

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

wealth of Christian precept and their poverty of Christian example, to criticise "Golden Rule" Jones. He earnestly sought, at any rate, to demonstrate the efficacy of the golden rule as a law of social life. Whether or not he sought in the right direction, he at all events refused refuge in the indolent explanation that the precepts of Christianity and the necessities of civilization make a paradox which only the Lord can reconcile.

Mr. Jones was commonly classified as a socialist. Not alone was this done by those to whom "socialist" is only a handy epithet to hurl at everyone who ventures to protest against the present social disorder. He was supposed to be a socialist by socialists themselves, although not regarded as orthodox by the "scientific" cult.

In truth, however, Jones was most distinctly an individualist, notwithstanding the fact that he believed in social solidarity. He conceived of social solidarity as the natural product of individual love. To appreciate his golden rule philosophy in its relation to society, one must consider the three theories into which social philosophy is capable of being finally analyzed.

There is at one extreme pure individualism, which considers social life as an expression merely of individual life in the aggregate, and regards the individual as paramount, admitting of no principle of coercion of the individual by agents of organized society. At the other extreme is socialism, which considers social life as an organic whole, and regards society as paramount, contemplating control of the individual by organized society through coercion. Between these extremes is the third concept of human relationships, which distinguishes individual affairs from common concerns, regarding the individual as paramount in the former and society in the latter, and contemplating coercion in legitimate spheres of common action, but excluding it from legitimate spheres of individual action.

It is evident that the social philosophy of "Golden Rule" Jones cannot be assigned to the intermediate theory defined above. He made no distinction between indi-

vidual and common concerns. The larger wages he earned by his labor as an organizer of production were the same in his eyes as the royalties he received from privileges of which he was a beneficiary. He saw no better private title to the one than to the other, and claimed none to either.

Neither can his social philosophy be assigned to the class distinguished as socialism. The individual of flesh and blood and nerve, of thought and feeling and spiritual possibilities, was too big, in his theory of the scheme universal, to be regarded as nothing more than a cell in the social organism. Coercion, moreover, was abhorrent to him.

His abhorrence of coercion was so strong that he rejected the individual modes of coercion which most individualists admit into their philosophy. The only force for which he stood was the melting, fusing force of love. He was an individualist whose principle of social progress was expressed by the golden rule.

In our view Mr. Jones would have given greater effect to his efforts at practicing the golden rule, had he clearly distinguished between private right and private privilege, between private affairs and common concerns, between private earnings and common benefits.

The golden rule is not an admonition to do to others as they would selfishly have us do to them, nor as we would selfishly have them do to us. It is as our ideas of fairness between man and man would prompt us to have others do to us that the golden rule would have us do by them. This Christian rule is not a sentimental apothegm; it is a vital law of justice, in the administration of which each individual is commissioned, not as an amiable autocrat but as a just judge, to decide the other man's case as if it were his own. The test question under it must always be like this: "Were I the other and were he I, what would I have him do to me if I were governed in my desire by my sense of fairness?"

But Samuel M. Jones, however it may have been with his theory of the golden rule, whether unsound or sound, sentimental or

wise, had the full confidence and courage of his convictions, and lived without faltering, as well as one might in the social disorder that surrounded him, the life which it was given him to see as the truest.

If as a magistrate he was no harsher with poor and disreputable criminals than other magistrates are with rich and respectable ones, it is as yet to appear that crime has been fostered thereby.

If as a rich manufacturer he adjusted his business as best he could under the circumstances so as to distribute some of the profits among the workmen, it is yet to appear that those workmen have been "pauperized" thereby.

If as a citizen he steadfastly refused to be bound by party ties, it is yet to appear that this may not be the most efficacious way of dissipating dangerous party power.

If as a man he tried to live by the golden rule, instead of acquiring a churchly reputation, it is yet to appear that he may not thereby have set a better example of Christian faith.

As a captain of industry his life was one of great usefulness. As a philanthropist his methods were superior and his example unique. As a citizen and public official his record is an inspiration. As one who loved his fellow men he will not soon be forgotten.

#### "OOM PAUL."

With the death of Paul Kruger, President of the South African Republic before its subjugation by British arms, the most dramatic personage of that sad history passes away.

Although Kruger personified Boer resistance to British conquest, and in a sense personified the republic of which he was president, he did not personify the spirit of that republic. He was provincial and conservative; the spirit of the republic was fast becoming cosmopolitan and democratic. Kruger held his place in spite of what he represented, because his long public service had endeared him personally to the people. With his death the South African Republic of religious bigotry and provincial aristocracy, would have given way to a