of those who fear that he may outstrip the Anglo-Saxon in the race of life.

In Kentucky there has been a steady progress in public sentiment with reference to the Negro. Before the war he was a chattel, and held a place just a little above that of the race-horse or the blooded cow. Then came emancipation, and his former owners for a while felt a resentment toward those who had so violently deprived them of their property, which in part spent its force on the freedman himself.

The first movements on the part of the State toward recognizing him as an element in society was the proposition to allow him to testify in the courts. Just and reasonable as this now appears, it was at first received with a storm of disapproval, and seemed for a time to have destroyed the prospects for political preferment of all who openly favored it. But sentiment has changed entirely, and the first and most conspicuous advocate of this step is to-day a popular member of Congress, having been three times elected without serious opposition in a district composed of what was once the strongest stock-holding counties in the State. Then came the question of manhood suffrage, which was accepted under the pressure of the Constitutional amendment with an ill grace indeed. Views have changed, however, until all thoughtful men see that our fellow-citizens of African descent give the South twenty additional votes in Congress, and are willing to concede that, considering their condition and environments, they have used the right to vote in a manner creditable and encouraging. Then came the agitation with reference to their riding on the cars, but this no longer disturbs the public mind, and has become a question of condition and not of race. Colored people are now found in railway coaches of every class, and nobody notices their presence if decent in appearance and orderly in conduct.

The evolution of a system for the education of the Negro has been an interesting feature of our State economy. It took several years to bring us to the point of giving him for this purpose the taxes that he paid. This was at the time considered by our peo-

ple quite liberal and magnanimous. It soon became apparent, however, that it fell far short of our obligation to a class of our population so helpless and needy, and now with universal approval the law gives to the Negro child for school purposes the same *pro rata* that is enjoyed by the offspring of those who pay the bulk of the taxes. I would not be understood as claiming that prejudice in Kentucky has died out in a single generation; but I do assert that the Negro has a position here very different from that which he held at the close of the war. Time and intelligence have wrought wonders, and he is no longer engaged in working out his destiny "with fear and trembling," but is recognized as having fixed rights which none care to deny him. He is acquiring property, establishing family names, realizing the importance of social standing and learning the value of intelligence. There is still a race antagonism in Kentucky to the extent that social equality is neither allowed nor desired, and that the schools, in view of the best interests of all, are and must be kept separate. Intermarriage between the races is forbidden by law, and would not be tolerated by the thoughtful elements, either white or black. The masses of the colored people are still so far behind in educational advantages that they cannot find congenial associations save among themselves. The middle wall of partition has not been broken down, but it is no longer maintained in a spirit of rancor or bitterness. It is simply a necessity of the situation, and is acquiesced in by the Negroes themselves without question or complaint. Whoever attempts to predict what will be done in the future with reference to the Negro question is apt to utter nonsense, just as our fathers have done before us.

My own opinion has been for some years past that education will relieve the South of the most serious evils connected with the Negro problem. An ignorant man is not apt to change his location because he prefers "to bear the ills he has rather than fly to others that he knows not of." Those who have observed must have seen that intelligent colored people emigrate, as do the whites, and seek such places as offer the best facilities for earning a livelihood in their chosen spheres of service. As their condition is improved the dense Negro population of the South will be scattered, and the race will find itself a factor in the further development of every section of the Union. With more general intelligence will come a better observance of the moral code and a

higher conception of the responsibilities of life. Of course there must be a decided feeling of antagonism toward the Negro on the part of the white people of Louisiana or else a politician like Senator Eustis would not have written such a paper as he contributed to the October number of *The Forum*; but even its tone is different from what it would have been twenty years ago. It shows that the distinguished writer is not without appreciation of the better qualities of the "man and brother," but cannot yet tear himself away from the prejudices of "a day that is dead" and discuss dispassionately questions which time and the good sense of the people under God are settling to the glory of a country great enough to furnish equal rights before the law to all races of men. I have spent my entire life in the South, and belong to the dominant political party of that section. I have among the Negroes many warm friends whom I esteem, and who, in my intercourse with them, have shown that they possess some of the noblest attributes of manhood.

