dislike for theorists, particularly of the Economic breed—most likely sought to find a man as ignorant as possible of political economy, and so chose a professor of it. Yet, at the same time, the President is credited with autocratic leanings—so it may be that Hadley's anti-legislative elysium is at hand and that the "Economists"—Heaven help us! are to have an inning.

I suppose that in ordinary life these professional gentlemen will pass muster with the average. But, when *Economic* writing and teaching are considered, it will be fair to compare them with Zadok Smeedle's deer. Zadok, a village Munchausen of my early years, shot at a deer which he failed to get, though sure that he had struck it. Next year he saw another deer with a white star on its forehead, and that seemed to have a bell about its neck—he heard it jingling. This deer being killed proved to be the one wounded the year before, when his ball it seems had struck it in the forehead, letting its brains run out. The bell-like sound was merely the lead rattling around in an empty skull.

* RADICALISM IN LITERATURE.

PART II. Some Modern Manifestations.

(*For the Review.*)

By GRACE ISABEL COLBRON.

In speaking of the manifestations of Radical Thought in literature, it is not our purpose in this article to include any such writings as are purely theoretical or dogmatic, however fine their literary quality may be. The intention here is to consider the awakening of the radical Thought in works of pure literature, so-called, in writings that conform to the one or the other art form, poetic verse, fiction, or the drama.

The development along these lines during the past century in all the tongues of civilization has been tremendous, more than the sum of all the centuries preceding can show. Of course in the scope of a short magazine article like this, it will not be possible to more than mention the trend of literature in some countries, or to give a name or two from others. From the struggle for political freedom which inspired Schiller and Kleist, down to the economic struggle as portrayed in Hauptmann's "Weavers"; from the unconscious teaching in Dickens' portrayal of London slums down to the very conscious preaching of George Bernard Shaw, for example, the same road has been taken by modern literature in every language. More in some, less in others, many factors working together to make the difference, but the trend has been the same, the same gathering towards a common goal.

Russia takes her poets' mission seriously, and therefore her autocrats, understanding the poet's power, clip his wings and attempt to muzzle him with legal gags. But as no danger can deter the poet who feels the call to speak and who knows that thousands are hanging on his words as on a gospel, Russia's radical literature has put forth superb blossoms. But the evasion of the letter of the law, rendered necessary for the Russian poet if he would be heard at all by his countrymen, has driven him to be more a portrayer than a preacher. With the exception of the fearless Tolstoy, the Russian writers' greatest strength lies in a pitiless portrayal of wrong conditions, more than in

* Part I. of this article appeared in the Winter Number of the REVIEW for 1905.

a holding out of hope of cure. The Russian poet paints the cruel picture to the minutest detail, and then leaves it to work upon the minds of his hearers as the thing portrayed would work itself, if they could see it with the vividness with which the poet's keener insight views it.

In Germanic Central Europe, from Norway down to Austria, there is a greater fearlessness of arraignment of present authority than in Russia, therefore a more definite concentration of purpose on some special phase of the question; and a somewhat greater regard for the restriction of literary form, although this not in as strong a degree as seen in France. Sweden, once so great in literature, has now but two strong voices among her poets, August Strindberg and Selma Lagerlöf, and both are too distinctly personal in mental attitude to be reckoned among radical economic writers. But Strindberg's cruel force of portrayal, and Fru Lagerlöf's exqusite human sympathy gives the works of both a standing even in the line of the New Thought.

In Denmark there is a calm, fearless discussion of every question, and although Denmark is in a fairly healthy condition with regard to political and economic questions, the troubles that arise are treated with an outspoken directness by its writers, whose eminent gift of literary form has long made them respected in the art world. Norway's two great spokesmen, Ibsen and Bjórnsen, have carried their message for their own country to every other civilized nation as well, and have done much to bring the discussion of the questions of the day within the circle of literary criticism by the sheer force of their compelling personality.

