

Rhode Island, The State, when it declares its advocacy of "the principle of public ownership of public utilities, not only that they may be administered for the good of the people instead of for private gain, but because, in the form of private monopolies, they have become an imperium in imperio, rivalling the state in power and seeking to dominate it." Judge Parker's Fourth of July democracy needs burnishing. It is rusty with a plutocratic rust.

Mayor McClellan on thoughtful action.

A much more inspiring Fourth of July address than Judge Parker's at Tammany, was that of Mayor McClellan before the National Educational Association at Asbury Park. Mayor McClellan made an appeal for thoughtful action instead of mere action in modern life. "The country," he said, "needs men of thought and men of learning and needs them badly. We have deified action at the expense of thought. The good old motto, 'Act in haste, repent at leisure,' no longer stands at the top of our copy books. We have preached so persistently the doctrine of action that we are almost convinced that any action is better than none. We suffer from the spirit of unrest, which frequently prompts us to ill considered, immature and thoughtless action, often merely for the sake of doing something. We are inclined to applaud the man who does, not so much because he accomplishes anything useful as because he accomplishes something—be it good, bad, or indifferent. The spirit of unrest permeates our whole national life, political, social, educational. Contentment bids fair to be banished from our existence. He who is content is sneered at as being without ambition; and yet ambition and hysterics are different things. Were our ambitions laudable, our state of mind would be most commendable; but unfortunately we scarcely know what we are striving for. We have forgotten that deeds are merely a means to an end. Having no par-

ticular end in view, we treat the deeds themselves as the summum bonum, the ultimate object of attainment." That is a well deserved rebuke to President Roosevelt, whose popularity hinges upon his activity in doing things, regardless of whether they are things worth doing or not. But it is more than a rebuke to any one man. It is a rebuke to the spirit of an era which, happily, is fading away. We are now coming upon times, and it is gratifying to find men like McClellan recognizing it, when thought will be esteemed as highly as action, and hysterics will no more pass for ambition than accumulations of lucre will stand for success.

"Put yourself in his place."

A just criticism of very wide application is made by a correspondent of the New York Age, an able (though in the political sense somewhat narrowly partisan) Negro weekly. The criticism is applied by the Age to the newspaper fashion of sending correspondents to "write up" conditions among peoples and classes of which the correspondents know nothing except from the outside. This might be a service of general enlightenment, as the writer in the Age truly remarks, if the correspondents "would put themselves to the trouble of actually investigating, instead of spending their time in discussing matters with chance acquaintances in hotel lobbies and sample rooms." Referring to one of these correspondents who had unintelligently "written up" the Negro of the South, the Age writer pointedly asks what that correspondent could know "of the home life of the Negro, since he cannot enter those homes," and as pointedly answers: "Absolutely nothing except what he is told by people who themselves do not enter them." We say that this criticism is of wide application, because it explains the real cause of all national, racial and sectarian alienations and hatreds.

We hate and despise, because we do not know those whom we

hate and despise, no matter how earnestly we may protest that we do know them. The Negromaniac of our Southern States, for instance, insists that he knows the Negro. He does not know the Negro. He may know the Negro slave, but not the Negro man. No one can know the Negro without in imagination sincerely putting himself in the Negro's place and looking out upon the world from the Negro's point of view. Until he knows the Negro as an equal, and not as a menial, he does not know him as a man at all; and this simply because Negroes no more than other people permit themselves to be known to those who keep their distance and look down upon them. It is the grossest assumption for any class to profess to understand another class with which they refuse to associate upon terms of equality. Although everyone has been a child, no one can understand children if he holds aloof from them. How much more impossible, then, to understand classes with which we have never mingled upon terms of equality and mutual respect.

If we would know any class, any nationality, any race, we must become as one of them, thinking their thoughts, uniting in their sympathies, appreciating their aspirations. Until we have done this, all that we report of them has but little more real value than travelers' tales. It is because he studiously does this, that Prof. Frederick Starr's anthropological work is of special value. He studied the street urchin by becoming a real newsboy; he studied the Indian as a naturalized member of an Indian tribe; he studied the Ainu, the survivors of the aboriginal race of Japan, by associating with them upon terms of friendship; he studied the Mexican in the same way; and now he proposes studying the pigmies of Africa and their neighbors by joining their community and living their life. Only so can men come to know one another. No one knows his butler, though of his own race and nationality. No one knows

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 Intercollegiate 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.