

A View of the Whole South

ALLEN TATE

TO THE question: What is the South? it were better not to wait for an answer. For unless one asks it in a soliloquy that can dictate its own reply, one is likely to hear: The South is Uncle Sam's other province. That is the answer that one gets, by and large, out of the enormous symposium edited by Professor W. T. Couch, of the University of North Carolina, and published under the misleading title, *Culture in the South*.^{*} I say misleading because culture is nowhere clearly understood in all the thirty-one extremely interesting and valuable essays by as many authors; unless culture be the purchasing-power to buy the latest manufactured articles. It must be remembered that the writers herein on social and economic subjects are mostly sociologists and economists, for whom culture is likely to be the table and the chart. Be that as it may, what picture of the South do we get out of their composite labours? What picture do they wish to turn it into? These questions come down to the critical one: What kind of society do these men of the New South want?

In this long but all-too-brief discussion of the points of view set forth in *Culture in the South*, the reader will observe one underlying contention: when men say that we have no choice in the kind of social sys-

^{*} CULTURE IN THE SOUTH, A Symposium by Thirty-one Authors edited by W. T. Couch (UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA PRESS. 711 pages. \$4.00)

411 Philura Gould Baldwin
Memorial Library

tem that we shall get, it being quite "determined" beforehand by history, facts, forces, conditions, we know that what they are really saying is that *they* are determined to give us the kind of system that *they* want. When the ante-bellum planter said that God had ordained slavery, he was saying what Mr. Broadus Mitchell (whom we shall hear again) says when he affirms that industrialism is determined by forces of the immediate past, and is thus inevitable. This kind of determinism, both of the planter and of Mr. Mitchell, must be taken seriously; only we must be careful to keep strictly in mind just what it is they are telling us. Not all the writers in this book say what Mr. Mitchell says, and in order to get a notion of what they think or have found out, I will at once try to summarize the articles, not in order of appearance but by subject-groups:

1. *Preface*. Professor Couch, the editor, gives his contributors a free hand. Yet he offers in his Preface his own point of view on Southern civilization in an interesting commentary on the recent Agrarian symposium, *I'll Take My Stand: the South and the Agrarian Tradition*. Having been a contributor to that book, I feel that I am able to point out that Professor Couch's criticism of it is based on a misreading of the text. Consider, he says, "the doctrine that the agrarian way of life is essentially different from the industrial, that it is better—or, at least, better for the South, and that it is worthy of being preserved even at the price of economic obscurantism". If economic obscurantism means self-sufficiency for the farmer, a state in which his "purchasing-power" is of interest only to those

who have something, usually useless, to sell him, we plead guilty. But it was nowhere said that Southern agriculture at this moment affords an ideal society to set off against the depravity of industrialism: we said that Southern agriculture might be made into a system in which security and stability could be won in a measure impossible so long as the farmer, fixed in the commercial scheme, remains in economic vassalage to his local merchants and bankers and, in so far as these are vassals to the big bankers and industrialists, to the whole financial system. *Item:* This sensitiveness of the Southern pro-industrialist to the disappearance of purchasing-power on the farm, or, put the other way, their dislike of independent agriculture, is symptomatic of the general capitalist imperialism towards the Market. The expanding Market—and here the Marxists, for instance John Strachey in *The Coming Struggle for Power*, are right—is the cornerstone of industrial capitalism; it must expand not only towards greater consumption of commodities, but towards an unlimited supply of labour that it can buy at its own price; therefore the Southern industrialist is greatly concerned for the farmer's purchasing-power if indeed he cannot persuade him to leave the farm for the factory, where he will play the double rôle of consumer and cheap labourer. There is, in this process, the concealed joker that may wreck capitalism—destruction of the consumer in the act of cheapening labour. *Item:* It must be said that neither the editor nor his contributors, even when the latter are critical of the industrialization of the South, are aware of the plight of world capitalism; nor is there any critical perception of its possible alterna-

tives. These men are still catching up with the North, nor do they ask whether there is now anything in the North to catch up with. The reader will judge whether, and in what sense, the South may be a backward region.

