

Others stress the political aspects. The *New York Telegraph* says:

It was buncombe. It was introduced as a sop to Negroes of the North who have some influence in politics, and it was debated with a view solely to campaign literature. In the next campaign the so-called sponsors of the measure will be able to tell Negro voters that the bill would have gone through if it had not been for the wicked Democrats. It may fool some of them. The record shows that Negroes holding the franchise are easily fooled.

And the Philadelphia *Public Ledger* adds:

It would be well for the managers of the party which espoused the measure only to surrender it, to consider well the possible consequences. For they may be very certain that the fight of the colored people of the United States, and of their warm sympathizers among the white people, will not be abandoned until something effective shall be done to check and finally abolish the lynching wrong.

The Middle West is not certain that the Dyer Bill was the best sort of Bill but it is certain that something should be done.

The Cincinnati, Ohio *Commercial-Tribune* says:

The Dyer bill may not be the last word in the wisdom of how to suppress lynching. It is a gesture in behalf of doing something in that direction. Just to talk the whole proposition to death indicates opposition to the principle. It looks like a movement merely bent on defeating any and all anti-murder manifestation. As such it is not the highest order of statesmanship.

And the Chicago *Tribune* compares the 18th Amendment and the Dyer Bill:

The South supports a federal amendment prohibiting the use of alcoholic beverages throughout the nation, regardless of state or local customs or convictions. The Southern senators favor the intervention of federal power to prevent a New York citizen from taking a glass of wine or a Milwaukeean a glass of beer. This is an invasion not merely of the right of private judgment, but of local self-government, local police power, local social conscience.

Why is it proper to call upon the central government to impose its authority upon private habit and local custom, but a danger to the fabric of our government for the central authority to protect life when the local government fails to protect it?

We think the states should have sole responsibility for their own social policy and public discipline. But if the central government is to assume such responsibility we cannot see that mob murder in Georgia or Illinois is an improper object of its restraint while the drinking of alcoholic beverages is a proper object.

On the Pacific Coast, the Portland, Oregon, *Oregonian*, says:

The lynching evil must be suppressed if the canker of lawlessness, already grave, is not to spread throughout the republic. Our government is in a poor position to reproach other nations for acts of barbarity while this evil prevails, for it furnishes them with a ready retort. The success of those who killed the Dyer bill is but temporary, for the question will continue to be raised until the law is supreme over the mob in every state.

The old reactionary bourbon spirit is voiced frankly by a certain Chester H. Rowell, a Southerner writing in the Los Angeles *Express*:

No bill exercising federal authority over any aspect of the race question can ever pass Congress except by overcoming by actual physical resistance the Southern senators. The Constitution, for instance, confers on Congress the power to make or alter regulations for the elections of senators and representatives, but no Congress will ever be permitted to exercise that constitutional authority.

Southern senators will filibuster against it absolutely without limit. They will trade votes to defeat it, on either side of any question, and they will obstruct its consideration by physical resistance, even to the extent of permanently stopping all the functions of government.

Other papers take refuge in imputing hypocrisy to the Republicans.

The whole thing was a "sham" says the Louisville *Post*. Most of the papers, however, look at the matter seriously. The Jacksonville, Fla., *Times-Union*, the Charleston, S. C., *Post*, the Houston *Post*, the Savannah *News* all agree that the spirit behind the Dyer Bill is not dead and unless the Southern States stop lynching, a Federal Law is sure to come.

The Rev. Ashby Jones says in the Atlanta *Constitution*:

The lynching bill was lynched—the force bill was destroyed by force. The Dyer bill died a violent death, and there have been no mourners among either Democrats or the Republicans.

The whole proceedings ran true to form. A mob assembled in the Senate chamber, and everybody knew it was forming, and knew just what they were going to do. The officers in charge of the proposed law made a slight pretense of defending their prisoner and then surrendered to the overwhelming numbers and force of a small minority. The prisoner was a great embarrassment, and the officers were truly delighted to have him forcibly taken from their charge and put to death.