In Germany radical thought has found voice in all forms of literature, but as Germany's finest literary work during the past five decades or more has been in the drama, so it is in the drama that radical thought also has come to finest fruition. Hauptmann's "Weavers" and "Hannele" stand as two great monuments of the present, and between them and Schiller's William Tell, that fine song of political freedom which still can find an echo everywhere, there is a long line of splendid works, excellent as dramas, and effective as sermons on justice. Arno Holz, Richard Dehmel and one or two others among the minor poets have voiced radical thought with fearless courage, and a plea for justice founded on a sympathetic understanding of the needs of humanity is the keynote of all the works of Germany's leading woman writer, Clara Viebig. Her novel "Our Daily Bread" is as strong in this respect as it is fine as a work of art. The novel "Jörn Uhl" by an hitherto obscure country pastor, Gustav Frenssen, which has made the literary sensation in Germany of the last five years, is also full of radical thought, in the natural simple way in which the man of the soil, he who is nearest nature's heart, often sees fundamental justice more clearly than the more cultivated mind obscured in vision by what others have thought and said. Pastor Frenssen, by the way, has for years been a convinced Single Taxer.

From Holland, long so silent in the literary concert of the nations, there comes one of the strongest radical dramas of the modern stage. "The Good Hope," by Hermann Heiermanns, Jr., a play of life in a Dutch fishing village, is as superb in its dramatic intensity as it is strong in its moving fidelity to detail and in the moral it points. It is worthy to stand with "The Weavers" in the first rank of great dramatic radical sermons. Two other plays by the same author show his gift for dramatic actuality, and his minute and keen observation, but as neither has so great a subject, the suffering of a whole class under economic justice, as inspires "The Good Hope," therefore these other plays have merely a passing literary value and will not live, as will the last named work.

Probably hardly any of those who read the works of Emile Zola in an inadequate translation, and perhaps not all of those who read him in the original,

realize how strong a prophet of the Radical Thought this prolific writer was. But it is not in the writings of his later days, not in the fantastic-utopian "Fecundity" nor the religious fanaticism of the Londres-Paris-Rome series, that we must look for his great radical sermons. They are found in the Rougon-Macquart series, where also the finest literary value of his work is found. "Germinal" equals the "Weavers" in its intensity; "Le Debacle" is a superb arraingment of king-made wars; and "Nana," much misunderstood, contains considerably more than the mere picture of the half-world it is generally supposed to be. It contains, with "L'Assomoir" and "Germinal," intimately connected with it, an arraignment and a prophesy, more terrible than which no literature can show.

When we come to the two great countries using the English tongue, we find a lion in the path of the poet who would talk of vital things, more terrible than all the fetters of arbitrary legislation. This is the mental attitude on the part of the great Anglo-Saxon public that neither Art nor Religion should have anything to do with the affairs of daily life. The Anglo-Saxon likes to hear his preacher in the pulpit tell him of Heaven at a certain hour on Sunday morning, possibly also Sunday evening, and maybe once during the week. He also enjoys reading, in good verse and prose which may be either good or bad, about love and abstract beauty and all sorts of agreeable things that have nothing to do with his business or political affairs. But let the preacher once touch on the questions of public ethics and civic morality, and let the poet dare to sing of economic questions—at once the howl arises: "Cobbler, stick to thy last!" As if public and civic morality were not pre-eminently the business of a church that is to do any good at all in modern life; and as if Life itself, in all its phases, was not pre-eminently the poet's domain!

But in spite of this deterring public attitude, modern literature in the English language is beginning to take more and more an active part in public affairs, and if not to lead, at least to show how the current in modern life is setting. The English tongue has more and greater works of pure economic science to show than has any other language, but it has only just begun timidly and modestly to voice the radical thought in its literary art forms. Dickens led the way, unconsciously for the most part, and too early in the day to be understood by his audience. And it is not at all an irrevelant assertion to state the present awakening of interest in Dickens may be due to a realization * * * sharpened by the awakening of the radical thought in all literature, of how much ahead of his time he was, and of the actuality for the present day of the message he has to bring.