2. *Literature, education, journalism, folk-lore.* Ten essays cover these subjects; they exhibit a high quality of learning and judgement, and they are indispensable to future study of these fields in the South. John D. Allen's analysis of Southern journalism divides newspaper opinion into three camps—the New South Toryism of industry; the Old South Toryism of the Confederacy, in which sentiment on the one hand has no connection, on the other, with economic interests which easily merge with those of rising industry; and Liberalism. Mr. Allen is both fearless and astute, but like the majority of the authors of this book, he fails to see that Liberalism has no programme and that, however brave and pious its criticism may be, it is ultimately futile. Professor Edgar W. Knight contributes an informative article on educational problems and “progress”; but here progress means bigger and better schools. H. Clarence Nixon, of Tulane University, surveys the colleges and universities, to the conclusion that a great Southern University is necessary, most of the existing institutions being timid and subservient to the new industrial money of which they have felt considerable need: this is one of the best essays in the book. Yet none of the writers in this field attempts a thorough criticism of the New Education. Arthur Palmer Hudson writes about white folk-songs; Guy B. Johnson about the folk-songs of

the Negro; and B. A. Botkin writes a more general essay on "Folk and Folklore". These articles, based on the latest results of research, are of capital interest and importance: yet again the relation of this material to the meaning of "culture" is nowhere suspected except at moments by Mr. Botkin: culture presumably remains something that you buy with money, possibly from Europe. Mr. John Donald Wade offers us, under the title "Southern Humor", the most distinguished piece of writing in the volume. His thesis that Southern humour rises in the inability of the Southerner, since Appomattox, to take any abstractions or programmes seriously, may indeed be seriously disputed, unless Mr. Wade means ideas that are not related to his immediate life. William Cabell Greet has written the first systematic study of Southern speech that I have seen—another essay of importance. One of the ablest and most discriminating essays on the general culture of the South is Professor Jay B. Hubbell's "Southern Magazines"; he is just and detached throughout; and his conclusions will be the starting-point of future study in this field, as well as advice and warning to the aspiring founder of magazines in the South. In "The Trend of Literature" Mr. Donald Davidson (ill at ease among his Liberal neighbours) puts his finger on a fundamental *malaise* of the modern Southern writer—his inability, for various reasons, to look upon his society as a normal manifestation of human life, with the consequent confusion of purpose that keeps his style and point of view on the defensive or satirical plane. Mr. Davidson, justly I think, makes exception in favour of the poets, who, however, standing outside this *Zeitgeist*, are unread.

His essay brings to a head the whole cultural problem of the South, a problem that few of the other contributors seem aware of: that the basis of culture is a dignified local life resting upon the common people, who take all the props from under a genuine culture as soon as they are deprived of independence; hence the complete industrialization of the South, even if the perfect bungalow and kitchen sink of the industrial apologists were possible, would destroy the last stronghold of culture in the United States.

3. *Manners and Society*. Miss Josephine Pinckney examines the social changes of the last generation, as these changes have affected domestic manners and customs; she concludes that the South will not be quickly transformed; for the deep-rooted leisureliness of Southern life is a concrete reality against which abstract benefits like quick wealth and power will break at last in vain. Miss Pinckney's essay is full of shrewd and sensitive observation, not the least interesting of which is her remark that Prohibition with its corn liquor did more than any other thing to lower the social tone of the upper class of the South. Mr. Clarence E. Cason, in "Middle Class and Bourbon", tries to discover in the Old South a middle-class, but I think with not very much success, since his notion of a middle-class is a number of people with a "middling" amount of money and power. Again the most advanced Southern "iconoclasm", *i.e.*, the brave explosion of the mythical Colonel, commits itself to that least desirable form of provincialism which consists in seeing itself in isolation both historical and economic. For a middle class is that class which, pro-

