

# The Looking Glass

## LITERATURE

IN the March CRISIS we quoted in this column the stirring verses of Guy Fitch Phelps called "The White Christ". To this Mrs. Myra King Whitson sends "The Answer" which we gladly publish:

### THE ANSWER

To Guy Fitch Phelps

The real Christ comes from the East,  
The West, or over, or underneath;  
And He follows the drip-drip-drip of blood  
Where ever His brothers breathe.  
Pale skin and dark, cover seething blood,  
And the color's the name—it's red—  
The real Christ broods in anguished Love,  
Where ever that blood is shed.

\* \* \*

Mrs. Whitson writes: "If you really do want to be fair to your paler friends . . . I hope you will print these lines which I enclose. They are the immediate response of the heart of one, who by accident is white, as to skin, but who feels as many of us do, the deeper, essential kinship of all mankind. We can hardly let you accuse us of worshipping a 'White Christ who sanctions faggot, club and gun'."

\* \* \*

We have received *The Commercial Outlook*, a monthly magazine which voices "the sentiments and views of students in Commerce and Finance of Howard University, its Alumni and friends, and acquaints the school and public with a knowledge of Negro business."

\* \* \*

Blanche Watson, protagonist in the United States of the Gandhi Movement in India, writes in her "Voice of the New Revolution":

Ever since the East India Company first gained a foothold in India in the 18th century, India has been regarded by the British as an instrument in the expansion of England. Writing in 1882, nearly forty years ago, Sir John Seeley, a British historian said:

"There is then no Indian nationality, although there are some germs out of which we can conceive an Indian Nationality developing . . . If the feeling of a common nationality began to exist there, only feebly, if—without inspiring any active desire to drive out the foreigner, it only created a notion that it was shameful to assist him in maintaining his dominion, from that day almost, our Empire would

cease to exist . . . For it is a condition of our Indian Empire that it should be held without any great effort . . . The moment India began to show herself what we so idly imagine her to be—a conquered nation—that moment we should recognize perforce the impossibility of retaining her."

To-day, in India, this universal feeling of nationality has not only taken shape, but it is assuming enormous proportions.

## THE ARCH CHAMELEON

WHEN is a quibble not a quibble? On the lips of Mr. William Jennings Bryan. Hear him and his bland interpretations in *N. Y. Times*, written since he has moved South:

Back in 1898 when we were discussing imperialism a public man from the South cautioned me against laying too much emphasis upon the Declaration of Independence, adding that in the States where the blacks menaced white supremacy it had been found necessary to ignore the doctrine that all men were created equal. I replied that limitations upon the exercise of suffrage by the black race ought not to be based upon a denial of the doctrine of equality as found in the Declaration of Independence, but upon the real foundation, which in no way contradicts or weakens the Declaration of Independence. I defended the doctrine of equality in the inalienable rights enumerated in the Declaration of Independence and explained to him that the problem which the whites of the South had to solve did not involve the question of equality before the law; that no one denied that the blacks were entitled to equal protection in their rights. The question is, which race shall control the Government and make the laws under which both shall live? The more advanced race will always control as a matter of self-preservation not only for the benefit of the advanced race, but for the benefit of the backward race also.

In the States where restrictions are placed upon suffrage for the purpose of excluding enough black to preserve white supremacy, *the blacks have the advantage of living under laws that the white man makes for himself as well as for the black man. The laws make no distinction in the matter of crime between whites and blacks.*

\* \* \*

The italics are ours. Is Mr. Bryan really unaware of the distinction between *making a law and enforcing it?* Does he really believe that the law is interpreted in the same way for white as for colored in



MR. BRYAN LENDS A HAND

N. Y. Call

Southern Courts? The *New York Call* differs with him:

With the change of a few words Bryan's defense of "white supremacy" might have come from Calhoun or Toombs. "The colored people . . . live under the laws that the white people make for themselves as well as for the colored people." If Negroes made the laws would they "be better for both, or (be) administered with more fairness than now"? Republicans moving South act as white Democrats do toward the Negro in the South.

Bryan has offered a justification for class

rule and exploitation that is adapted for any age where labor, white or black, has been sweated for the pleasure of a minority. His pretense that laws are made to serve the Negro as well as the white contradicts all the evidence we have of white class rule in the South. What of the debt servitude of Negroes? Is the almost universal penalty of lynching for Negroes assessed against whites? What of the practice of courts sending Negroes into the chain gang to build roads? What of Negroes serving on juries? What of the Negro's testimony against a white man in court?

What is more, this "white supremacy"