

will have noticed stone arches here and there, countless. Some are finely polished, with beautiful carvings and inscriptions; some but rough, plain stone, with simple inscriptions. These are the arches dedicated by distinguished Chinese to their mothers. It is through their sons that Chinese mothers get fame, because the conditions of life exclude women from public life. It is very touching to read these inscriptions by the dutiful sons who consecrated them to their mothers. And these arches are always held in reverence. Even during our internecine wars the rebels and imperial soldiers always leave these arches intact. Very few arches are dedicated to fathers, because we believe men have all the chances of making themselves distinguished. Even when the arches crumble, the stories of the virtuous life of women will always be remembered by Chinese, because one generation tells another of the deeds and virtues of women of the preceding generations. All this is what made China last so long. So we owe to our women, too, as you to yours, the long continuance of our empire.

While I am speaking on that I ought to correct an erroneous impression of the world in general about Chinese binding their feet; that is, the world thinks Chinese mothers are devoid of natural instinct in making their little girls suffer the cruelties of having their feet bound. But that is not so. Our mothers have as much love for their children as any other race; but the foot-binding is a fashion. How that fashion started nobody, not even a Chinese scholar, was able to explain clearly. Some say it was due to an empress of a former dynasty. She was a very beautiful woman, but she had a club foot, and to hide the deformity she squeezed her other foot to the same size, and that started the fashion. It was ever after followed, up to the present. That empress lived about 1,500 years ago. The present dynasty is Manchu. The Manchu women have large feet; the Chinese have small—not only as a fashion, but as a sign of gentility, showing that she has to do no work. And the mothers, in their anxiety to see their daughters well matched and well married off, are obliged to resort to having the feet of the daughters squeezed to an unnatural size, because there is a larger demand for small-footed women, and that demand must be supplied. The mothers themselves have small feet, and they suffered as much when the process was being operated upon them. So it stands to reason that they knew the pain and suffer-

ing of having small feet. Still they feel obliged to practice the same cruelty upon their daughters, because they want them to be well married, into higher families.

On the incoming of the present dynasty, one of our best emperors, who reigned about 200 years ago, issued an edict abolishing the binding of feet. Do you know what that edict cost? A rebellion in China. All the women instigated their husbands to rebel. And the emperor saw his mistake. After that edict was out for three months he had to recall it.

But of late the fashion is changing. We have now another edict from the empress dowager, issued last year, exhorting the gentry to tell the people to stop the practice. That edict has a good influence. Also, the intercourse with foreigners has an influence that is being felt by all the people in the different parts. Of course it takes some time to get the people in the interior to come to the same opinion. But the Chinese, once they are on the move, never stop; and I think our women move as fast as our men; and it would not surprise me if in ten, fifteen or twenty years at the longest the fashion of foot-binding will be dropped entirely. Our women will at that time begin to import Paris gowns, and take to tight-lacing (applause), because their life would be dull without a fashion; and fashion is a tyrant, more tyrannical than the most despotic monarch. Fashion decides—from which there is no appeal.

As I said, education makes American women, and I think you will agree with me that no country can advance without having their women educated. China can be no exception to the rule. Last year I had the honor to serve as secretary under the prince sent by our emperor to congratulate King Edward VII. at the coronation; and in going through the different countries the prince was especially impressed with the advanced state of the English and American women. On his return home he submitted to the throne a memorial drawing up a plan of educating the Chinese women, and that plan was under serious consideration. Two or three schools have been started already, and the rest will follow. I do not think it will be very long before all Chinese women will be educated in a practical manner—not the little education they are receiving now; and the time is coming when all the women of the world will be educated. Then the American women will have their desire to have universal sisterhood and that time will arrive before universal brotherhood, be-

cause women are less selfish than men; they are more sympathetic; the feeling of self-interest appeals less strongly to them, and that day of universal sisterhood will come, and when it does come all the stones in the world will be requisitioned to build a monument to do honor to and to perpetuate the fame of American women. (Applause.)

Make things, do things, be things; and don't fuss and scramble.

A. T. P.

BOOKS

MASS AND CLASS.

