

vote for the socialist party, which was in 1871, only 124,655; in 1881, 311,961; in 1890, 1,427,298, and in 1893, 1,876,758, has been carried beyond 2,000,000, is conceded.

Nor are these two the only European countries in which socialists have developed strength in politics. Italy has a socialist vote of some 90,000, with 19 deputies in parliament; Denmark has over 25,000 votes, with nine members of the rigsdag, and Belgium has 461,000 votes with 29 representatives.

This is by no means the extent of the socialistic movement in European politics. In every European country socialist agitation is in progress, and in most of them votes in large numbers are cast for socialist candidates. But there is no important parliamentary representation except as enumerated above; and only in France and Germany is the representation strong enough to visibly affect parliamentary action. In those two countries, however, the socialists have become a factor in government. They were chiefly instrumental two weeks ago in ousting the Meline ministry in France; and in Germany, with a larger popular vote than any other party, though with a comparatively small parliamentary representation, there is no foretelling what trouble they may yet make for the imperialists, in a parliament in which there are several other opposition parties.

Neither in France nor Germany is the socialist party an exception to the universal rule, so far as its platform of principles goes. In both countries the party stands for "collectivism," as the socialistic phrase has it, meaning government ownership of all the implements for producing wealth; but it is not to its platform of principles that it owes its strength in either country. In France the socialist party is the only one which is not under the control of reactionary priests or the army ring, a fact which tends to draw to it those voters who, whether believers in "collectivism" or not, are hostile to the church and the army. It is to this, far more than to any exceptional advance of socialistic sentiment, that the growth of political socialism in France is attributable. Similar reasons account for the tremendous socialist vote in Germany.

The only way in which a German democrat can forcibly express himself against what he objects to in German government, is by voting with the socialists. He cannot vote effectively with any other party. The centrists are strictly a Roman Catholic party, composed of both aristocratic and democratic elements and living merely upon the recollection of Bismarck's oppressive laws against the church. A vote for that party is not a vote against German paternalism, nor even against imperial oppression, except Bismarck's oppression of the church. The liberal party is not only timid, but is hopelessly broken up into small independent parties. There are a number of other parties, but none of them is attractive to a man who has any deep inclinations to vote against the obtrusive paternalism of the emperor and the conservatives, and some of them are distinctly repugnant. To express emphatic opposition, therefore, one must vote with the social democratic party.

And this the German democrats, like the French democrats, are doing in increasing numbers. They bother themselves little if at all about "collectivism." What they wish to do, as a recent prominent German politician says, is "to express their feeling of political discontent with things as they exist by voting for the most violent opposition." And not only do they find that to be the socialist party, but the socialist party invites support irrespective of its collectivist ideas. It is to a degree an opportunist party, so much so that in its parliamentary action it steadily opposes any increase of the powers of government under the existing system, even when the powers proposed would, if the government were democratic, be in harmony with collectivism. The socialist party of Germany is, as its name implies, a social democracy. Its programme is democratic collectivism, and in political action it gives more emphasis to the adjective than to the noun—is more democratic than collectivist. It is in fact the democratic, the only democratic, party of Germany.

The increase of the socialist vote in Germany, as in France, is therefore not remarkable. It does not indicate that the idea of socialism is any more

nearly triumphant in those countries than elsewhere. If the political conditions which prevail there prevailed in the United States or in England, it is altogether improbable that the socialist party in either would be the ciphers they are. But socialistic ideas would in neither be any further advanced.

There is of course a stronger tendency to socialism in the continental mind than we in this country are familiar with; but after fully allowing for that, it must still be plain, upon considering political conditions, that the political growth of French and German socialism marks a growth in France and Germany of democratic rather than socialistic sentiment.

EMASCULATED ECONOMICS.

In his last work, "The Science of Political Economy," Henry George directed attention to the fact, which most intelligent observers may now plainly see, that the universities have cast political economy overboard and substituted for it what they call "economics." They are teaching the science of individual wealth, as distinguished from the science of social wealth.

The advantage of this to those universities which, in our plutocratic regime, are dependent upon individual accumulations of wealth due to legalized plundering, is not far to seek. Though both political economy and "economics" deal with the natural laws under which civilized men get a living, their scope is different. Political economy—the economy of social wholes—deals with the way in which a living is got by mankind; whereas "economics"—the economy of individuals as distinguished from the economy of social wholes—deals only with the way in which a living is got by particular men, regardless of the rights of other men.

Particular civilized men may get a living either by exchanging services with others, or by extorting services from others. But considered as social wholes, civilized men can get a living only by exchanging services. They cannot get it by extortion. This is evident upon a moment's reflection. The living that one

man may extort must be at the expense of the living that other men earn. Wealth acquired by extortion adds nothing to aggregate wealth. The gain of one is the loss of others. Consequently, in the economy of social wholes, which is political economy, all the methods of individual economy must be excluded, save those that are consistent with getting a living by the exchange of services as distinguished from the extortion of services. Not so with reference to the laws of "economics." These relate only to the methods of individual economy. "Economics," therefore, is merely the science of getting rich and no questions asked. Its more significant name is "plutology."