God knows I do not feel toward them any sentiment of race antagonism, neither do they expect from me more than they are entitled to in view of their culture and condition. Does not the course of events in Kentucky give reasonable ground to hope that the day is not far distant when throughout the Republic it will be realized in heart and expressed in act by white and black alike?

"That one sure link doth all control  
To one close brotherhood,  
For who the race of men doth love  
Loves also Him above."

---

BY REV. JOHN H. BOYD.

DURANT, MISS.

---

There are many points worthy of notice in Dr. Haygood's admirable reply to Senator Eustis' article on "Race Antagonism"; but I shall comment only on what is said about the Negro question being one of national concern. It seems self-evident that, now since the Negro has been enfranchised, he ought to be fitted to vote intelligently and from principle; that the condition of seven



million citizens must be of interest to all parts of a common country, and that the South in her present state is not equal to the task of fitting the Negro for the duties of citizenship. If these are not self-evident truths, Dr. Haygood has set them forth so clearly and forcibly that they have all the weight and authority of intuitions.

Even if national welfare were not jeopardized by the present condition of the Negro, philanthropy alone should seek to raise him to a higher plane. "No American citizen is out of place in seeking to make the Negro a fit citizen." There can be no officious intermeddling in this matter. May Slaters and Hands be multiplied! May more Fisk and Claflin Universities be founded! May more Northern teachers come to elevate these poor black children into Christian manliness! There is, however, another "spirit of intermeddling." Let me make a move with Dr. Haygood's own pieces. "If there were seven millions of Chinese in New England as unqualified for citizenship as are the majority of the Negroes in the South"; if by Southern legislation they were made citizens and voters, and by their votes should place corrupt men in power, squander the state's revenues, levy oppressive taxation on lands owned entirely by the native whites; if the good people of New England should overturn this tyranny; then if we of the South cried out "Fraud," "Intimidation," and unceasingly denounced them for not being thus governed; if we even told the Chinese that they should arm themselves and resist to death any attempt to keep them from ruling, for they had a right to rule, because, forsooth, there were more almond eyes in New England than any other kind of eyes; if we demanded that these Chinese should be received into hotels and churches and schools, and told the New England people that they were horridly wicked not so to receive them, would not such a message as this be sent to us? "Southern brethren, we need your help: send men, send money, to elevate these degraded Chinese; but let us manage the political and social relations—that is 'a domestic and home-rule question.'"

I do not believe that I have written a word counter to Dr. Haygood's meaning. There are two kinds of "intermeddling." Of the kind that Dr. Haygood writes we want more; of the other, every Southern man wants less.

The Negro problem is not, "How to secure the Negro his vote at the next election?" nor "How shall caste be instantaneously destroyed? but "How can we fit the Negro for citizenship?"

“How can we elevate him in intelligence and virtue?” This is so pressing that we invoke aid from every quarter. When the Negro has been qualified by education and character he will secure his rights as naturally as the heir enters into his property on reaching his majority. Social relations will adjust themselves to the satisfaction of all concerned. The key to the whole situation is the elevation of the Negro. When this is done all other problems will be self-solving.

By JULIUS D. DREHER,

PRESIDENT OF ROANOKE COLLEGE, SALEM, VA.

I have your request for a brief expression of my views on the controversy between Dr. Haygood and Senator Eustis on race antagonism in the South. As it is impossible to discuss a subject of so great public concern within the narrow limits prescribed by your letter, I must restrict myself to brief mention of a few of the many points that invite attention.

I heartily agree with the spirit of Dr. Haygood's reply to Senator Eustis. It is useless now to attempt to fix the degree of responsibility of the North and the South for the existence or the continuance of slavery. It is worse than useless to seek help in solving our present perplexing problems by indulging in sectional recrimination, in partisan appeals, or—to quote Dr. Haygood—in “commonplace satires on the inconsistencies of the New England friends of the Negro.” In any serious discussion of the Negro problem, it needs first to be admitted that the humane sentiment of the civilized world has been growing more and more uncompromisingly opposed to human slavery anywhere and under any forms whatever; and that consequently the abolition of slavery throughout the world has been from the first only a question of time. The early abolitionists in any country are to be regarded as simply pioneers in the cause of humanity, outspoken apostles of human freedom, heralds of the incoming era of universal brotherhood. If we take this broad view of the general question, we shall regard the steps leading to emancipation in our own country and in other lands as so many milestones on the ample highway of human pro-



