

neglected to have it carved over some schoolhouse door. Besides, there are many more or less obscure relatives of school trustees, past, present and to come, and only a few schools to name for them. It is wise to waste no school name on a man whose fame doesn't need it, when there are so many relatives who would have no fame without it. The Plamondonists were right.

The use of the word "negress" for Negro woman, is not only a gratuitous insult to a race whose history in the past and experience in the present call for the sympathy and kind consideration of all who are truly chivalrous. It is also such an abuse of language that it should shame even the unchivalrous out of using it. As well say Germaness, or Irishess, or Turkess, or lawyeress. We agree, therefore, with the New York Age in denouncing the word. But we do not agree with its objection, and that of the South African Izwi Labantu, to the word "Negro." Whatever may have been the motive in which this word originated, it has acquired dignity as a race name and can be accepted as such with entire self-respect.

Izwi Labantu says of it:

We entertain a peculiar aversion to that word "Negro" and would welcome its dismissal from the vocabulary of cultured writers, among whom Afro-Americans are most responsible for its continued use. Its associations are degraded, and will continue to cast obloquy upon a race of people who are broadly of Ethiopian origin, while the term Negro is restricted to the inhabitants of Nigeria. The so-called American Negroes are a cosmopolitan race originally drawn from various tribes in Africa. It matters not that it has been familiarized by European use. Just for that reason and because it is encouraged by the white races to denote the disparity between white and black to the disadvantage of the latter, the sooner the black man ceases to help thus to demean the race the better it will be for the race's self-respect.

Raising similar objections the Age complains that the word—

is treated as a common noun, when, as a matter of fact, as applied to a race, it is a proper noun. Even the savage

Indian receives better treatment in this matter of nomenclature. We shall stick to the term Afro-American, as it is correct and dignified, and covers all of the people in this country of African origin.

While the objection to treating the race name "Negro" as a common noun is well taken, it is a mistake to regard "Afro-American" as either a correct or a dignified term. We may speak of naturalized Germans as "German-Americans," for they are Americanized Germans; but their children born here are in strictness simply Americans. As to the Americans of African descent, to call them Afro-Americans is to imply that they are Americans only by adoption and not in the full sense of the American birthright. It is not the origin nor the past association of a name that gives it dignity, but the dignity of those to whom it attaches. Affectation is never dignified, and "Afro-American" is an affected term. "Negro" is a full, round, strong word. What if it does mean black? Are not Negroes black? And are they ashamed of being black? Would it not be better for them to make the name one to be proud of, than to run away from it and hide behind a verbal affectation? It is easy to understand how "Negro" may become a word of inspiration; but how can "Afro-American" ever rise above the commonplace? Negro orators may arouse enthusiasm, Negro heroes may excite admiration, Negro scholars and statesmen may command respect. But how could an "Afro-American" ever rise above the mediocre? When we think of Toussaint l'Ouverture—slave, soldier and statesman—it is not as an Afro-Frenchman that we honor him, but as a great Negro.

#### "GOLDEN RULE" JONES.

The lovable mayor of Toledo will always be best remembered by the nickname which has so remarkably distinguished him.

If there is one thing more characteristic than another of the prevailing religion of this country, it is the "golden rule"—"Whatever ye would that men should

do to you, do ye even so to them." Divest Christianity of this principle and its corollaries, and there would be little left in it but paganism. Yet one man, otherwise obscure, acquires distinction simply by trying earnestly to make the "golden rule" the polestar of his life!

When distinction so general and so unique attaches with such tenacity to any man, identifying him everywhere and to everybody as "Golden Rule" Jones, there must be something lacking in the ordinary methods of propagating Christianity. "Golden Rule" could have no such vogue as a nickname if the principle of the golden rule were generally held as a vital doctrine.

There was something mystical about Jones as he appeared to the public mind. Simply because his belief in the golden rule was vital, he was not understood.

The common people did not understand him, but they welcomed his message gladly, as the common people of Palestine had welcomed the same message twenty centuries before. So Mayor Jones soared above all opposition when the suffrages of the people who knew him were invoked.

Neither did the scribes and Pharisees, the money changers and the high priests, understand him; but instinctively they recognized in his example the seeds of destruction to their privileges. So, in spite of himself, he inspired them with fear and cemented their hostility.

On all sides "Golden Rule" Jones was misunderstood in this Christian country because he was a Christian.

Others were content to preach the golden rule; he sought to practice it. Whether his methods were best for their purpose or not, may be questioned. But it cannot be denied that they were better than no methods.

If the golden rule is a true principle of life, there must be a true method of making it operative. And what contributions toward the discovery of that method have been made by modern leaders of conventional Christian thought? Have they not preferred explaining away the golden rule to applying it courageously?

It is not for them, out of their