

One day, when I was explaining these things to her politely,
 She retorted that it was I who am the pauper:
 And that her children must go ragged
 That mine must be smart;
 That hers must be hungry that mine may be pampered;
 That hers must die that mine must live.
 So I told her that she was talking politics, which is not woman's business,
 And that the Socialists had been perverting her.
 I shut the door in her face, and gave her no more work
 Till I could do without her no longer,
 And had to send for her to come back.
 She said that some of her children had died in the meantime,
 As she had had no money to buy food for them.
 So I said: "That will teach you to keep your place, and not to call me a pauper."
 Now she comes and cleans my nurseries,
 And feeds and tends my babies,
 And makes elaborately embroidered clothes for them;
 But she says nothing,
 And I wonder why she is silent.
 One night I dreamed that I asked her why,
 And she said:
 "My dead children are crying to me to kill you,
 And my living children are crying to me to forgive you,
 And I have not yet decided which to do."

BOOKS

JESUS AND SOCIALISM.

Socialism and the Ethics of Jesus. By Henry C. Vedder. The Macmillan Co. New York. Price, \$1.50 net.

As a matter of fact the connection between the ethics of Jesus and Socialism is tenuous enough because, in the first place, Jesus lived and taught in a time, and in reaction to an environment, in which neither the status of man nor the social consciousness necessary for the conception of Socialism, were existent; and secondly because Jesus' teachings had reference to the individual alone—his parables of the Kingdom of God within the human soul being the full content of his authentic teaching according to the most scholarly criticism—and therefore Jesus' teachings can only apply to our moral attitude toward our fellow men, and not to any administrative proposal for the expression of that attitude. Jesus could not say, without self-stultification, "Be a Socialist," or "Be a Singletaxer"—although if he ever had committed himself to an administrative creed it would probably have been, "Be an anarchist."

Jesus, consistently with his message, could only say, "Be a doer—but choose the party which you see to be right—not the party which you are told is right."

Such a distinction between the teachings of Jesus which are inspirational and the advocacy of any particular doctrine as being more "moral" than any other, is necessary, for it is a pity that Jesus should be used either to turn anyone into or away from Socialism. As he is generally used to turn people away from Socialism, Dr. Vedder's book will perform a useful function in tilting the balance in the other direction.

While his interpretation of the message of Jesus is too full of debatable points for discussion in a brief review, and while, in the opinion of the reviewer, the question as to what Jesus would have thought of Socialism, had he ever been called upon to pass judgment on it, is pragmatically of no importance for our day, there remains, aside from those points, a mine of valuable knowledge and suggestion between Dr. Vedder's covers. One regrets, however, that having set out to treat his subject historically, and given a chapter to the rather dead subject of political anarchism (whose death is perhaps a necessary prerequisite for the ultimate birth of a real anarchism of freely acting moral agents), he only devotes a paragraph of inept criticism and a few scattering remarks to the ever living subject of the single tax.

Full bibliographies add to the value of the work as a survey of the subject.

LLEWELLYN JONES.



THE FIRST SCIENTIFIC SOCIALISTS.

The Ricardian Socialists. By Esther Lowenthal, Ph. D., Assistant in Economics, Smith College, No. 114 of Studies in History, Economics and Public Law. New York: Longmans, Green & Co. London: P. S. King & Sons. 1911.

A unique essay among the many other valuable ones of this serial publication of Columbia University. It deals with the writings of certain socialists who preceded the communists and were not of the Marxian school, nor yet utopians. They were "scientific" socialists in the scholastic use of that accommodating adjective; and are called "Ricardian Socialists" because they advocated the abolition of private property in the means of production in harmony with Ricardo's theory, which was the "science" of that day. The leaders in this cult, whom Dr. Lowenthal's essay re-introduces, were William Thompson, John Gray, Thomas Hodgskin and John Francis Brey. They wrote between 1820 and 1840. It is interesting to note how the same analytical flaw runs throughout the writings of those early social thinkers, and of Dr. Lowenthal's essay as well. All disregard the truly scientific difference between capitalized labor