gress. It helps us little indeed in solving the problems growing out of this great step in our national life, to be told by Senator Eustis that some Northern people have been unwise, inconsistent, and even fanatical, on this Negro question. When two school-boys fight, if each finds fault with the other and with his ancestors for generations, that does not settle—it rather aggravates—their little difficulty. If the South blames the North, and the North the South, that may all be perfectly natural, and the battle of words may be thick and interminable, since much may easily be said on both sides of the question; but would it not be wiser to leave these old matters of controversy to the impartial verdict of the historian in the distant future, and address ourselves to the momentous task of discharging the obligations imposed upon us by the present condition of affairs?

The humane sentiment of the world has doomed slavery as an institution of modern society; and now the benevolent spirit of the age pronounces against the repression of the natural or acquired rights of any class of persons. This spirit is most active where individual freedom is least restricted, where equality of opportunity exists, and where the highest estimate is placed on man as man. Its aim is to give the greatest happiness to the greatest number, an equal chance to all men to rise, and every wise help and encouragement in the race of life; and all this, without regard to nationality, creed, race, color or condition. Recognizing as a maxim that where the need is greatest the call of duty is strongest, it is quite natural that this spirit should seek to protect and elevate the Indian in the West, and to educate the Negro in the South in order to fit him for the duties of manhood and citizenship. The education of the Negro is not simply a Christian, but also a patriotic duty; it is a national problem, a national necessity; and it is a task that cannot well be accomplished by the Southern people alone. We ought not, therefore, to consider the benevolent and patriotic efforts of Northern people to aid in this work as intermeddling with the affairs of the South. It would be strange indeed if the Northern people, who are largely responsible for bringing about the emancipation and enfranchisement of the Negro, should not recognize their obligation to aid in fitting him for his new position. Fortunately they not only recognize this duty, but they have the ability and willingness to aid in the solution of this grave problem. According to the census of 1880. New

England, with one-fourth the population and one-twelfth the area of the thirteen Southern States (not including Missouri), had an assessed valuation of property greater than that of the South; and the six Middle States (including Maryland and the District of Columbia), with nearly three-fourths the population and one-seventh the area, had an assessed valuation more than double that of the Southern States. Or, to give the figures: The New England and Middle States combined—area, 182,995 square miles; population, 15,766,582; assessed valuation, \$8,216,134,370; the Southern States—area, 818,065 square miles; population, 16,257,393; assessed valuation, \$2,370,923,269. A little study of these figures will show how difficult the educational problem is in the South, and how easy it is in the North.

In proportion to assessed valuation the South is doing as much as the North for public schools, in appropriations for which the Negroes share equally with the whites. With a taxable basis of \$1,584,756,802 (in 1880; now more than \$2,000,000,000), Massachusetts finds it an easy matter to keep her common schools open for ten months in a year; while Virginia, with an area more than five times as large and a taxable basis of only \$308,455,135, has no easy task to keep her schools in session five months of the year. Connecticut, although less than one-eighth the area of Kentucky, has nearly as large a taxable basis as that State; while Rhode Island, one forty-seventh the area of Georgia, more than equaled the latter in wealth (in 1880). The Southern people have done nobly in this work of educating both races; but let them do much more—let them go to the full extent of their ability, a limit not yet reached; and there will still be an ample field inviting the largest private munificence or—if you please—national bounty. Let us of the South be grateful, then, for Peabody, Slater, and Hand, for Vanderbilt and Tulane, and hosts of other contributors to the lower and the higher education of both races: and let us not regard their patriotic gifts to education—as Senator Eustis seems to do—as intermeddling with the “local” affairs of the South.

