

impelled not merely by a personal interest, but by his duty as a Colonial official, to watch recent developments affecting the colored people.

Mr. Olivier does not hesitate to say that on these visits he has found himself "unable to account for an attitude of mind toward the race question which impressed one as superstitious if not hysterical, and which would appear from the tone of the Southern press to prevail widely in America." This is not because there is no race prejudice or hostility towards black people in Jamaica. But such antagonism as appears is unquestionably diminishing, so Mr. Olivier reports. Moreover, a Jamaican of mixed race is not debarred from occupying any position in the social life of the island, including the public service, for which he is qualified. Although the Negroes and mixed bloods are in an immense majority (there are but 15,000 whites in a total population of 700,000), it has never been necessary to defend race purity by forcing the individual Negro of merit or the race as a whole into an inferior position. Colored men are landowners, clergymen, doctors and lawyers. Many colored men are magistrates, and some are the chief magistrates in their parishes. The majority of the Negroes are peasant proprietors or employes on sugar plantations. Those who rise to high position "associate with the white residents on precisely the same terms as persons of pure European extraction."

Now, according to the theory prevalent in the Southern States, this condition of affairs should have but one result—the decadence of the white race. This has not been the case. While there has been and is intermarriage, especially between colonists of Irish, Dutch or German origin and Negroes, as also between half-whites and women of pure European blood, this ex-Governor of Jamaica has been "unable to recognize that any sort of evil has resulted from their intermarriage; I should rather say the contrary." What is still more important Mr. Olivier does not find that "social and professional equality between the two races, when resulting from compatibility of temperament and interests, conduces necessarily or strongly to a likelihood of intermarriage." Among the white creoles in Jamaica and other colonies there is a strong repugnance to intermarriage with darker peoples. But as to the mixed race being necessarily "degenerate, deficient and decadent, both in physique and morals," Mr. Olivier admits that, although he went to the West Indies for the first time shar-

ing the prejudice of this common theory, he has found it impossible to sustain the view after studying the question in Jamaica, Honduras, the Leeward Islands, and elsewhere.

Mr. Oliver has even less sympathy with those persons who would countenance social injustice in order to prevent social equality. As an administrator familiar with judicial statistics, he finds that assaults by black or colored men on white women are practically unknown. The only terrors of Jamaican highways are the white runaways from European vessels. Women and children often live for months on plantations without white protectors, surrounded by colored people. There have been, Mr. Olivier reports, "no savage punishments here, no terrorism, no illegal discriminations against the colored." And he adds significantly, that in his opinion the propensity to the assaults most dreaded by whites south of Mason and Dixon's line is actually stimulated by the very attitude of the whites. He agrees with many psychologists in affirming that there is maintained "a constant storm of suggestion to the most imaginative and uncontrollable of passions in an excitable and imaginative race." "When a class," he continues, "makes the preposterous and self-damnatory announcement to another, whose women it has continually made the mother of its own offspring, that it is of an inferior order, there immediately is aroused all the self-assertiveness of the human claim to equality which is as fundamental in the African as in any other race." Evidently, Mr. Olivier has been in the South, and has viewed with amazement that double standard of morals which in most circles makes it perfectly permissible to disregard the purity of the Negro race while prating vehemently about the need of defending at any cost, the purity of the women of the white race.

On the political side of the Negro problem, Mr. Olivier feels that the bestowal of suffrage upon the newly emancipated slaves was a mistake, and naturally resulted in efforts to cut down the Negro electorate "by methods constitutionally indefensible and unjust." But the alarming conditions fill him with alarm. The whites' holding of their position by means of unjust devices gives the Negro race "a permanent plea of injustice," and results in a situation "demoralizing in the extreme." Mr. Olivier is even well enough versed in our affairs to see that, in order to justify its position, the minority is "almost inevitably compelled to blacken the char-

acter of the colored majority and depreciate their abilities by all kinds of misrepresentations." A truer word was never said on that point. The resulting situation, as Mr. Olivier sees, stimulates hysterics, which vent themselves in "outbursts of lust of blood and torture," and result "in social terrorism and obscurantism." Finally, Mr. Olivier's opinion that the pressure of this terrorism is so great that "sane men in America keep silence, or at best half-silence, in the face of an increasing Negrophobia which appears to be developing into a national danger," constitutes a serious warning to be taken to heart by all who believe in the continuance of truly democratic institutions.—The New York Nation.

