

The Independent

VOL. XV.

LINCOLN NEB., NOVEMBER 26, 1903.

No. 27.

THE NEW SOUTH

A Retrospective and a Prospective View of the South by a Northern Man

Editor Independent: A new south is coming to the front. This must be kept in mind by those who would found a new party. The new south will demand protection instead of tariffs for revenue only.

There are places in the south, now, where the negroes do not know that they are free. But this will not always be so. Ever since the civil war they have been gradually gaining in knowledge and prosperity. Northern capital has been going there. Mills and factories have also been going there. Gradually the south is becoming northernized. The negroes, as well as the whites, are feeling this new force.

There is a great deal of discussion throughout the country with reference to repealing the 14th and 15th amendments of the constitution of the United States. Why do they want to repeal these amendments? Why not also repeal the 13th amendment, which declares that "neither slavery nor involuntary servitude . . . shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction?" The 14th amendment declares that "all persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the state wherein they reside." This declaration is broad enough to include negroes as well as foreigners, because negroes are "persons born" in this country; and, therefore, we have a solemn, constitutional declaration that negroes are citizens not only of the United States, but of the state wherein they reside. This gives colored citizens all the rights that white citizens have, and if this amendment can be repealed, the 13th amendment abolishing slavery will also be repealed and become null and void.

The object of repealing the 14th amendment then is to deprive negroes of all the rights of citizenship, which would certainly reduce them to slavery. The 15th amendment declares that "the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of race, color or previous condition of servitude." This gives our colored fellow-citizens the same right of suffrage that our white fellow-citizens enjoy. It does not, however, give them the right to vote, if they are ignorant and don't know what civil government means; but it does give ignorant negroes the right to vote, if ignorant white men have the right. In other words, it makes ignorance among white people as bad as ignorance among black people. It says that the right to "vote shall not be denied or abridged on account of race, color or previous condition of servitude," which means that the vote shall not be given to the white man unless it is given to the black man on the same conditions; that if the black man is disfranchised on account of ignorance, the white man must be disfranchised for the same reason; that if the black man is disfranchised on account of poverty, the white man must be disfranchised on the same account.

It does not compel the states to confer the suffrage upon the blacks, but it does prevent the states from discriminating against the blacks on account of their color. It is a glorious declaration and will eventually help the states to make suffrage depend upon intelligence and virtue. It will be a great benefit to the south.

The several states can make such laws as they please on this subject, provided they give equal rights to all and special privileges to none; but if the supreme court of the United States finds that there is discrimination against negroes either by making a state law or by adopting a state constitution, the court will set aside the state statute or state constitution as null and void and compel the states to make equal laws.

The new party must resist the movement for repealing the 14th and 15th amendments, as a movement intended to revive negro slavery; if not so intended, this is at least the tendency; and the civilization of our day recoils from any such tendency.

If the object of repealing the 14th and 15th amendments is not to keep

colored people in slavery, what is the object?

If the 14th amendment is repealed, then negroes cease to be citizens, unless the state legislatures choose to make them citizens. And the states that seceded and thereby produced civil war—(simply because Abraham Lincoln was elected president and it could be seen that there could be no more slave states and that slavery must be restricted to the states where it was)—certainly will reduce negroes to slavery, as soon as the 14th amendment is repealed. This amendment certainly makes them citizens, and if the southern people do not intend that negroes shall be citizens, what do they intend that they shall be? There is no middle ground. They must either be citizens or else reduced to the condition of horses, cattle and other animals, that can be bought and sold and treated as property. Should these people be reduced to merchandise?

If we repeal the 14th amendment and go back to the constitution, as we had it, before the civil war, then we shall be called upon to allow the southern states to count three-fifths of the slaves in making up the number of representatives which each state is entitled to in the house of representatives in congress. The constitution reads, on this subject: "Rep-

resentatives shall be apportioned by adding the whole number of free persons . . . three-fifths of all other persons." Here "all other persons" means negroes. If, then, we repeal the 14th amendment and make negroes slaves, these slaves (or property) shall be counted, in making up the number of representatives each southern slave state will be entitled to in congress.

Do the southern people want to do this? Do they really want to make slaves out of their negroes and yet have them counted as almost equal to their owners, in making representation in congress? If so, then a white man, by owning a lot of slaves, can be very powerful in congress, and wealth would go to make up representation of the southern states in congress, while freemen would make such representation of the north.

After the civil war, by force of the 14th amendment, negroes became citizens of the United States and of the state wherein they reside. What would be gained by going back to days previous to the civil war? Why not go forward and try to make good citizens out of negroes instead of reducing them to slavery again? Have not they improved since the war? Don't many of the ex-slaves own the plantations that their masters once owned? Haven't many of them be-

come very intelligent citizens? Why, then, move backward instead of forward? If we should attempt to go backward, would it not produce another civil war? If the determination on the part of the north to restrict slavery to the states where it was, produced a civil war, why would not a movement to revive slavery now produce another civil war?

In the old ante-bellum days the slave owners who ruled the south, preached and believed in free trade (or tariff for revenue only). This was caused by slavery. But the time is coming when negroes and white folks will preach and believe in protective tariffs. They will see that the backward state of manufactures in the south will need protection, whether the north needs it or not. And they will be as determined in favor of protection as they were once in favor of free trade. The same men or their descendants who once talked free trade will be found to talk the opposite doctrine. This we are certain to see. And, if we see this, we shall only be seeing what we saw in the south before slavery became a prominent issue, because it is a fact, that previous to 1820, when slavery became the paramount issue in our national politics, and to a large extent in state politics, the south believed in protection much more than the north did.

