

the State's reputation as a good place to live in and invest money in is redeemed from the hands of the anonymous figure with the rifle and the hemp. We want every acre of land in Georgia to be settled by the finest class of white people this Union can send us. We want every horsepower of waterfall developed and set to whirring the wheels of the factories in a thousand valleys, and we want money from every quarter of the globe to do it with—but as long as we give the editorial writers, cartoonists and publicists of sister states through industrially competing sections of the republic food for attacks and comparisons putting us in a class with Mexico, holding up life in Georgia as just one lynching after another, as being enjoyed only at the price of the vigilance of night-riders, just as the old-time pioneers had to fight Indians for the privilege of enjoying a night's sleep, as a State where law is impotent and the individual supreme, then so long will the good people stay away, naturally, and the worst element come just as water seeks its level. That Georgia is one of the most delightful parts of the Union to live in, that life and social intercourse is as safe and delightful as anywhere else, if not more so, that lynchings are merely incidental and not typical every Georgian knows, but as long as lynchings go on in this State nobody else is going to believe it."

The Governor of the State confesses his impotence:

"Although it may not be generally understood and it probably isn't widely known, it is a fact, nevertheless, that the Governor of Georgia is a man whose hands are tied under the present laws. I have done all that I could to stop lynching and to bring the guilty parties to justice. The provisions of the law are such that the governor has no powers over the control of lynching unless the civil authorities apply to him. Then he can declare a state of martial law. In no instance during my term as governor have the civil authorities asked me for aid or said that they were unable to compete with the situation."

Meantime the Atlanta *Constitution* is making frantic appeals:

"Georgia must do something about this matter of indiscriminate lynching and do it quickly. For every day's delay the people of the whole state pay the penalty."

"Certainly the public conscience is not

so seared, nor the public eye so blinded to the state's welfare, that the people of Georgia propose to permit this sort of thing to go on indefinitely, growing worse and worse from year to year, with no effort to stop these assaults upon the law which are assaults indirectly upon every man, woman and child in the State.

"Because of her lynching record, Georgia is being condemned from Maine to California and from the Lakes to the Gulf.

"How long are we going to continue to hold this unenviable record? How long do we propose to continue to increase it? . . .

"Time and again the *Constitution* has shown, inevitably, just where this disregard for law was leading; time and again has it urged revision of the law, looking to speedier and more certain punishment for guilt, in order to remove the last vestige of excuse for mob law.

"What has come within the last few months? Georgia has achieved the black and unenviable record of having led all the States of the Union in lynching, and not in one single instance for that particular crime for which, some years ago, was taken as the only offense that could possibly justify mob execution! . . .

"With another lynching in Twiggs county last week Georgia now has a record of an average of one a week since the beginning of the new year. If this rate is maintained, it is easy to see how the state may double and even treble her performance of last year, when she surpassed every other state in the Union in her exhibitions of mob violence. . . .

"Isn't it time for Georgia's conscience to spur the manhood of the state to action, and to call the politicians from out of the cellars?"

A southern woman, writing in the Macon *Telegraph*, strikes this ominous note:

"Has the South so soon forgotten her bitter experience in the horrible struggle over State's rights that she would so foolishly rush into civil strife again? Who in the South after years of sober reflection but realizes the vain boastings of the 'fire-eaters'? Who does not reverence the memory of our beloved Alex. Stephens, whose voice was ever raised in defense of law and union and peace?"

"And yet the sons of those men, who fought the bloody war and learned through

suffering the sad and humiliating lesson; these men today are ready and willing to follow blindly, ignorantly, men who advocate disunion, strife, lawlessness and pretended citizens' and States' rights. A citizen or State has no rights but to be law-abiding. When they wilfully violate laws made to promote a more sane and temperate life, they deserve nothing but contempt; they have forfeited all rights.

"I am convinced that the brutish men who would fiendishly take a human being out and put him to death without law are not trying to defend their homes nor protect Southern women. It is simply their thirst for blood, their brutish nature lusting for expression. Southern women do not need, nor desire, nor appreciate such defense. They only blush in shame that they are fellow-citizens of such characters. I am today more afraid of such men than of all the colored races, brown, yellow, red or black, on God's green earth."

MASSACHUSETTS

THE case of the colored stenographer dismissed from the Massachusetts institution on account of race prejudice has caused much discussion. A correspondent writes to the *New Republic*:

"To my mind the saddest factor of the situation is that the discrimination applies to all Negroes. Inasmuch as we rightfully discriminate against illiterate and ill-bred whites, I see no reason why we should not also discriminate against the same type of Negro. But when a Negro endeavors to develop his character and to broaden his culture, and he receives from us frowns and discouraging hindrances, when his reward is not even equality of opportunity with the whites, then his case is pitiable indeed."

"It has been with much interest and speculation that I have watched the vicissitudes of a fine Negro's struggle. I suppose this chap possesses all the best instincts of the Caucasian. He seems to be the kind of man who is never satisfied with present attainments and to whom success becomes but a step to a more distant goal. He entered Harvard Medical School with the understanding that a hospital appointment was to be had after graduation. This appointment never materialized.

"Given such a Negro, educated, well-bred, intelligent, likeable, and possessed of

the best characteristics of the best whites, there can be only one reason for ostracism. That is prejudice. And for anyone to suppose that the prejudice of Boston, Mass., is a superior kind of prejudice to that of Boston, Ind., or of Boston, Cal., is to be so smugly mistaken as to be almost beyond enlightenment's cure."

A Tennessean answers hotly:

"Are there still people that believe in the racial equality of the Negro? Would he be willing for a sister of his to marry a Negro, or be doctored by one? To a Southerner the idea is too repulsive for words. The Negro has always been a servile race since the time of Noah's curse of servility on Ham. The highest civilization that they ever attained was in the Moors, and when they intermarried with the Spaniards they lost the best characteristics of both races. The same is true of the mulatto.

"No one denies that the position of the ambitious Negro is a pitiful one, but are we willing to lower the standard of the white race so as to raise the Negro? It has been demonstrated that the fusion of the two races generally produces a sort of mongrel conglomeration. What we want to strive for is more race purity, instead of letting down the bars."

The Boston *Post* says:

"There is no denial of the fact that the trouble arose because the other employees of the hospital objected to sitting in the same dining room with this colored girl, although it seems evident that the highest authorities of the institution did not object to sitting in the same office with her. The time to have scotched this race prejudice was right then."

"It should have been made clear to the employees who felt contaminated by eating in the same room with this well educated and refined girl that there would be no objection to their resignations at any time they wanted to send them in, but that Miss Bosfield would continue to eat in the main dining room. There would have been no resignations."

"To be entirely frank," says a correspondent to the Boston *Herald*, "Miss Bosfield cannot and ought not to expect to be received on perfectly equal terms with her white co-workers. We are all subject to limitations of some kind; this is a limitation which is absolutely inherent in the Ne-