John Bull—"Avast there, Johnny Crapaud; what are you doing to Ben Ali?"

Johnny Crapaud—"Vell, Mistaire Bull, Ben Ali he bin ver of man; he hip sick, und he haf mooch propair-tee."

John Bull—"I see the point. Go ahead, just so you don't forget your friend J. B. in the final division."

Johnny Crapaud—"It iss agreed, bon ami."

Hans—"Dunder und blitzen! Vat you two roppers do mit Ben Ali? Gid oudt mit you and leaf mein frint pe." (Sotto voce): "I haf designs on him meinsellef, aver I ain'd so soon retty yet."

F.

BOOKS

WAR OF THE CLASSES.

Whatever Jack London writes is well written and worth reading. He is free and frank in style and thought. He has lived an open, independent life, and his writing reflects his life. "I had lived my childhood," he writes, "on California ranches, my boyhood hustling newspapers on the streets of a healthy Western city, and my youth on the ozone-laden waters of San Francisco Bay and the Pacific ocean. I loved life in the open, at the hardest kind of work." Here we have a training far removed from the academic—no A B course or Ph. D. seminar work in this. Nor is there any savor of the schools in his writings. Unaffected and unspoiled, he has looked on life, and tells us plainly what he has seen, and what he thinks about it.

The present book (War of the Classes, Macmillan, New York, \$1.50) is no exception. It is frankness itself. It is his clear profession of his faith in socialism. The last chapter tells "How I became a Socialist," and we see that it came by what the academic folk call

"laboratory method." It came by actual contact with things. His actual experience, without theory or knowledge of theories, brought his conviction. "I had been reborn," he says, "but not renamed, and I was running around to find out what manner of thing I was. I ran back to California and opened the books. I do not remember which ones I opened first. It is an unimportant detail anyway. I was already it, whatever it was, and by the aid of the books I discovered that it was a Socialist."

Herein, perhaps, the brilliant young thinker may have made a mistake. It probably mattered a great deal what books he opened first. The life he had led, in close touch with toilers, had shown him the wrong, the injustice, and the hopelessness of things as they are. He saw the need of some revolution, and the programme of Socialism naturally appealed to him in its completeness. There is no indication in the book that he had made a close study of the line between the natural functions of Socialism and those which as naturally belong to the individual.

But let us not quarrel for the present with one who is doing such good work. Let us read this new book, and see what he has to tell of the Tramp, the Scab, and, most of all, the Class Struggle in the first chapter.

It is interesting to note in this first chapter how clearly and surely he puts the blame of present conditions upon the closing of the gateway of independent opportunity. Many writers seem to see this—like John Graham Brooks in his *Social Unrest* and Robert Hunter in his *Poverty*—and then they too quickly drop the subject. "The day of an expanding frontier," writes Mr. London, "of a lottery-like scramble for the ownership of natural resources, and of the upbuilding of new industries, is past. Farthest West has been reached. . . . The gateway of opportunity after opportunity has been closed, and closed for all time." So then the only opportunity left open for young ambitions lies along the rôle of retainer and courtier in one of the classes Mr. Ghent has so cleverly described in his *Benevolent Feudalism*. But what if natural opportunities might again be opened! And opened this time without the condition of a lottery-like scramble! Neither Mr. London nor Mr. Ghent would deny the possibility. Is it not already in some sort a part of the programme? Why not—inasmuch as its denial is confessedly the beginning of evil—make it, with its corollaries, the basis of the whole programme?

No one sees the significance of closed opportunities better than Jack London. How could the marvelous difference between the conditions of 50 years ago and those of to-day be more vividly told than in the following citation? "Had he been born," says Mr. London, "fifty years later, Andrew Carnegie, the poor Scotch boy, might have risen to be president of his union, or of a federation of

unions; but that he would never have become the builder of Homestead and the founder of multitudinous libraries, is as certain as it is certain that some other man would have developed the steel industry, had Andrew Carnegie never been born." This great difference which has come in America within 50 years is too generally ignored by the orthodox, and we should be all the more grateful to writers who proclaim its truth, show the consequences, and want to do something to mend things.