ducing nothing, buys cheap and sells dear, getting a rake-off from both producer and consumer; the Morgans, for example, being middle-class, regardless of their wealth and power. (This provincial failure to see the South as the last battle-ground of a conflict that began in Europe with the economic changes growing out of the Reformation, the conflict between producer and *entrepreneur*, between the land and manipulating capital, not only blinds Mr. Cason to the social realities of the South; it confuses the outlook of the larger number of the authors of economic articles in the book.) Mr. J. Wesley Hatcher's article, "Appalachian America", presents the entire social, religious, domestic, and economic life of the "mountaineer"; it is the best thing ever written on this subject and it ought to be expanded into a book. Two factors have prevented a proper understanding of the highlander: the old prejudice of the low-country Southern gentry, and modern industrial exploitation. Industry has advertised the mountaineer as a debased creature whose life deserves no respect but to whom, for some mysteriously humanitarian reason, should be given the improvements of the bathroom and the kitchen sink. As far as the highlands are concerned, says Mr. Hatcher, "the solution of the economic and social problems of the people is not to be found in coercing them into the slums and bread-lines of our industrial centres, but rather in the adjustment of the educational programme and methods to the task of developing the remaining resources in a manner that will give the richest and fullest life possible". Given the all-pervasive faith in "education", Mr. Hatcher is not to be blamed for missing the key to the difficulty:

economic autonomy. And this problem is political, not "educational", as we shall see when we come to the essay on Southern politics.

4. *Business and Industry*. This is a depressing exhibit. Professor Claudius Murchison hymns the courage of the Southern business man who broke away from "inertia" and "old habits"—to do what? The real answer is: to wreck the South and Southern agriculture, as his *confrère* in the North has wrecked the whole country. Again there is no inkling of the world condition of business; it is assumed that everything is going to get better. This is a perfect example of academic timidity before the industrial masters; for the bankers and industrialists, the real if temporary masters of the South, keep the college, and the professors keep the peace. Let us pass on. "The Industrial Worker", by Harriet L. Herring, is a competent analysis of the position of the industrial worker, a position that is in urgent need of reform; but there is no hint of the real source of reform, which apparently is to proceed from the sheer charity of the money power. This article has the negative defect of the book as a whole—lack of historical and political sense, and this is a lack of realism. Mr. George Sinclair Mitchell analyzes the relation of Southern industrial labour to organization: until the Southern worker is organized he will not get a fair hearing in the courts. This is good sense: the labour movement in the South should be supported, but it must not be supposed that it can achieve the solution to the real labour problem, which is wage-slavery. The hard plight of labour becomes manifest in Mr. Bruce Crawford's article, "The

Coal Miner", a plain tale of corruption, ruthless exploitation, and insane competition. Mr. Crawford offers a brief review of the Harlan war, and if to this review we add the historical background of the mountaineer already sketched by Mr. Hatcher, we begin to understand the causes of the miner's plight. Mr. Crawford sees the solution to the problem in socialist reform; Mr. Hatcher, in local independence. I think the latter solution is the correct one; for labour legislation is never radical but only ameliorative, the worker remaining, for all his improved condition, a wage-slave. (It may be remarked that in this country, North and South, where there is enough land to support a huge population, wage-slavery could be easily avoided, as it cannot so easily be in England where there is no land this side the colonies for the worker to fall back upon.) On the question of labour legislation Professor Charles W. Pipkin tells a story that may well astonish the optimist of Southern industry: the concessions to labour, in the form of child-labour laws, old-age pensions, and workman's compensation, though numerically considerable, are actually so slight as to cripple the operator little if at all. And these concessions will continue to be made, in partial and ineffective form, as a propagandist sop to the worker and the humanitarian public: the operator knows the procedure to be harmless, for he alone holds the *political power*. In the face of this circumstance, Mr. Broadus Mitchell's panegyric of Southern industrialism rings out like the cry of blind Pew in the night. I have tried for years to understand what is wrong with Mr. Mitchell. There being, he says, no Old Southern culture that he "can see", it would be well

to get more factories in the South. Industrialism is not only the superior economic structure for society; it is also "determined" economically. It is beautiful to observe the forces of history at the service of Mr. Mitchell's desires; I envy him. Now the commentators on Southern agriculture agree that from two-thirds to three-fourths of the thirty-five million inhabitants of the Southern States live on the land. The farmers are in wretched condition; but this does not concern Mr. Mitchell; he can do nothing for them. Although labour troubles in the South have been grievous, they have not been grievous enough. We must catch up with the world; we must completely industrialize the South so that we shall have a problem that must be solved in socialist terms. There is a moral imperative upon us to do this. This point of view, I gather from certain intimations *passim* in Mr. Mitchell's essay, is "realistic"; that of the Agrarians, backward-looking and sentimental.