And an interesting debate takes place in the Tampa, Florida *Morning Tribune*. The Editor says:

If the advocates of the Dyer bill would devote one-tenth the money, time, and determination they have put into the efforts to have this spectacular thing enacted, into a campaign to eradicate the cause for which lynching in the South is the remedy, there would be no need for such a bill anywhere; but so long as the "bad nigger"—and he is usually of "high color" and "high eddication"—is made to believe he will be able to do his devilment and be protected through a bill which will penalize a whole county that makes an example of him, just so long will lynchings be; and all the Dyer bills in all the files of all the advocates of such methods will not operate to save one single black rapist from the nearest tree or post when he lays foul hands on a white woman in the South.

If the courts will not punish promptly and effectively the black rapist, the people will, and this is no appeal for mob law either, but a simple statement of facts.

But a colored woman replies:

Mr. Editor, the Negroes of this community feel that the editorial referred to shows such a spirit of antagonism to Negro education and advancement as we are reluctant to characterize as the *Tribune's* real attitude. . . . The premium that white men put on their womanhood is worthy of the commendation of any people. Making criminals of hundreds of fathers of the future womanhood of their race who participated in mob murders is rather inconsistent, however. Please let us say further, Mr. Editor, that we do not know any case where educated Negroes have been lynched save in race riots like the ones in Arkansas and Oklahoma, where the bloodthirsty mob found pleasure in destroying the lives and property of the best Negro citizens as a means of humiliating the entire race. Nor do we understand what is meant by the Negro of "high color". Surely, the writer does not refer to mulattoes whose color proves the disregard our Southern white men have had for racial purity and the value of virtuous womanhood even among the Negroes, their humble loyal friends . . .

Yours for peace and civic righteousness.
BLANCHE ARMWOOD BEATTY.

Finally the San Antonio *Express* writes:

So the crape will continue to hang from practically all the constitutions—National and State. And we, the people of the United States, will go on with our perfect Union; in which "Justice" is established, domestic tranquility insured, the general welfare promoted, and the blessings of "liberty" secured to ourselves and our posterity.

The roastings at the stake and the riddling of lynched corpses with bullets will go on, too. Mob-murder will continue to grow

fat on what it feeds upon and, as ever, utterly fail to achieve its—ofttimes falsely—declared object.

And we shall continue to thank God that we are not as other men are—even as the "unspeakable" Turk in Asia Minor, the "treacherous" Japanese in Korea, the German in Belgium, and the Belgian in the Congo; the British in Ireland and India, the French in Algeria, and the Polish and the Russian pogrom-butchers and thieves in their own lands.

Meanwhile, of course, the journalists and historians of all those brutal, unenlightened, far inferior countries will continue to record, for their own people's edification, the facts and opinions concerning our Twentieth Century American use of the chains, the fagots and the stake.

A GOOD NEGRO

MEANTIME in Florida and Texas the perfect fruit of lynching continues. But North Carolina has the most delicious case.

Says the Greensboro, N. C. *News*:

Sometime between midnight of December 6 and 1 o'clock of December 7 a citizen of Columbus county was aroused at his home in Chadburn and upon appearing at the door was confronted by a group of men wearing masks and robes, one of whom demanded that the householder come out into the yard. Several guns were pointed in his direction. He complied, and then asked:

"Now here I am. What do you want?"
"We will tell you when we take you down the road a piece," a voice replied.

The man who was prisoner to the mob is L. E. Hall, Negro, teacher, expert farmer, in the employ of the state of North Carolina, and the United States. He is an agent in the co-operative extension work in agriculture and home economics. The head of this department is Dr. B. W. Kilgore, director of the agricultural extension service. Hall is the appointee of C. R. Hudson, state agent. These field agents receive their pay in part from the state treasury and in part from the national treasury.

At a bend in the road leading out of Chadburn one of the men in the car with Hall suggested that he look back, and on doing so he counted the headlights of seven automobiles (a flour sack had been placed over the head of the prisoner; the lights were visible through it.) The captive was told there were three more cars ahead. Something was said about a whipping. It was evident that there must be about 40 men in the mob.

"Good land!" said the prisoner, "does it take all these men to whip one man?" "No," he was told, "we have brought along some for witnesses." After about three miles the procession stopped, and a whispered conversation amongst the masks took place. The prisoner was told that he would be asked