With so inadequate provision for public schools, we should not be impatient of results in the education of the Negro. So recently in slavery, and still more or less enslaved by the vices incident to that system, the Negro must be tried for several generations before an adequate test can be made of the power of education to elevate him. On the whole, he has made steady, if not rapid progress;

on the whole, he has conducted himself creditably since, as he did during, the war. He is naturally docile and peaceable; and if we treat him as a man with the same fairness, justice, and consideration we claim for ourselves as men, we shall hear less of race antagonism in the future. Knowing the peaceable disposition of the Negroes as we do, is it not strange how often the specter of a "Negro uprising" or "Negro riot" is conjured up by heated imaginations and published throughout the Union as an imminent danger to the white race? Southern man as I am by birth, education and residence, an ex-confederate soldier whose home was in the track of Sherman's march through South Carolina, I must, nevertheless, confess that I feel no little impatience when reading such reports about a race which exhibited so much peaceableness and trustworthiness during the war; and which, unless needlessly provoked or deceived, may be relied upon for a continued exhibition of virtues that are characteristic of the race. The admitted superiority of our race, of which we boast so proudly, instead of carrying with it the right to hold the Negro forever in a position of hopeless inferiority, imposes upon us the greater obligation to help him make the most he can of himself and his situation. This policy of helping and encouraging the Negro will do more than any system of repression to promote between the races in the South that entire harmony in which the best interests of both races are alike involved. And this, it seems to me, does not necessarily mean Negro supremacy in any Southern State. The real question is not now, and never has been, whether the Negro should entirely monopolize the government of any community; but the time has come when the most important question for the consideration of the Southern people is the probable result of any policy that abridges any rights guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. For if we deprive any class of citizens of their lawful participation in the choice of law-makers and rulers, we repress or remove the most powerful incentive to the growth of that patriotic devotion to country which lies at the foundation of our national welfare, and gives the only sure promise of the perpetuity of our free institutions.

BY HON. SETH LOW,

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

The article of Senator Eustis of Louisiana, in the October *Forum* of 1888, upon Race Antagonism in the South, and the reply by the Rev. Atticus G. Haygood, are worthy of the most careful attention on the part of thoughtful men both at the North and at the South. Whatever views one may hold upon the subject, it is impossible to read the two papers here discussed without gaining a new and solemn sense of the magnitude and importance of the questions involved in the Negro problem. Senator Eustis labors to establish two propositions. First, that there is a race antagonism between the white man and the Negro which is invincible, and which can be satisfied only by a relation which leaves the Negro in a position distinctly and permanently inferior to the position of the white race. Second, that the solution of the immensely difficult problem involved in this relationship is a question local to the South, and which the South should be permitted to solve in its own way. The second of these propositions Dr. Haygood, one must think, demolishes completely. Neither the Northern conscience nor the Northern intelligence can assume, for one moment, that the rest of the Nation is unconcerned in the solution of this question which is to be reached at the South. Whatever may be the exact nature of the problem, the North is as vitally, if not as immediately, interested, in its proper solution as is South Carolina itself.

The first proposition, therefore, that there is a race antagonism which necessitates the relation of inferiors on the part of the Negro race, seems to present the real question for discussion, so far as the settlement of the question is to be advanced by argument. Dr. Haygood frankly takes issue with this proposition, and freely admits that from this standpoint the Senator's conclusions can be understood. It is an advantage that should be made clear to the Northern mind that a view so radical is seriously entertained by an influential body of opinion in the Southern States. Without argument, and without any serious reflection upon the subject, the practical attitude of the North to the colored population living in their midst, would seem to be that before the law the colored man is entitled to the same rights as the white man; that, in the

exercise of his right of suffrage, the colored man's ballot is to be as free and as sacred as the ballot of the white man. When the question leaves the domain of public rights, society leaves the social relations of the two races to settle themselves. In other words, in the actual conditions prevailing at the North, it seems to be clear that the two races can live together upon an equality as to public rights. This is all that is asked should be done in the South. No thoughtful man will dispute that the situation becomes infinitely more embarrassing where the Negroes are in a majority, or even where they represent an important minority. It seems, however, as though these difficulties were not so much incidents of the difference in race, as of the low standard of development on the part of the Negro in those sections of the country where these conditions prevail. Centuries of slavery and degradation are not to be overcome, even in the uplifting air of America, in a quarter of a century.