Mr. W. J. Ghent, author of "Benevolent Feudalism," explains his reason for the title he gives his new book (Mass and Class; a Survey of Social Divisions. New York: The Macmillan Company), lest he may be suspected of having plagiarized from Mallock's *Classes and Masses*. The explanation is needless. Mr. Ghent's title is expressive and appropriate, and that is enough. His social philosophy, somewhat satirically put forth in his previous book, is here presented in the form of serious exposition; and one of its principal features is its judicial defense of the socialistic notion of class-consciousness—the theory that men act together as a mass in classes, according to economic class-interests. This theory, which is the antithesis of the theory that the general tendency of social progress is on the whole in accordance with moral ideals of universal application, is the corner stone of modern socialism.

By taking human history or experience in detail merely, and pushing aside all the details that indicate idealistic devotion, a plausible case may be made for self-interest as the mainspring of individual success and social advance. So, also, may this self-interest be made plausibly to appear at its best as class interest, if only the predatory classes of history be considered. But much more is needed than anything yet put forth in socialistic literature, including Mr. Ghent's very interesting and judicial *Mass and Class*, to demonstrate that the economic class-conscious theory of social development has a scientific basis.

That there is such a thing in human nature as class-conscious idealism—recognition of class ideals instinctively—no one disputes. In the face of nationality in peoples, denominationalism in religion, alma materism in education, and so on, the fact would be too great and obtrusive to be denied if anyone cared to deny it. But that there is such a thing as class-conscious self-interest—instinctive recognition of interdependent individual interests—is not so clear.

There are, indeed, things that resemble it. The most impressive instance is

to be found in the apparently conscious solidarity of the so-called propertied classes. Socialists call this "capitalistic class consciousness," and infer from it that the capitalist class may be fought with and overcome by awakening in the working class a similar class consciousness. But capitalistic class consciousness depends upon mental apprehensions of a kind that are entirely alien to the working class as such. John Randolph of Roanoke put the whole thing into a sentence when he said that nothing is more timid than a million dollars, except two millions. In other words, the so-called capitalistic class consciousness is nothing but a panic produced by individual fears of loss of individual accumulations. It is a social disease. Threaten the safety of vested interests, and you frighten every unintelligent investor, little as well as big. They become like a flock of sheep running after the bell wether. This is not because they are concerned for the interrelated interests of their class. It is because each is concerned for his own board,—and directly so and not through any sensitive class nerve. They are not one whit more capitalistically class conscious than are the non-capitalistic mob that flock after them in order to get or to keep backsheesh.

To call the panicky fears of capitalists class consciousness, and infer from it that the working class can be awakened to consciousness of their economic interests as a whole, regardless of more obvious and immediate interests as individuals, is to build on a quicksand. Such workmen as are governed by motives of self-interest naturally strive to get into the capitalist class, not to destroy it. Their individual selfishness always has and always will (so far as socialist literature brings to light anything to the contrary) blind them to the fact that an injury to one of their class is the concern of all of that class. They are incapable of merging individual selfishness into a class selfishness.

This is characteristic, not of workmen especially, but of the quality of selfishness. Selfishness is the most individualistic of all psychologic forces. Workingmen are not peculiar; it is only that they are men before they are workers. As men they are swayed by their personal, and not their class, interests, and in the long run by universal, rather than by class ideals, if by ideals at all. When class interests seem to sway them it is really class ideals, and not class interests.

Socialists themselves are living exemplifications of the error of their theory of class consciousness. They are devoted not to their own self-interest, nor to that of any class whose benefits they can hope to share, but to a social ideal which cannot be realized by anybody until long after they have gone into the oblivion which their materialistic philosophy also teaches.

Mr. Ghent thinks, along with the "scientific" cult of socialists, that morals are generated by economic class interest. Yet he demonstrates no more at best than that economic class interests check and temporarily modify moral ideals. But that is nothing. No one disputes the bad influences of selfishness upon ideals. Does not every man in his own individual life check and modify the development of his own moral character by giving way to economic temptations? Showing that classes and nations and races also give way to economic temptations falls very far short of demonstrating that moral force is generated by economic conditions.