J. H. DILLARD.

THE WANDERING HOST.

"The characteristic peculiarity of *Pilgrim's Progress*," says Macaulay, "is that it is the only work of its kind which possesses a strong human interest. Other allegories only amuse the fancy." Within the latter class comes "The Wandering Host," by David Starr Jordan, president of Leland Stanford University (Boston: Am. Unitarian Association). Whatever pleasure is to be derived from it must belong wholly to the understanding, and not to the emotions.

This allegory might be characterized as a symbolic representation of the rise and progress of the Christian religion. "In early times," says the narrator, "there was One who made a journey and left a Chart. This chart was very simple and very plain—easy to understand. Even a child might understand it." Great multitudes start out to follow in the steps of this One over the mountain, through forest and desert to a wide, swift river. But soon disputations arise as to the meaning and directions of the Chart, and so there come into use new charts. Following the course of the narrative one can imagine the heated discussion of theologians assembled in general councils, the ascetism of monks and anchorites, the wars of the Crusades, the persecutions of heretics, the splitting into sects, and later on a dawning of the spirit of the brotherhood of man. Finally all who have gone by devious ways come together and throw away their charts, keeping and holding in reverence only the original Chart.

The narrative closes with the following beautifully expressed thought: "And some one wrote upon the Chart the single rule of the forest: 'Choose thou thine own best way, and help thy neighbor to find that way which for him is best.' But this was erased at last, for beneath it they found the older, plainer words which One in earlier times had written there, 'Thy neighbor as thyself.'"

JOSIAH EDSON.

RUSKIN SYSTEMATIZED.

In his preface to the second edition of "The Anatomy of Misery, Plain Lectures on Economics" (Boston: Small, Maynard & Co. Price, \$1), John Cole-

man Kenworthy says that in writing the book it was his conscious effort to reduce Ruskin to system. The attempt is so well made that one is almost forced to the conclusion that the economics of Ruskin cannot be reduced to system. Indeed, anything systematic, unless it be slavery, is well-nigh unthinkable of a political economy the first principle of which, as Mr. Kenworthy declares, is expressed in this formula: "From each according to his ability; to each according to his needs."

The formula may answer for philanthropy, where the giver voluntarily decides both upon his own ability and the recipient's needs; but the moment the giver's volition is controlled by others, the logical outcome of the formula is slavery, for slavery is essentially an economic state in which the ability of some is forced to contribute to the needs of others. If this is done by the municipal law, it is slavery; and it must be done by municipal law, if done at all, for there is no economic law in accordance with the formula.

Evidently Mr. Kenworthy contemplates enforcement of the formula by municipal law. Anticipating the obvious question regarding idlers and good-for-nothings, he replies: "The community demands that every member shall work, according to his capacity; the idler, the good-for-nothing, can, therefore, have no just claim on wealth." Yet the formula requires others to minister to their needs, and in accordance with their needs. Something suggestive of this goes on to-day, when the needs of the Rockefellers, Astors, and their like are involuntarily administered to from the ability of thousands of their fellows. Something very like it, also lop-sided, went on in the United States when the needs of the masters were met by drafts upon the ability of their slaves. These instances lack equilibrium, to be sure, the needs being considered as all on one side, and most of the ability on the other; but that is inevitable when you attempt to systematize and enforce the doctrine, "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs." It runs into favoritism as certainly as a brook runs down hill.

We may remark, also, that if "the good-for-nothing" have no claim on wealth, as matter of justice, then the "good-for-little" can have only a little claim, as matter of justice, and consequently, as matter of justice, that the formula upon which Mr. Kenworthy rests his systematization of Ruskin economics is unjust. The just formula is not from each according to his ability and to each according to his needs, but from each according to his willingness and to each according to his service-ability.

Mr. Kenworthy has great powers of clear and condensed statement, which he has used to advantage in his analy-

