

his casual acquaintances, though of the same social grade. How absurd, then, for any man to pretend to know individuals, classes or races with whom he has never associated except in the relation of master and servant, or patrician and plebeian, or civilized man and barbarian? Anyone who is honest with himself may realize the truth of this by a simple but effective mental process: "Put yourself in his place."

### SOCIALISM AND PLUTOCRACY.

When the real conflict of socialism occurs, in our country at any rate, it will not be between socialism and plutocracy. Yet certain plutocratic organizations and publications imagine that this will be its character. One of these organizations is the hybrid that calls itself the National Civic Federation, to the presidency of which August Belmont has succeeded Mark Hanna, and with which certain trade unionists affiliate; and one of these publications is the official organ of that federation, which has recently published an editorial denunciatory of an effort to form an Inter-collegiate Socialist Society in order to interest college students in socialism.

The editorial in question is characteristically empty of argument and full of abuse. It is important only because it emphasizes the fears of plutocracy at the growth of opinions which its organs are pleased to denounce as socialistic. Plutocrats dread having such opinions brought to the attention of the rising generation.

Their dread is not due to their fears of anything evil in socialism; for well they know that study of any subject tends to eliminate its evils. But they also know that the same study of so-called socialism which would tend to eliminate its evils, would tend to make the good in it stand out in bold relief. This is what plutocracy fears, and this is the reason that plutocratic organizations and publications are trying to discredit everything to which they can attach the epithet "socialism."

They are wasting their energy. In any conflict between plutoc-

racy and socialism, plutocracy will go to the wall, as it ought to.

What is the difference between plutocracy and socialism? The one difference essentially is that socialism is in its methods democratic and plutocracy is not; while both stand for abolishing competition, plutocracy offers as a substitute for competition the corporation trust, while socialism proposes a commonwealth. Probably neither would be democratic in the final outcome, for the abolition of competition involves abolition, sooner or later, of democracy; but the aspirations of socialism at any rate are democratic. Between plutocracy and socialism, therefore, the only question would be whether the monopoly that drives out competition shall be controlled by corporation stockholders or by all the people.

On that question intelligent democrats could hardly hesitate, even though they knew that the people of the cooperative commonwealth of socialism would eventually fall under the dominion of officials, just as the stockholders of the plutocratic trusts fall under the dominion of inside rings of boards of directors. Nor would most of the people hesitate. Plutocracy has made itself so repulsive that no crusade against socialism can succeed if it falls under plutocratic leadership or coincides with plutocratic sympathies.

The crusade against socialism that can succeed and deserves to succeed, is one which, while rejecting the bad in it, adopts the good. Socialists who demand public ownership and management of business in which competition is inherently impossible, are in the right. To the extent that this may be socialistic, socialism is to be welcomed. In so far, however, as it proposes to abolish competition regardless of whether it is inherently impossible or not, socialism is wrong and can be and ought to be rejected.

Here, then, is the issue on which the real conflict with socialism must turn, and the more generally and sympathetically socialism is studied, the better will that issue be understood and the stronger will the genuinely individualistic side of it become.

### EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

#### GERMANY.

Freiburg, June 20.—Friends of the movement in favor of the municipal ownership of public utilities or of government ownership of the railways, express and telegraph business should organize some kind of system for gathering pertinent news or statistics here for publication.

Hardly a day passes during which some little item that might be used to create sentiment for public ownership, does not force itself upon my attention. Is it a special evening train run at a low rate for bathers in the Rhine, one-fourth fare for school children's excursions, extensive precaution for making travel safe with the result that 20 times less accidents occur on German railroads than in the United States, or a parcel of 11 pounds that I can send to the remotest end of Germany for 12 cents—all these contrast with conditions at home. Here one sends a ten-word telegram anywhere within the Empire for 12 cents, and the annual reports of the municipalities are full of facts and figures showing the superiority of the municipal ownership of such utilities. They only need to be gathered and brought to the public attention at home.

It is a mistake to rely on the casual reports of American travelers abroad; for, as I have observed, not one in 500 has the least interest in such things. Tourists hasten to see the great old wine keg in the Heidelberger Schloss, but fail to notice that they are making use of street cars owned to 60 per cent. by the city. They admire a beautiful school or a handsome bridge here in Freiburg, but fail to learn that such things are paid for by the "unearned increment," the value of the land, namely, which the municipality owns within its own limits. This value increased from \$2,000,000 in 1870 to \$30,000,000 in 1904.

EDWARD RUMELY.

### NEWS NARRATIVE

Week ending Thursday, July 6.

#### Possible revolution in Russia.

Although the reports from Odessa continue to be very vague regarding the extension to the Black Sea fleet of what seems to be a revolution (pp. 166, 199), the fact that the crew of one battleship, the Kniaz Potemkine, has revolted and under the red flag still resists the Czar's government is evident, while the indications are numerous that this revolt ramifies and has paralyzed the whole fleet.