This would be quite sufficient to account for the disposition of plutocratic colleges and professors to cast aside political economy and take up "economics" in its stead. But however that disposition may be accounted for, the fact remains that this change has been made. We now have "economics," and we have "sociology;" but we have no such union of the economic and the sociological as is implied by the term political economy. A virtual declaration of this fact appears in a criticism of George's "Science of Political Economy," which was published in the London Spectator of May 21. The essence of the criticism is that George does not distinguish between the "social organism" and the "body economic." Here, though there is a pretense in the term "body economic" of conceding a social quality to economics, yet the writer speaks in such a way of economics as the science, quoting from George, "of how civilized men get a living," as to show that his mind grasps the idea of civilized men not as social wholes, but as individuals. In thus distinguishing the social organism from the body economic, he divorces economics from sociology.

One of the absurd effects of this divorce, which is shown without a smile, by the Spectator itself, is the exclusion of the natural laws of distribution from economic science. When we "come to the distribution of wealth," it says, "we are in the midst of principles affecting the welfare of the social organism, which everywhere overreach those affecting the

body economic." This implies the transfer of distribution from "economics" to "sociology." Yet the distribution of wealth is as inseparable from the production of wealth as reaping is from sowing. If men could not reap they would not sow; but for distribution there would be no production. George truly says: "Distribution is in fact a continuation of production—the latter part of the same process of which production is the first part; for the desire which prompts to exertion in production is the desire for satisfaction, and distribution is the process by which what is brought into being by production is carried to the point where it yields satisfaction to desire—which point is the end and aim of production." This being understood, what should reasonable men think of the attempt of the universities to emasculate the science of political economy by treating production as "economics," and relegating the subject of distribution to the abstractions of university sociology?

That the Spectator is right, assuming that economics can be separated from sociology, in making the distribution of wealth a department of sociology instead of economics, is true. Since "economics" has to do only with individual economy, there is no place in it for the laws of distribution. It is the science of get; the balancing principle of give is foreign to it. And distribution implies giving as well as getting. But distribution must be excluded from "economics," in order to adapt that science to a plutocratic regime. The natural laws of distribution, practically considered—as political economy must, but mere abstract sociology need not, and our university sociology does not, consider them—would be a menace to the vested economic wrongs of our time, such as no millionaire patron of colleges would tolerate. The natural laws of distribution are loaded, and millionaires and their "economic" professors know it.

NEWS

We were able last week to report the end of the first act in the drama of the invasion of Cuba—the landing on the 22d of June of an American

army upon Cuban soil. But we were not at that time in possession of the details. All during the night of the 21st a detachment of nearly 6,000 well-armed and well-disciplined Cubans, detailed by Gens. Garcia and Rabi, lay in ravines and thickets, keeping watch by every road and mountain path between Guantamano and Santiago, to guard the American troops against the possibility of a surprise on the following day. The landing was made, June 22, at Baiquiri, about two thirds the distance from Guantanamo to Santiago; except as to Gen. Kent's division, which landed on the 23d at Jaragua, about midway between Baiquiri and Santiago. The landing was unopposed, and but two men lost their lives. They were privates in the 10th cavalry, a negro regiment, who fell between a lighter and the pier at Baiquiri, and were crushed before they could be rescued. Besides these deaths the only American loss consisted of a few packages of supplies, and about 50 animals, that were drowned. The landing was accomplished by means of small boats. At this time the army was as healthy as when it left Tampa. Only 80 men were on the sick list, and no worse condition has been reported since.

The first act in the invasion was quickly followed by the second. Gen. Shafter advanced at once westwardly from Baiquiri to secure good positions near Sevilla, a fortified town on high ground just east of the Guama river, where the Spaniards were expected to make a stand. Meanwhile the Cubans were pushing on in the same general direction, but nearer to the coast, and by the night of the 23d their outposts were in the vicinity of Aguadores, at the mouth of the Guama river, southwest of Sevilla and about six miles from Santiago. In the afternoon they had skirmishes with Spanish outposts, routing them and killing two of their men and capturing 50 cavalry horses. Among their captures, also, were messages from Spanish headquarters ordering the Spanish forces to fall back upon Santiago as the Americans advanced, and not to risk a battle until the city should be attacked. These orders, as will appear further on, have been implicitly obeyed.

Early on the morning of the 24th, Shafter's advance in the direction of Sevilla had gone beyond Jaragua, and the head of his column was near the foot of the elevation upon which Se-