It is also a fact that after 1820 the south became more and more in favor of free trade, while the north became more and more in favor of protection. The cause was slavery. The south found, or thought she found, that wealth could be increased more rapidly under free trade than under protection, while the north found that wealth could be produced more rapidly under protection. The cause of this change of opinion was slave labor in the south and free labor in the north. The south found slave labor profitable; the north did not. The climate of the south demanded negro labor; and, inasmuch as negroes could not exist in the south without being deprived of citizenship and reduced to slavery, slave labor became a necessity. The ruling class there, the land owners, who were the only wealthy people, demanded slave labor, because it was about the only labor they could get—and it was the cheapest labor in the world. Instead of this the north invented machines and in this way partly did away with the necessity of slavery. The northern machines proved a little cheaper than the southern machines.

It is a fact that manufactures in the south are in their infancy, compared with the north. This will make protection much more necessary for the south than for the north. The south will have to travel over the same ground industrially that the north has been traveling over. In the south labor is cheaper than in the north. This will make capital more profitable there than in the north for many years to come, if the policy of protection is continued. This will cause capital to leave the north and go to the south. The great and growing country of the future, then, is the south, provided only the policy of protection is kept up; if not kept up, slavery will be restored; if not restored, progress of the south, in wealth and intelligence, will be slow.

The new party, then, must go for freedom and protection if it would find favor in the south.

JNO S. DE HART.
Jersey City, N. J.

..CLEAN HANDS..

Captain Billingsley Comments on Recent Lavatory Experiments.

Some people have confidence of having clean hands with chunks of charity. Others again think there is great efficacy in kindness.

Justice alone will clean that which is soiled. Young Rockefeller is of the opinion that a great Sunday school, created, dominated and maintained by him and through which he injects scriptural wisdom will give him clean hands.

John D. Rockefeller, the father of the Sunday school saint, who has done more diplomatic grand larceny, scientific bunko work, and brought more distress to fireside homes than any other trust magnate on earth, thinks he is cleaning his hands with college and church donations. Even Lincoln is about to get some of his blood money.

Andrew Carnegie, who probably has crushed less competing steel plants than any trust lord, but who has garnered rich harvests on fictitious values, is in the hand-washing business; is handing out public library packages all over the land.

J. Pierpont Morgan is soaping his hands for a redeeming and purifying wash by donating to the city of New York a well filled art hall near the scene of most of his gigantic robberies.

The bold trust buccaneer, Charles Schwab, gave summer outings to many boatloads of impoverished humanity, hoping thereby to cover his dirty hands with a halo of charity. He has faith that he can thus post-

pone or frighten away avenging justice.

The modern champions of greed and enemies of society are resorting to many artifices to escape the services of justice. Justice will refuse such alluring overtures. She demands an answer. She will not accept such soap, water, towel and sponge as an atonement. She is blind to them.

Justice says to the oppressor and despoiler, "there is blood on your hands." "Macbeth has murdered sleep." You are in the broad daylight of righteousness, and your palms are soiled with dirty dollars. You tried to murder justice and "Banquo's ghost will not down." Only justice can clean your hands.

To the venal vampires, justice says to their pleadings for a continuance, "You have swindled and impoverished men, women and little ones. You have heaped sharp stones in their pathway of life. You seek the remission of sins at the confessionals of priests, editors and statesmen, followed with rich gifts. I will none of it—the men, women and children are still pinched and starving from your greed."

The day of reckoning must come. You cannot with unwashed hands conjure up some miracle to save you. The time is coming when justice will challenge again the dirt on your hands. "The mills of the gods grind slowly, but exceedingly fine." You men with unclean hands, do you observe that roses have left the cheeks of the children of your victims? They are working hard to give fathers and mothers a chance to live.

L. W. BILLINGSLEY.
Lincoln, Neb.

Mark Foster's Plan.

How to Disseminate a Knowledge of Populism.

Mr. Foster's letter quoted on one of the editorial pages this week is worthy of consideration. He asks for one thousand volunteers who are able to expend \$4 a year—a dollar every three months—to join him in propaganda work. His plan is this: Send The Independent a dollar for four 3-months subscriptions, all to be sent to the subscriber's own address. Hand the papers out where they may do the most good. At the end of three months send another dollar, and thus keep it up for the year.

A great many of The Independent's subscribers keep a file of their papers and for that reason dislike to permanently part with their file copy. Hence, if any number of The Independent's readers wish to join Mr. Foster in this propaganda work, we will make the following terms:

Five copies to one address for \$4 a year—one for your own use and four to give away. The \$4 can be paid quarterly, a dollar at a time, or all at once as the subscriber prefers.

Let no reader of The Independent attempt this unless he is abundantly able to spare the money. It would add wonderfully to The Independent's circulation and usefulness, and give an impetus to the revival of populism, to have a thousand men join Mr. Foster in the work he suggests; but a good many of The Independent's best workers cannot afford to spend quite so much. However, there are no doubt more than a thousand on The Independent's list now who might do so without inconvenience.

Suppose we see how many will join Mr. Foster. Mention "Mark Foster's Plan" when you write.

The same Boston literary critic from whose letter a quotation was made, has sent "a supplementary note" on the same question. In this she says: "There is one term of great value which The Independent uses, and I would be glad to see it adopted by every writer dealing with political affairs. It is the term 'partisan insanity.' The more a writer studies that term, the more useful it will appear. What is it that makes farmers who sell everything in a free trade market and buy everything in a high tariff, protected market, go out into a campaign, march long distances, carry sooty, greasy lamps and shout for high tariffs? The whole thing can be summed up in the two words, 'partisan insanity.' That tells the whole truth and to tell it in any other way would require columns. The same two words explain the action of thousands of other men—wage-workers among the number."