5. "Also There is Politics", by Mr. George Fort Milton, author of a brilliant life of Andrew Johnson, is the sole essay on that subject. It is very nearly the sole mention of it in the entire book. The trouble with Southern politics, says Mr. Milton, is the Solid South; there is no respectable opposition party. What is Mr. Milton's own view of the State? We do not know. The parties do not have to stand for any view of the State, for Mr. Milton knows, as we know, that the real political masters are the bankers and industrialists. (This knowledge I attribute to Mr. Milton; he does not authorize me to do so.) So we get opposition opposing opposition, while the money power rules.

This I understand to be the perfect formula of Southern Liberalism, if we add thereto the tiger's chaudron of pious zeal for reform and progress. The State governments, says Mr. Milton, have of late years been greatly reformed in economy and efficiency; yet, alas, "progress" in public works and highways has provided opportunities for graft and corruption of the direst sort. There is this, of course, on the one hand; there is that unfortunately on the other. The donkey, political thought, starves to death between the bales of hay, doing justice to them both, and hoping for the best.

6. *Agriculture*. This is by far the ablest group of essays in the book. Professor Rupert B. Vance writes a geographical survey of Southern soil, climate, and natural resources; he recommends regional planning—an excellent recommendation that ought to be the basis of restoring Southern life. Who will do the planning? It is a political question; it is not probable that a committee of high-minded professors will be appointed to the task. Professor A. E. Parkins offers us a valuable descriptive and statistical account of farming in the South; it is a chaos that apparently requires chiefly more efficient machinery to bring it to order—in "harmony with modern commercial agriculture". Here, again, there is no broad critical sense of the relation of farming to industry; commercial farming, in the face of its collapse, is taken as an inevitable good. The best of these articles, the best article on economics in the whole book, is Mr. Clarence Poe's "The Farmer and His Future". Mr. Poe clearly and concisely urges two reforms that contain

the solution not only to the farm problem in the South but to the problem of labour in the city: he urges, first, diversification of crops, particularly towards clovers and grasses for cattle raising, a "crop" that will not only keep farm labour employed and paid in the winter off-season, but will enrich the soil for plant-crops; and he urges, secondly, as an indispensable basis for this reform, a programme of self-sufficiency for the farm, in which the farmer's own living comes off the land first of all. It is perfect in its simplicity; it is not urged by the other contributors for a reason that I have already pointed out: industrial capitalism wants to sell the farmer *everything he uses*, subsistence agriculture signalling a shrinkage of the Market; and the farmer's independence represents also a shrinkage of the Market where cheap labour may be bought. Until recently we were undergoing the same process that England suffered a hundred years ago—dispossession of the farmer who must necessarily go to the city to supply cheap labour for industry. (The probable effect of Mr. Poe's "agrarian" programme upon industrial labour I shall indicate in a moment.) With this group of essays I have placed Professor Den Hollander's "The Tradition of 'Poor Whites'", a revolutionary study of the history of Southern social classes. Den Hollander shows that the fiction of a small number of great planters set above a vast horde of miserable peckerwoods and clay-eaters was the invention of Northern prejudice, one more way of discrediting the South before the Civil War: the great majority of slaveless men were yeomen subsistence farmers, whom the upheaval of the war threw as tenants upon the big plantations. Yet the

fiction has been taken over by the modern Liberal and industrialist in the South; it rationalizes his rejection of the "past"; and it gives moral colour to his "uplift" programme for the poor-white coming into his factory. Here the familiar process has been at work: industry crushes agriculture, dispossesses the small farmer, and then works itself into a moral fervour over his plight; it then rescues the miserable victim of wicked plantation exploitation by enticing him into the factory village (bathroom and kitchen sink), where, as a wage-slave, he receives the finishing touches of the servitude that tenantry began. It is worth remarking here that, able as these essays are, none of them offers a programme for the evils of the tenant system, though these evils all through the book are acutely pointed out and analyzed. Why is this? Simply because it is a dangerous political question: it would involve a programme to make agriculture independent and prosperous at the expense of industry's monopoly of the commodity and labour markets.