A host of newer English writers are touching on vital subjects from all sides: "Zack," Edwin Pugh, J. A. Steuart, Richard Whiteing, Phillpotts, George Moore, and the spectacular but gifted Bernard Shaw, are but a few of those whose works show the influence of the New Thought, and an earnest desire to bring a message of understanding and of hope to their hearers.

Among our own home writers, there is an encouraging awakening also, Walt Whitman, the Mighty Prophet, is no longer an isolated Voice Crying in the Wilderness. Others of lesser strength, but of equal earnestness have joined the ranks of the fighters against injustice, of those who would awaken the sluggish public mind to a knowledge of the evil and to the need for a remedy. Frank Norris, the gifted California poet, was called away too soon to complete the work he had laid out for himself, but he has done enough to show how truly he understood the ills of the modern world. Edwin Markham has sent out many an inspiring verse in the cause of justice, and a younger poet, William Vaughan Moody, little known as yet, has already shown himself possessed of a breadth of outlook that is remarkable, combined with a mastery of poetic form.

Hamlin Garland, our well-known Single Tax comrade, has always stood

openly on the side of those who fight for Justice; in all his artistic experiments the one thought of sympathy for suffering humanity is uppermost, whatever the subject of his work may be. A host of newer younger writers here, as in England, confirm the encouraging hope that the English-writing poet can see the trend of modern thought as well as can his colleagues elsewhere, and that he is willing to fight *his* foe, even more terrible than the legal fetters which bind them, the lion of indifference to his seriousness which lies in his path.

PATENTS FOR INVENTIONS.

(*For the Review.*)

By FRED. J. MILLER.

There are two kinds of opposition to patents and patent laws. The first of these is opposition to all patents, and all patent laws, as authorizing grants of monopolies. This seems to be based upon the idea that all monopolies—all exclusive privileges of every kind are wrong in principle and ought not to be allowed. The other sort of opposition is based upon the belief that our present patent law works injustice in many cases, and ought to be amended in important respects. Considering the first kind of opposition, it seems to me that it has no sound basis. A patent, or at least some security of return for labor expended in inventions is justifiable upon the same ground that copyrights are justifiable; upon the general law that what a man has produced by his labor he is primarily entitled to the possession of. The patent law, in fact, recognizes that a man is entitled to the exclusive possession of his invention during his lifetime. That is to say, a man who has invented an improvement of any kind may, if he chooses, keep it a secret. He may use his device or machine in the manufacture of goods to be sold to the public, and though the goods themselves are thus necessarily revealed, and may be patented or not according to circumstances, the machine which makes them need not be revealed at all, and there are cases of this kind—many cases in fact—where this is being done. No one, so far as I know, denies the right of the inventors and the makers of the machines to thus keep them secret; it being obvious that other inventors and other machinery makers have the same right to invent and make machines for the same purpose, which right in fact they often do exercise. It is difficult to see where any unfair monopoly results from such retention by the inventor of the secret of his own invention.

But now the patent law steps in and merely says that if the inventor, instead of keeping his invention a secret and using it for his own benefit, exclusively, will make its construction entirely public so that anyone versed in the art may be thereby enabled to make and use a similar machine, the inventor may still retain the exclusive right to manufacture and sell the invention for seventeen years, after which it is to become public property.

It is open to question as to whether or not this is a fair bargain as between the inventor and the public. In some cases it is probably as fair as any that could be formulated. In other cases, it is undoubtedly unfair to the public. But, still, in other cases it is certainly unfair to the inventor, who, during the seventeen years' grant of the exclusive right to the use of the invention may, for good and sufficient reasons, be unable to reap any of the benefits from his invention, which, nevertheless, may turn out to be, eventually, one of great value to the public. This has happened in many cases. The locomotives so long used on the elevated roads in New York afforded an example of it.