

case, we do not quite see. Since the courts have established government by injunction, there is no reason, in consistency, why a lawyer should not apply for injunctions for clients, and yet, as a citizen, vote and work against this innovation. If he were very nice indeed about the point of consistency, so nice as to refuse to give to his clients as a lawyer the benefit of laws which as a citizen he opposed, his competitors at the bar might be benefited, for they would get his clients away from him, but it is not easy to see how political opposition to these laws would be thereby strengthened. Lentz himself has explained that in applying for an injunction he was moved by a desire to let those working people who had twice voted for government by injunction have a dose of the kind of medicine they had voted for.

In deciding to convict a labor union picket of violating a labor injunction, Judge Baker, of Indianapolis, took occasion to say that "it is treason against human right to prevent a man from working that he may keep his family from starvation." Judge Baker didn't mean that. It is absolutely true, but he didn't mean it and doesn't believe it. In a multitude of ways men are prevented from working, and Judge Baker approves them. Taxes on occupations do this very thing, but he wouldn't abolish these taxes. Blacklisting does it, but he doesn't care. Protective tariffs do it, but he wouldn't repeal the protective tariff laws. Land monopoly does it, but he wouldn't abolish land monopoly. All these things are "treason against human right," but Judge Baker is content. He didn't mean to say that "it is treason against human right to prevent a man from working." That is too comprehensive for him. He should have been more specific. What he did mean to say was that "it is treason against human right for labor unionists to prevent a non-union man from working."

During the current week the bi-centenary of the founding of Yale

college was celebrated. This is a fit occasion, therefore, to compare American prosperity of the present with American prosperity of Yale's centennial period; the more especially as it can be done by quotations from a source which Yale justly delights to honor. One hundred years ago, in Yale's first centennial year, old Dr. Dwight, then president of Yale, a grandfather of President Hadley's immediate predecessor, made an extensive tour of New England, and afterwards embodied the results of his observations in some volumes of "Travels." His purpose in part was explained in his preface. Said he:

As it was naturally presumed by me that some of those who will live eighty or a hundred years hence must have feelings similar to my own, I resolved to furnish, so far as it should be in my power, means of enabling them to know what was the appearance of their country during the period occupied by my journeys.

Over and over again Dr. Dwight insists that equable conditions of life, neither high nor low, make up the sum of contentment, and hence of happiness, in America. In another part of the preface he writes:

Every farmer, with too few exceptions to deserve notice, labors on his own ground, and for the benefit of himself and his family merely. This also, if I am not deceived, is a novelty; and its influence is seen to be remarkably happy, in the industry, sobriety, cheerfulness, personal independence and universal prosperity of the people at large. Great wealth, that is, what Europeans consider as great wealth, is not often found in these countries. But poverty is almost unknown. Comfortable subsistence is enjoyed everywhere, unless prevented by peculiar misfortunes, or by vice. The feelings of a benevolent man are very imperfectly satisfied by the sight of opulence and splendor in the hands of a few, contrasted by want and suffering in the many; of palaces and villas, encircled by cottages and cabins. A succession of New England villages, composed of neat houses, surrounding neat schoolhouses and churches, adorned with gardens, meadows and orchards, and exhibiting the universally easy circumstances of the inhabitants, is, at least in my own opinion, one of the most delightful prospects which this world can afford.

That is a very different kind of prospect from the kind that Prof. Hadley

would be obliged to describe were he to follow the example of his illustrious predecessor and write a book of observations on the American social conditions of Yale's bi-centenary.

One more quotation from Dr. Dwight should in this 200th year of their alma mater interest all Yale men who believe in keeping this a country of democratic masses instead of making it a domain of plutocratic classes. We quote from Dr. Dwight's observations on the first town he traveled through after leaving New Haven:

. . . . The houses are generally good; and their owners obviously in easy circumstances.

I say their owners; for you are to understand that every man in this country, almost without an exception, lives on his own ground. The lands are universally holden in fee-simple, and descend, by law, to all the children in equal shares. Every farmer in Connecticut, and throughout New England, is, therefore, dependent for his enjoyments on none but himself, his government and his God, and is the little monarch of a dominion sufficiently large to furnish all the supplies of competence, with a number of subjects as great as he is able to govern. In the cultivation of his farm he gratifies his reason, his tastes and his hopes, and usually finds the gratification at least sufficient for such a world as this. Here he can do everything which is right, and no man can, with impunity, do anything to him which is wrong. If he is not in debt, an event necessary only from sickness or decrepitude, he is absolutely his own master and the master of all his possessions.

There is something to me in the sight of this independence and the enjoyments by which it is accomplished more interesting, more congenial to the relish of nature, than in all the melancholy grandeur of the decayed castles and ruined abbeys, with which some parts of Europe are so plentifully stocked. The story of this happiness will, indeed, be less extended and less amusing; but the actual prospect of it is incomparably more delightful.

In consequence of this mode of occupancy every man has something to defend, and that something, in his own estimation, of incalculable value. It is a secure estate, absolutely his own, and of such magnitude as to furnish an ample competence to himself and his family. In estimating the subject, pounds, shillings and pence are forgotten. Too much endeared to him to be computed in this manner, it endears everything around him—his neighbor-

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 equitable 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