To those who look at the matter from a distance, Dr. Haygood will seem to be right in his view, that the response on the part of the Negro race to the efforts to educate them, made during the last few years, is sufficiently marked and encouraging to warrant the utmost efforts which can be made along that line, both on the part of the Southern States themselves and of their friends at the North. Meanwhile, the one attitude which would seem to make impossible any hopeful progress with the question, is precisely that attitude outlined by the Senator, the assumption that a race antagonism exists which will render futile all such efforts. To convince the North that this attitude is correct, it will be necessary to break up the Northern conviction that, as matter of fact, it is completely possible for equality of public rights to exist, side by side with social relations which adjust themselves unaided by written law. It will further be necessary to demonstrate to the North that a republic can survive, founded upon universal suffrage, in which millions of citizens are compelled to hold a civil position concededly inferior to the position of a great bulk of their countrymen. The question as it presents itself to the Southern mind appears to be, in the words of Senator Morgan, "Shall Negro majorities rule?" The North is unable to appreciate why the South should find itself shut up to this question, except for the fallacy, as it seems to us, which underlies the position taken by Senator Eustis. At the North the Negro vote divides, as well as the

white vote. Why is it not possible that both votes should divide at the South, as well as at the North?

Politics aside, there is unquestionably, in all thoughtful circles at the North, the profoundest sympathy for our Southern brothers in the presence of the great problem which lies so close to them, and which yet concerns us only less vitally than it concerns them. This sympathy on the part of many has been outspoken; those who have spoken are but few compared with the great multitude who sincerely cherish this feeling. But even to these, if I may speak as one of them, it seems as though Senator Eustis confuses the issue and misses the only line along which a solution consistent with republican government upon this continent can by any possibility be found. It seems to such men that the first action which the situation calls for in the South, is a change of aim on the part of those whose position enables them to form public sentiment. Instead of aiming to find a "modus vivendi," in the midst of republican institutions, for an inferior race side by side with a superior race, the aim should be so to divide the votes of both races along the questions of present concern, as to make the government of a Southern community a government representative of all its elements instead of only one. Time and education and patience are no doubt necessary for progress along this line as along any other, but the advantage that this has, over the attitude taken by Senator Eustis, is, that the aim, at least, is consistent with the whole basis of popular government as illustrated in the United States. The other aim, which would preserve the domination of the white race, with or without law, is not consistent with a republican form of government. Politicians at the North are likely to find it an unfailing weapon in their hands, as long as it remains the evident policy of the Southern States.



By P. D. SIMS, M. D.,

CHATTANOOGA, TENN.

Whatever of lasting benefit resulted from slavery, accrued more to the black than to the white race.

Whatever of lasting injury resulted from slavery, accrued more to the white than to the black race.

The Negro lost no civilization. He was taken from a state of barbarism. Slavery was to him an enforced tutelage, that gave to him the rudiments of civilization—industry and subordination. It lifted him in the scale of humanity from a lower to a higher level. The emancipated slaves of America, as a class, were better equipped for citizenship in a civilized government, than they were when forced into bondage—better than their brethren are to-day in their native African wilds. Slavery was hurtful to the white man, in that it taught him a spirit of domineering and a habit of idleness and profligacy. For the resultant benefits to the black, the white is entitled to no credit. For the resultant injury to the white, the black is amenable to no censure. Both grew out of the cupidity of the white man. The Negro, being an unwilling party to the hurtful relation, was entitled to whatever of good might grow out of the evil. The white man, having forced the relation, is justly amenable to its evil results.

While slavery left the Negro, as a race, better than it found him—better in all human probability than he ever would have been without it; and while it left the white man the worse for it, the white man cannot plead this in cancellation of the debt of common humanity—the debt that every man and every race owe to those beneath them.

The philanthropic efforts put forth by individuals, societies, and states, both North and South, for the education of the emancipated race, have been successful in that behalf, far beyond the most sanguine expectations, and too much cannot be said in praise of those who have undergone so much self-denial and self-sacrifice in this work. But while the Negro has been thus elevated as a race in intelligence, in culture, in all that goes to make manhood, can we say that any appreciable progress has been made toward a peaceful co-citizenship of the two races? Are not events and experiences crowding themselves upon us to force the conviction, that the more

12

nearly equal in numbers, and the more nearly equal in intelligence, two races, not miscible by intermarriage, become, the more marked and the more determined will be the antagonism between them? In the (recent) language of a distinguished Republican Senator, must not "the one or the other go to the wall"?