Press dispatches of the 30th reported that the Potemkine has fired on the city of Odessa the previous evening, and that some of her crew had landed with machine guns and were fighting with the populace behind barricades; also that the battleship Georgi Pobiedonosetz, with the cruiser Griden, had left Sevastopol for Odessa to give battle to the mutinous Potemkine. A few hours later on the same day the American consul at Odessa advised the Washington authorities that the Potemkine had surrendered without firing a shot; but on the 1st she was reported through London news agencies as having been joined by the Georgi Pobiedonosetz, whose crew also had mutinied. This report was more than confirmed by the American ambassador to St. Petersburg who, on the 1st, advised the Washington authorities that three battleships were then flying the red flag of the revolution off Odessa. A hopeless condition for the Czar's government must have been revealed when the remainder of the Black Sea squadron assembled at Sevastopol, upon its return from Odessa, where it had been sent to subdue or sink the Potemkine, for on the 2d, at a council of admirals and captains at Sevastopol, Vice-Admiral Kruger presiding, it was decided, according to press dispatches of that day and since, to ungear the machinery of the squadron and allow the officers and crews to go ashore. This action, together with the fact that the squadron had failed in its Odessa expedition, was regarded as an official recognition of a mutinous condition throughout the fleet. There were also definite reports that the crews of the other vessels had refused to fire on the Potemkine.

On the 2d the Kniaz Potemkine was reported from Odessa as having disappeared seaward the night before. On the 3d, also from Odessa, the surrender of the Georgi Pobiedonosetz by her mutinous crew to the Imperial authorities was circumstantially reported as having occurred. She was reported on the 5th as having rejoined the squadron at Sevastopol, and her mutineers as having been imprisoned at Odessa. The Potemkine was next heard of

at the Roumanian port of Kustenji, where a delegation from her crew delivered a proclamation addressed to the representatives of the Powers in Roumania, formally declaring war on all Russian vessels which refuse to join the mutineers, and pledging respect for neutral territory and foreign shipping. The delegation requested that the proclamation be forwarded to the Powers. Shp was last heard of at Theodosia, on the Crimean coast near the entrance to the Sea of Azov. Here her crew formally made the following proclamation:

The crew of the Kniaz Potemkine notify the foreign Powers that the decisive struggle has begun against the Russian government. We consider it to be our duty to declare that we guarantee the complete inviolability of foreign ships navigating the Black Sea, as well as the inviolability of foreign ports.

The body of Omiltehuk, the sailor whose murder by his superior officer was the immediate occasion of the revolt on the Potemkine (p. 199), was buried with military honors on the 29th. A procession of many thousands of persons followed the body from the harbor to the military cemetery. The coffin, which was covered with the St. Andrew's flag and on which there were many wreaths, was carried by eight sailors. The procession was headed by priests, and neither police nor troops were stationed along the route to the cemetery.

Similar mutinies to that of the Black Sea have likewise been meagerly reported from other parts of Russia during the week. Russian sailors at Libau were said to have risen against the Czar's government on the 29th, and on the 1st this uprising was reported to have been stamped out at the cost of more than 1,000 lives. Another naval revolt was reported on the 3d. This was said to have occurred on the cruiser Minine, at Kronstadt, on the Gulf of Finland, near St. Petersburg, where a strike was in progress. Both the strike and the naval revolt are reported to have been put down.

At Odessa, martial law has been declared, and some 40,000 troops are reported to be in possession of

the city. Business there is at a standstill, and the sea front is cut off by the troops. Over 6,000 strikers are reported to have been killed by the troops, and a considerable part of the business section to have been destroyed or injured by fire. The surrounding country is also reported as disturbed by peasant uprisings. Lodz (p. 199) was reported as ablaze on the 1st, and Warsaw (p. 199) as in open revolution. One St. Petersburg correspondent regards the reported outbreaks as "evidences of a prearranged revolutionary movement." He writes (see Chicago Tribune of 2d):

Behind the mutiny on board the Black Sea warship, the insurrection in the naval yards at Libau and Cronstadt, and in the arms factory at Kolpino; behind the uprising in Warsaw and Lodz; behind the agrarian disturbances in every province; and behind the steady pressure of the zemstvos at Moscow, it is beginning to be realized that there is a clear-headed directing force, emanating from a central revolutionary authority.

Veracious accounts of the situation are evidently held in check by the government as much as possible, and little but guesses and dispatches manifestly inspired by government agents is telegraphed. In consequence, a cloud of mystery hangs about the whole affair.

#### Russian-Japanese peace envoys.

Official announcement was made through President Roosevelt on the 2d, of the names of the Russian and the Japanese envoys who are to meet at Washington (p. 199) to confer regarding terms of peace between Russia and Japan. For Russia the envoys are Muravieff, formerly minister of justice and now ambassador to Italy, and Rosen, recently appointed ambassador to the United States to succeed Count Cassini; for Japan they are Komura, minister of foreign affairs, and Kogoro Takahira, minister to the United States. In making this announcement by direction of the President, the President's secretary, Mr. Loeb, added the following formal statement:

The President announces that the Russian and Japanese governments have notified him that they have appointed the plenipotentiaries to meet here (Washington) as soon after the