

deliberate on this matter when the religious press is more anxious to apologize for white murderers, than to protect the lives of the colored people? Do they suppose the world will believe that in these repeated massacres the whites are always innocent, and the negroes, a class proverbially docile and kind-hearted, are the originators and prime agents of the trouble? Religious journalists do themselves and their cause an infinite harm when they attempt any such line of defense.

We regret to notice the apologetic tone of the Southern press in treating of those engaged in the horrible Hamburg massacre. We are especially sorry to find the Southern *Methodist* press following in the wake of the political journals. Here is what the *Southern Christian Advocate*, published at Macon, says of this brutal affair:—

“Such conflicts are most deplorable in themselves, and in their effects upon society and the well-being of the South. But the attempt to fasten upon the whites the responsibility for the inauguration of such collisions, which lead almost inevitably to horrible excesses, is diabolically unjust. A very different light is thrown upon the inception of this dreadful affair, by General Butler's letter, reference to which is made in our news' columns. In forming a judgment, let justice be done, in the light of truth.”

This is the old story. The negro is the sinner, whatever happens; and he, instead of the white perpetrators, must bear the curse and punishment. Such an apology is too base to be made by any Christian man. The better people of the South should not give such demons the moral support of their apologies. Gen. Butler, now properly indicted as an accessory to murder, is understood to be the leader of the Ku Klux, and as such, though belonging to the highest social circle, should not be defended or apologized for by the religious press, and especially should he not be chosen as a witness upon whose testimony the case before the public is to turn. To take the testimony of such a man is to take the accomplice of the criminal, if not the criminal himself, on to the witness stand. He would have the world believe the disturbance was begun by the colored people, and that this beginning affords some apology for the horrible acts that followed. Both positions are untrue. There is not the least scrap of evidence, aside from Butler's assertion, that the negroes began the disturbance, save as they exercised their right to drill as militia. That was the great sin. The negro must not bear arms. But if the colored man is to be deprived of the use of arms, is it to be by mob rule? The South would do well to think before they go too far to take a backward step.

But how can the average Southerner