7. *The Negro*. Another dangerous question ably discussed in a long article by the editor, Professor Couch. Although Professor Couch sets forth accurately and fearlessly the economic, political, and social condition of the Negro, he too has no programme for the improvement of this race. His zeal is noble, at times lachrymose, but it is not precisely responsible to shed tears unless one is prepared to do something for the pitiable object. Professor Couch is aware that the Negro problem overlaps the white-tenant problem; that both problems are economic problems; but not that the economic problem is a political problem.

There is the other problem of the reformers who are anxious to have Negroes sit by them on street-cars, but are loath to devise a programme whereby they may purchase land; nor have I any sympathy with reformers who are agitated about social equality, for there has never been social equality anywhere, there never will be, nor ought there to be. Every class and race should get what it earns by contributing to civilized life. (For that reason the American capitalist class, having added nothing to civilization, is an inferior class.) There will be no practical solution to the race question (as a problem it is inherently insoluble and ought to be, like all social problems in ultimate terms) until Southern agriculture, by means of politico-economic action, recovers its independence; that alone will destroy the lynching-tension between the races by putting both races on an independent footing. Liberals like Professor Couch, who find no "justice" in Anglo-Saxon domination, have no precise picture of what should take its place: let us have "justice" and the devil take the hindmost. It is not a question of sentimental justice. I argue it this way: the white race seems determined to rule the Negro race in its midst; I belong to the white race; therefore I intend to support white rule. Lynching is a symptom of weak, inefficient rule; but you can't destroy lynching by *fiat* or social agitation; lynching will disappear when the white race is satisfied that its supremacy will not be questioned in social crises. To tempt the Negro to question this supremacy without first of all giving him an economic basis is sentimental and irresponsible. Since a majority of the Negroes are in the South, and a majority of these on the land, it is

a matter of simple realism to begin the improvement of their condition as farmers. Improvement here depends upon the general improvement of agriculture, upon the rediscovery of the agrarian economy (which the Negro has never quite forgotten); the ground of a prosperity that should lead to his purchase of land. If abstract agitation against white supremacy would give way to concrete programmes for the Negro, a great deal could be done for him; but not until then.

8. *Lawlessness*. Professor H. C. Brearley, in "The Pattern of Violence", has written an invaluable study of crime in the Southern States. Mob violence and homicide are, of course, the two types of crime chiefly under discussion. Professor Brearley rightly places the origin of quick shooting in the South in the feudal spirit that the plantation system perpetuated in America. This spirit to a large extent survives, but the code of honour that once gave it dignity, prescribing the kinds of grievance that justify killing and setting limits to the modes, has disappeared; we get plain murder in place of the duel. One may conclude, on the basis of Professor Brearley's argument, that the feudal conception of personal integrity, while it remains, has been overlaid with a middle-class social pattern. In 1878 *The Code of Honor*, an astonishingly late defense of the formal duel, published in Charleston, asserted that "the leading and most rancorous enemies of the Code of Honor are the materialistic Puritan sceptics". The code of honour set little value upon mere human life; it tended to dignify life with a rigid conception of its ideal integrity, without which it is worthless. (It may

be remarked that the modern business man is not sensitive to attacks upon his ethical methods if they are profitable.) Of lynching Professor Brearley has no "explanation", but it has steadily declined since 1889, that is until 1930. The recent outburst of lynching in the South, which is not noticed in this article, is probably due to three factors: Communist agitation, which deludes the Negro into believing that he can better his condition by crime; general economic fear and instability taking the form of mob violence; and outside interference in the trials of accused Negroes. Professor Brearley points out that were it not for the new violence of industrial warfare, the end of which cannot yet be seen, there would be a sound hope for the disappearance of mob violence in the South.

9. *Miscellaneous.* Five articles remain; they round out the comprehensive scope of an invaluable and fascinating book. Dr. Edwin McNeill Poteat, Jr., writes a brief history of religion in the South, forecasting towards the end of his paper its future. Southern religion, he says, is still on the whole deeply conservative, adhering, in spite of developments elsewhere of liberal Protestantism, to the strict separation of the natural and the supernatural realms. There are, for example, in the South only seven per cent of the American Unitarian Churches and thirteen per cent of the two thousand Christian Science Churches. Fundamentalism, fortunately (this is not Dr. Poteat's view) still reigns. The South as a whole remains stolidly sceptical of the social mission of the church, putting its emphasis upon individual salvation.