To say there is no antagonism between the races, is to turn a deaf ear to the unending story of irritation and conflict, outrage and abuse, that comes and continues to come from the densely negro-inhabited districts.

The Negro is not assimilable in our civilization. Sociological laws forbid it, and sooner or later he must be cast off, by it, as foreign irritant matter. In slavery, the interest of ownership, as well as the consideration of acknowledged inferiority of the Negro, protected him. His present is a transition state. Nominally free, and equal with the white. Practically, in a state of quasi-slavery. Can it be otherwise and the races remain together? Theoretically, "yes"! Practically, "doubtful"!

"A condition and not a theory confronts us." To make the "theory" possible, and practicable, requires an amount of moral, intellectual and psychological training for both races too great, it is to be feared, to be attained before the weaker race "has gone to the wall," has been destroyed by antagonistic contact with the stronger.

---

By JOSEPH HOLT, M. D.,

PORTLAND, OREGON: LATE PRES'T BOARD OF HEALTH, NEW ORLEANS.

---

The Negro Problem is undoubtedly national in scope, and except in fitting the Negro by educational training for the functions of true citizenship according to the best of his individual capacity, I see no solution of the question. We cannot annihilate nine millions of people. We cannot transport nine millions of people. To what country would we send them? by what right? with whose money? with whose consent? We do not propose to destroy ourselves, or ourselves to go away. We must accept the inevitable: we must occupy together. The question at last is: How shall we



live together? Not by "race antagonism", for that implies interminable strife, destruction of every material interest, of industrial education and moral development, of the present and prospective happiness of both races. An orderly condition of society is as essential to prosperity and happiness as sunlight is to vegetable growth. The problem is reduced to this: How to live together as citizens of a common country, strictly amenable to law, each taking his social scale according to the instinct of his race and his personal merit; reprobating oppression and crime, bringing all crime to judgment, seeking all prosperity without injury to that of others. If any political economist, statesman, or other person, North or South, can suggest a better answer to the problem, now is the time for him to come forward and submit his plan for examination. After all, do we not magnify the difficulties of the problem? Does not the peculiar relation of the races in the United States, the fact that they can live together in unity of interest, the docility and teachableness of the inferior race, their dependence for instruction and guidance, their ready conformity to the customs, manners and religion of the superior, and the two races' reciprocal industrial service,—do these things not all seem to suggest for the national future, not only the highest attainable reach of the African American, but the absolute perfection of all that is possible in the European American? The histories of the two races in North America, in such striking contrast with those of the Indian and the Mongolian in their race contact with the white man, points to such a future with almost prophetic certainty.

A life-time familiar acquaintance with the Negro in the South convinces me that the two races are mutually adaptable through educational processes; that race antagonism between the whites and blacks in the United States is the result of an abnormal state of affairs, which admits of equitable adjustment, and that the necessities of the two races demand and will compel such an adjustment. For the two are certainly interdependent in those regions of the Atlantic and Gulf States south of the thirty-sixth parallel of latitude.

No matter whether Boston ships or Charleston ships brought him here, the Negro is here in multitude, here to stay; all argument must be conformed to these facts. The enemies of a beneficent harmony between the two races are the spoils-hunting political adventurer, the unscrupulous home politician, the vicious white man, the criminal Negro—these are the fomenters of race antagonism

through political villainies, mischievous neighborhood broils, and outrageous crimes, constituting themselves a composite rock of offence and a stumbling-block in the way of good citizens in the work of race adjustment.

The race problem is not a problem of the present generation's own creation or choice. They were born to it. It will not be relegated, and there is no solution of it except such as is found in the principles of right between neighbor and neighbor, whether brothers or not, established by the eternal Lawgiver himself. It matters not what retaliatory mischief may ensue from a violation on either side of these principles of equity and good citizenship; to this complexion it must come at last, sooner or later, but the sooner the better. It is a dreadful mistake to suppose the race question can be settled by violence. Even if rivers of blood were shed, it could and will at last be solved only by the rigid maintenance of the rights of citizens strictly under the law.



