

dian, whose argument is confirmed by Hoffman, who shows that four Indian tribes which have not come into close contact with the whites have preserved a high standard of morality and are increasing numerically.

Let us discriminate. Galton, Lombroso, and Max Nordau make out as strong a case of degeneracy on the part of the whites under modern civilization as any theorist has developed against yellow or black skin. Let anyone read General Booth's submerged tenth, and let him visit the squalid neighborhoods of great cities, and the desolate refuge of multitudes in the mountains of Europe, and he will be sorely tempted to despair of his own kin. But is civilization to blame for these wretched masses? No; it is the barbarity that has survived; the barbarity of greed, of strong drink, of animalism, of selfishness, cruelty, and oppression. These are laying waste untold millions of white people, robbing them of virtue, depriving them of hope. Are they culpable? Is there such a defect in their nature that no education can assimilate them to the higher civilization? My answer is, that in untold instances they are victims and not criminals; and that they are amenable to the influences of the higher civilization, but that it is the potency of the lower in modern life which overwhelms them. Their only hope is education, and if the remedy can serve them, withstanding the savageries of the new age, it cannot fail to be of help to those whose skins are of a different color. What the more intelligent and influential classes of the community need to realize to-day is the imperative obligation to civilize civilization. Critics condemn the children of other ethnic families because they succumb before scourges

which are decimating their own, when they ought to denounce the scourges and help to obliterate them. I hold until this is done, we have no assured ground for the position that these other ethnic races cannot be assimilated to our civilization, or cannot assimilate it in their character and life. And it follows, if such a thing is possible, then the means by which it is accomplished for our own blood must be employed on their behalf. But if the end itself is really unachievable, then what right have we to thrust ourselves into the territories occupied by these unhappy tribes, who cannot be improved, but are made worse by our mathematics, our looking-glasses, our books, and our fellowship? Why deprive them of their innocence, why render them unhappy and touch them, when the touch means death? Is the answer: that we need them for the development of trade—for the increase of wealth? But that is the argument of the assassin. He desires gain. It cannot be acquired unless he kills. But is he justified in killing? And a nation has no more right, for the sake of its own commerce, to enter the territory of the feebler, when it knows that its presence and operations must surely exterminate the inhabitants. By what authority in the revelation of God or in the conscience of humanity can such a crime be condoned? Who has made the Saxon superior to moral obligation, who has given him the right to crucify the yellow and black skin for his own aggrandisement? If no such right exist then he is shut up to the duty of segregation, not, only, however, from the African, but from the Asiatic of every type. He must exclude himself from eastern lands, and abandon the policy of colonization and expansion. But if, on the other