

"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-



sis. For the most part this is beyond serious criticism. There is no reason, perhaps, for adding "demand" to "labor," "capital" and "land," as a factor of production, since the idea is involved naturally in "labor;" but as Mr. Kenworthy assigns this fourth factor to its true functions, as the cause and regulator of labor, the only question raised in this connection is one of excessive sub-division, which isn't important.

In his contention that the laborer now sells himself when he makes contracts for wages, our author risks confusions of thought by failing to distinguish between sales of the person, and sales of the person's future product. What the laborer sells is not his person. He simply contracts in advance for his future product. If he were under no undue economic pressure to accept any terms that offer, there would be neither ground nor inclination to condemn this. But the laborer's economic condition, due to the monopolization of natural opportunities, is such that he makes his wages-contract upon unequal terms, and is consequently forced to sell his future product for less than its value. This is, indeed, the essence of slavery in its results; but the deplorable thing about it is the coercion as to terms, and not the fact of the sale of future produce. The evil lies in the one-sidedness of the circumstances under which the contract must be made, and not in the wages feature.

The most striking thing about Mr. Kenworthy's book is its clear, concise, and, for the most part, accurate exposition with reference especially to the production of wealth, coupled with an incomprehensible nebulosity with reference especially to the distribution of wealth. A possible explanation is that he has fallen into the common error of thinking of distribution as synonymous with the delivery of wealth—transportation, exchange, etc., which are really parts of the processes of production—and has failed to observe that distribution in contradistinction to production, does not imply the delivery of wealth at all, but only its apportionment categorically into shares. The wealth which constitutes a man's wages is delivered to him through the processes of wealth-production, but his share or proportion of wealth is determined for him by the processes of wealth-distribution.

Failing clearly to note this difference between production and distribution, Mr. Kenworthy's book drifts away from the clean-cut analysis and coherent synthesis with which its inquiry into economic laws begins, into what can hardly be characterized otherwise than economic incoherency. This oversight and its result cannot be fairly charged to him, however, for all writers who put exchange into the category of distribution instead of produc-

tion are guilty of the same fault. The worst that can be said of Mr. Kenworthy is that he has been misled by their errors.

But for that oversight, together with the impossibility of basing a coherent economic system upon the unjust, and therefore uneconomic, formula which relates the distribution of wealth to needs instead of earnings, this little book might really have deserved the encomium of Tolstoy in the second edition, that "it not only offers the reader more solid matter than volumes upon volumes of works written on the same theme, but does what multi-volumed works on political economy do not do—it states economic problems clearly and simply."

BOOKS RECEIVED.

—"The Ethics of Imperialism. An Inquiry Whether Christian Ethics and Imperialism Are Antagonistic." By Albert P. Carman. Boston: Herbert B. Turner & Co., Price, \$7 net. To be reviewed.

—"The Life and Writings of Thomas Jefferson. Including All of His Important Utterances on Public Questions. Compiled from State Papers and from His Private Correspondence." By S. E. Forman, Ph. D., Johns Hopkins. Second edition. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co. To be reviewed.

PAMPHLETS

A public document of timely interest and exceptional value was issued on the 12th of May by the Department of Commerce and Labor at Washington. It is No. 2256 of the Daily Consular Reports, and it deals exclusively with the subject of municipal ownership. The contents include excerpts from the official reports of U. S. Consuls at various places and for several years. Among the particularly interesting reports is one from Canada, which describes the successful operation of a municipal street car line at St. Thomas. Another describes "municipal socialism" in Great Britain, and from this it appears that in 1902 there were in that country 931 municipalities owning waterworks, 99 owning street railroads, 240 owning gas works, and 181 supplying electricity. The pamphlet includes Consul Hamm's reports on the city-owned street cars of Leeds and of Hull. The countries included in the pamphlet are Austria, Canada, France, Germany and Great Britain.

PERIODICALS

Joseph Edwards, the founder and an associate editor of *The Reformers' Year Book*, has changed his address to 21 Palace Square, Norwood, London, S. E. *The Reformers' Year Book*, an annual compendium of information relative to the reform movements of the world, has been made increasingly useful to students of social tendencies with each succeeding issue.

An editorial in the *International*

Quarterly for July discusses the present outlook and gives utterance to the following: "The public in general," says the writer, "is beginning to realize that we cannot hope to perpetuate political equality and the reality of republican government if we establish no limit to economic inequality, and impose no check upon the political activity of corporate powers that the State has created." When will the readers of such journals as the *International Quarterly* come really to believe this?—J. H. D.

J. A. Spender, in the July number of the *Fortnightly Review*, modestly shows how little the great statesmen of the passing day know of the real significance of passing events. He takes us back, through Lord Salisbury's *Essays*, to the politics of the '60's, and shows how little the great ones could tell of the future. Mr. Gladstone, we remember, asserted that Jefferson Davis had made a nation. Lord Salisbury thought that the North, whether or not it was victorious, would lead its armies upon Canada. Verily the prophets are not found among statesmen.—J. H. D.

In the *Hibbert Journal* for July, under the title the *Birth of a Soul*, the reader will find an enlightening discussion of Oscar Wilde's conversion. "Could the reformation," says the writer, "have been brought about at a cheaper price? Could the new soul have been born of any other parentage? Would anything but that terrible suffering have given the apostle of aestheticism the depth and earnestness necessary to conceive the *Ballad of Reading Gaol* and *De Profundis*? . . . Have all the churches, in nineteen centuries, thrown such light upon the problem of evil as is shed by these two books in contrast with their author's earlier writings?—J. H. D.

Prof. J. Laurence Laughlin has an article in the *July Atlantic* on *Large Fortunes*, in which not once—in not a single sentence—does he answer the real ground of complaint. There are certainly those who make indiscriminate complaints against large fortunes, and no one need find fault with him for protesting against such indiscriminate complaints. But that one should write a formal discussion of such a subject and omit the true ground of complaint is quite absurd. One might think that Prof. Laughlin had never heard of the word monopoly, but for this one sentence. Speaking of Vanderbilt's success he says: "It was not a case of monopoly; anyone else, equally capable, would have been free to do the same thing." As if this were an answer to the real complaint against monopoly!—J. H. D.

Some of us will be glad that there seems to be coming a revival of Anthony Trollope. A writer in the *Fortnightly Review* contributes a just and discriminating article in praise of his novels, which is sure to meet the approval of Trollope's readers. "There

