

hood, his country and its government—for with every serious thought concerning the blessings which he enjoys all these are intimately associated. With such an attachment to the objects which claim his protection, and, the high spirit of independence, inwrought from the beginning into his character, it is scarcely possible that he should not act the soldier, when he perceives any danger threatening his enjoyments or his country.

What a deadly parallel might be drawn between the prosperity which could suggest those observations and the prosperity of which we hear so much a hundred years later, when the happiness of all is supposed to be served not by modest and equable conditions, but by the fabulous and sordid gains of a privileged few.

President Roosevelt has entertained as a private guest at dinner at the White House, the Negro scholar and gentleman, Booker T. Washington. As this was a private dinner, the event is nobody's business, and President Roosevelt is quite right in refusing for that reason to discuss it. But some bourbon papers of the South, some sensational papers of the North, and some Democratic politicians who don't know what democracy is when they see it without the label, have raised a newspaper tempest over the incident, which demands a word or two of democratic comment. It is good democracy, to begin with, to allow every man the freedom of his own inclinations with reference to personal associates. But if this White House dinner were a public instead of a private matter, still it would be good democracy not to criticise it upon race grounds. Democracy, true democracy, knows no race distinctions. This does not imply that a democrat must associate socially with members of a race that is repugnant to him. He has the same right to regulate his personal associations by race standards as by individual manners. But if he objects to the presence in any public place of a person, who, for race or other reasons, is repugnant to him, he raises the question of that person's right to be there. It is not a matter of congeniality. It is a matter of rights.

Now Booker T. Washington has the same right to be at the White House, and the same right to be at the White House table, whether on private or state occasions, if invited, as the whitest faced man in the country. That is democracy.

White persons' objections to associating with Negroes, are, let us observe and not for the first time, not based upon personal repugnance. They are based upon class distinction. That the Negro is not personally repugnant is proved by the fact that to the very class that objects he is most acceptable in the closest personal relationships, but only as a servant. The real objection to association with the Negro is not that he is personally offensive, but that his color is an indelible badge of servitude. Let him appear in white company in the role of a servant, and he is welcome; but let him appear as a man, and he is repugnant. This reason for objecting to Negroes is un-democratic, and no one who is truly a democrat will be governed by it in his convictions, no matter how his timidity or his tastes may prompt him to act. Whatever course he may himself decide to pursue with reference to associating with persons of that race, he will not, if he is a democrat, object to association by others with gentlemanly members of it, nor deny to anyone of the race, for race reasons, his equal rights as a man and citizen.

After attributing to Bryan's campaign the stubborn resistance of the Filipinos to American invasion and aggression, and assuring the people of this country nearly a year ago that Bryan's defeat had been followed by substantial pacification of the "new possessions," the war department now proposes augmenting the American military force in the island. This is what might reasonably be called an anti-climax.

Important action on the subject of taxation was taken by the

State Commerce convention of New York in session at Buffalo on the 17th. This convention unanimously re-adopted a desolution declaring—

That the best way to reform the system of local taxation is to grant local option in taxation to the cities and counties of the state.

This is a distinct and emphatic approval of the method of taxation that is to be voted upon in Colorado next fall, and which will come prominently before the legislatures of New York and Ohio this winter. The State Commerce convention of New York is an influential trades body. Among its delegates are representatives of the hardware jobbers' association, the wholesale grocers' association, the Albany chamber of commerce, the Buffalo merchants' exchange, the New York produce exchange, and the Utica chamber of commerce, besides numerous other civic, industrial and fiscal bodies, and the mayors of several cities.

Explanations from Virginia regarding the striking out of the guarantee of freedom of speech from the state constitution are to the effect (we quote one of them, a letter in a school publication, *The Little Chronicle*) that—

The words "freedom of speech" were not originally in the bill of rights as drafted by Madison, Monroe, Marshall and Lee in 1829, nor were they inserted by the conventions of '51 and '76, but were put in by the Underwood convention. In the convention now sitting the words were struck out as superfluous, because section 14, article 5, of the state constitution provides, in positive terms, that "the general assembly shall not pass any law abridging freedom of speech or of the press." The daily press, north and south, assumed that, because of the assassination of President McKinley, Virginia proposed to throttle free speech, in spite of the first amendment to the constitution of the United States. Freedom of speech is one of the corner stones of our government and no state could, constitutionally, deprive its citizens of this right. It is inconceivable that one of them would desire to do so.

We trust that this statement of fact is more trustworthy than the exposition of constitutional law that accompanies it. The first amendment to the