There is indeed a great need of religious rejuvenation in the South. Dr. Poteat hopes that it will take a Liberal direction: the historical background of his discussion is unexceptionable, but his plea for the future savours slightly of rotarian Protestantism. Mrs. Ula Milner Gregory's essay on "The Fine Arts" has the hopeful spirit and a little more than the usual vulgarity of female missionary zeal: "Evidence of a country's love of painting is generally found in the number and size and quality of the country's museums." Again: "The art schools of the South constitute another important factor in the improvement of the art situation." On the whole this essay is evidence of the disorder of modern society that permits well-meaning persons to convert art into a "cause" and to devote their lives to something that they do not understand. Mr. Allen H. Eaton, however, discussing "The Handicrafts", brings to that subject a distinctly superior insight; he is aware that the "higher" arts historically stem from the home-crafts; he pleads for the preservation of the remains of these arts in the South. Foundations, money, museums will exterminate them; their sole hope of survival lies in the restoration of the agricultural, rural society and the dignity of local life. (The Bayeux tapestry was not produced for a museum or subsidized by a foundation.) In one of the best descriptive essays in the volume, Mr. Edd Winfield Parks outlines the rise and position of the city in Southern life. He warns us that generalizations are difficult, that urbanization may be only skin-deep; yet the commercial and banking city has come to occupy, in Southern life and economy, a place similar to that occupied by the North before 1860.

In "The Southern Heritage", Professor Charles W. Ramsdell reviews the entire history of the South; the discussion is intelligent and informed; but his conclusion has some of the facile characteristics of Charles A. Beard's tripod: there is the mechanical prophecy of more and better machine civilization, but not much effort at historical insight.

This brings to a close my summary of a book that is epoch-making in its field: it will doubtless remain for a generation a point of departure for future discussion. Although Uncle Sam's other province is amenable to no definition as a living fact, it remains by will or inertia outside the essence of Americanism. The question of the South for the future can be put into simple terms: Since the great industrial system of the North has been checked in its "progress" and must retrench for a new start, or even face a permanent stabilization at some point short of infinite profit and efficiency, what is left for the Liberal generation of the South to imitate? It can no longer imitate the North of the last decade which has ceased to exist: catching up with the North no longer means unlimited expansion of industry. Mr. Broadus Mitchell, I believe, stands alone in wishing to bring the Southern factory and financial system to the chaos that has overtaken the North; this moral heroism, which finds a good-in-itself in solving the appalling difficulties of industrialism, will leave Mr. Mitchell's weaker contemporaries cold. But the writing is plain on the wall: catching up with the North has come definitely to mean restriction of industrial competition and a resulting stabilization of the system. If the Southern in-

dustrial system were stabilized at this moment, the South would remain a predominantly agricultural region.

Now what is the obvious, common-sense moral of this situation? It is that the sixty per cent of the population on the land must receive the first attention, not because, being noble farmers, they deserve it, but because the well-being of the State requires that its foundation, which is production on the land, must be sound. Our "realistic" friends, the Liberals, get history to tell them what it is possible to do; it is invariably what they themselves want done. And what they want done is precisely what the drift of events will bring them. The morality of economic determinism is a kind of Pecksniffery that is at last intolerable: it is a rationalization of industrial power that has killed the political impulse.

The weakest discussion in "Culture in the South" is the essay on politics, but it is not Mr. Milton's weakness alone; his temerity in accepting that subject merely exposes him to an attack which the book as a whole equally deserves. Professor Couch in his Preface likewise betrays the general paralysis of the political sense. Without the new industrial wealth, says he, we could not have the universities; without the universities we could not study the problems of industrial wealth. I leave that syllogism without comment. Southern industrialism is the tin can rattling on the tail of the academic dog. And what shall we do about this magnificent piece of historical commentary: "This position [of the modern Agrarians] is a long step backward from that of the agrarians of the nineties who held, in general, that both industry and

agriculture could be and must be organized to serve legitimate human purposes." The Populists held it very much "in general"; and many Englishmen held "in general" that Mary of Scotland's head should not be cut off, but it is a sad fact that it was. The Southern Liberal can *hold* almost anything for *legitimate human purposes* which presumably will be announced some day after the social scientists have *studied* society long enough to find out what they are.