There are indications in his book that Mr. Ghent does recognize, even if vaguely, that moral ideals are modified to human apprehension, rather than generated, by economic conditions. Referring in a note at page 24 to the American agitation for the Cuban war, which he attributes to "an awakened sense of justice and humanity," he adds this explanation: "It happened that there was no adverse economic motive prevalent at the time sufficiently strong to obstruct the exercise of this altruistic motive." There is a similar indication at page 108, in a comparison of the British agitation to abolish West Indian slavery with that for the amelioration of factory conditions in England. Shaftesbury is quoted as complaining that the non-conformist religionists, who had been the mainstay of the anti-slavery movement in the West Indies, were not troubled about white slavery at home, and Mr. Ghent observes: "It did not conflict with their economic interests." This is no more than saying that men incline to morality unless overcome by economic temptation. It is in direct conflict with the theory that morality itself originates in the self-interest of dominant classes.

Obscuration of moral principles, distortion of moral ideals, retardment of moral progress, are indeed explained by economic temptation, whether individual, class, national or racial; but moral principle cannot be so accounted for. No social philosophy that rests upon individual, class, national or racial self-interest can long survive its academic infancy. The real social conflict is not between classes, nor yet nations nor races. Like the analogous conflict in the individual, it is between two psychologic forces—selfishness on one side and perceptions of ideal justice on the other. Selfishness makes for evil and tends to social destruction; ideal justice makes for good and tends to social upbuilding. Not through selfish class consciousness, but through moral perception and devotion to moral principle, is real social progress to be achieved and made secure. Class interests and associations may in greater or less degree obscure moral perception

and put moral courage to the test; but the clearer the perception and the stronger the courage, the more are class lines disregarded and all class-conscious selfishness abhorred.

No one who has read Mr. Ghent's *Benevolent Feudalism* and liked it, will turn from *Mass and Class* with disappointment. The lighter touches of the former book are of course lacking, but there is no retrogression. The book is direct, simple, clear, strong, honest and judicial. Whatever may be said of its philosophy, its motives and method are above criticism. The American reader who would get a glimpse of socialism from a sympathetic but not unbalanced American pen, can hardly find at the present time a better volume for his purpose.

PERIODICALS.

The *Delineator*, published by The Butterick Publishing Co., New York, is a good example of the steady advance of fashion periodicals to a high level of literary and artistic merit. The only criticism we have to offer to its excellent December number is that its illustrations are worth better presswork.

Reviewing Edward Atkinson's book, *Facts and Figures, the Nation of November 10* says: "Incidentally Mr. Atkinson brings out a fact that is little known—that the proportion of persons employed in great factories is diminishing. . . . The tendency is encouraging, and we may share Mr. Atkinson's hope that the small craftsman, being of some intelligence and independence, may be induced to attend to the evidence which proves how they are hampered by the present tariff." J. H. D.

If all the people in America who send and receive telegrams could be induced to read Mr. Lusk's article on the Australian Telegraph System in the November number of the *North American Review*, it would seem that it might be an easy matter to convert a majority to the adoption of a similar system of

A Special Holiday Offer

During the month of December a year's subscription to *The Public* and the choice of Louis F. Post's *Ethics of Democracy* or a copy of *Risocialism*, by Oliver R. Townbridge, will be included FREE with the new Library Edition of the Works of Henry George, all express charges prepaid, at the regular price of \$17.50 on installments, \$2 with the order and \$2 monthly, or for \$15 cash when books are delivered. Sent to different addresses if desired.

L. S. DICKEY & CO.
1601 Unity Bldg., CHICAGO

SIX RACY AND SPICY

10 cts. each

"Spells and Things from the Straight Edge," done into dainty Booklets.

50c for the six

The Church of Divine Satisfaction; The Honorable Charles Rockingham Duckets; The Ghost of Murdered Love; The Silly Old Dragon; The Highest of all Arts; The Philosophy of Toys.
STRAIGHT EDGE PRESS, 1 Abington St., New York.