Meanwhile the legitimate human purpose of the Southern farmer, tenant and landlord, is to get enough to eat in the first place, and in the second, having been fed, to dictate the political terms of his well-being. It is a simple matter of fact that the social-science approach to the farm is actuated by the desire, however unconscious, to teach the farmer how to be a good consumer of industrial commodities; this is called improving him and getting him into the stream of progress. Although Professor Couch weeps for the poor-white, he proposes, so far as I can see, to do nothing but study him.

There is a plain programme for the South, and it is a programme for all regions of western culture where the majority of the people are on the land and where there is enough common patriotism left to grapple with the future of orderly civilization. Either by legislation or by revolution, in those regions where the land supports most of the people, the power must pass to those people. The basis of this programme for the South is contained in Mr. Clarence Poe's article in this book. To Mr. Poe's suggestions should be added the regional programme of Professor Vance: future Southern industries should

rise where the raw materials are most easily available. It is an absurd criticism of the Agrarians to suppose that they would destroy the factories; it is rather that the people must be allowed to dictate what they want to have made in the factory. Moreover, if primary subsistence were the basis of the farm, the land would not only be able to dictate its factory needs, it would be in a position to thwart the factory-migration to the places of cheap labour. If in the South there were—as there is in France—a sound subsistence-farming, the cheap labour market of the capitalist would tend to narrow; his profits would decrease, his political power diminish; and the factory worker, hard to lure from the land, and threatening momentarily to return to it, could dictate his own terms. Whatever the solution to the problem of wage-slavery may be in the North, or in hopelessly industrialized nations like England, the agrarian solution most easily presents itself to the South. It is a single solution for the farm and the factory worker: prosperity on the land—which does not mean a big dole from industry (*i.e.*, government) to be collected into the pocket of industry again. It means the technique of making a living on the land.

The enormous difficulties of such a programme are apparent in every essay in “Culture in the South”; yet eventually the programme cannot be so difficult as none at all. That is the dilemma of the South: shall we drift Liberally or shall we take the present situation in hand? With notable exceptions, this notable symposium proposes to study and drift. As far as “culture” is concerned, few of the contributors suspect the existence of anything better than the culture

of the foundation, the class-room, and the museum; to this extent, perhaps, culture in the South has been middle-westernized. To possess a concrete image of a living society in which certain civilized qualities may be enjoyed by all classes is to be cultivated; without this, abstract improvements and benefits reduce a people to the barbarism of learning a new technique of living day by day. Agriculture in the past has supplied us with our civilization, and the civilized qualities that survive come remotely from the land. This sense of the history of America, and distantly of Europe, has almost disappeared; the parochialism of the industrial era has taken its place. This latest voice from the South shows, I fear, that she is backward with a vengeance.

The Protestant Garrison in America

R. L. BURGESS

THE educated American of the old stock does not like to use racial and religious terms in discussing politics. He does not wish to be rated as a Klansman, sullen and bigoted. But his fear that it is impolite to mention Jews and Catholics as such in political comment has been recently alleviated, although in a somewhat disturbing way. For he now realizes that he must label as Protestant or as English or North-European many ideas of his own which in the past he had hoped were truly universal, not of narrowly racial or religious origin.

At this point the Early American, if he may call himself such, perceives that he is a member of a sort of Protestant Garrison in America, made up on the whole of the descendants of those who came here first, and who are making an effort to rule and mold a Republic which they have fallen into the habit of considering as peculiarly their own. He does not like this. It makes him seem part of a blind and selfish biological process rather than the exponent of universally beneficent ideals. His belief in those ideals has until very lately been earnest and naïve. He had been touched deeply by what James Truslow Adams calls "the American dream". He had hoped that America forever would be a refuge for oppressed minorities, that the Goddess of Liberty would continue to ask no questions, but would enlighten the