

al law, either individual or social, or both. As to blood inheritance of the superior type, nothing is better verified by experience than that if it exists it speedily degenerates.

It is not individual blood, transmitting moral characteristics that makes permanent differences in social conditions. It is the blood of society itself. This blood is not the red fluid of individual veins and arteries. The blood of a nation, a community, or a family is its speech.

Language is the current through which thought is transmitted and upon which institutions are borne. The difference between the waif in the slums and the hope of the palace, between the lower classes and the upper, between nation and nation, is not a difference in blood corpuscles. The physiologist would examine these in vain to find any other difference than temporary disease. But the intelligent sociologist might find explanations of all social differences in the different ideals, the different outlook upon institutions, the different ambitions, the different affections, the different associations, in a word, the different trends of thought, which differences in language indicate. Language is the blood of human association. If a German differs characteristically from an American, it is because they have a different language, and consequently a different thought—one that differs in degree as the genius of the language differs. If a German-American differs, it is because this transfusion of social blood has not been successful. He is still Germanic. The British accent and the American differ in degree as American and British characteristics.

As with nations so with groups. The blood of aristocratic society is its modes of speech and not the red blood of ancestors. It is similar with the argot of thieves. If interlopers in either circle expose their breed, it is not because the blood in their veins differs, but because they do not think in the unaccustomed language.

When one thinks in French, he is a Frenchman, but not otherwise. Carl Schurz, for instance, though of German birth, is an American. He thinks in the idiomatic English in

which Americans think and consequently thinks after the manner of Americans.

Of course in speaking of language as the blood of a people, we speak in metaphor. But all references to the "blood" of peoples are metaphorical. When it is said that Americans are of English blood, this must be a metaphor; for the country is full of Americans who haven't an English ancestor. But they inherit English traditions—through the English language—some of them the democratic traditions of Magna Charta, and some the divine right traditions of King Charles. An ignorant laugh went up once when Gov. Altgeld, German born, appealed to the principles of "our" revolutionary forefathers. But the patriots of '76 were as truly, in the social sense, his forefathers, as yours or mine; for, thinking in their language, he drew inspiration from their principles.

The only inheritance, in the social sense, that any man can have is the inheritance that is transmitted socially by language, as physical life is transmitted individually by blood. In this social blood, and not in blood of vein and artery, we must look for the strain that enervates or the strain that vitalizes social life. Here it is that we shall find the moral taint, the institutional disease, the vicious ambitions or the noble ideals that are capable of indefinite transmission from generation to generation.

We shall not find them here by mere philological examination. That would be to an examination of the blood of society what an examination with the naked eye would be to the blood of the physical body. The examination we mean is sociological, looking beneath the surface of language into the crystallizations of thought it transmits. These are the inherited things, and their transmission is the only kind of heredity that need seriously concern sociological inquiry.

Let us reform the ideals, crystallized into institutional disorder, which the society of to-day has inherited through language from the past and is in danger of transmitting through language to the future, and we may safely leave the problems of

blood inheritance to family physicians, insanity experts, and dabblers in heraldry.

NEWS

The steel strike is still the center of public interest, though nothing exciting or decisive has yet occurred in connection with it. At the time of our last report (p. 297) the South Chicago lodges of the Amalgamated association had, on the 14th, refused to join in the strike, and Mr. Tighe, the official representative of President Shaffer, had revoked their charters. On the 18th it was announced that this revocation had been suspended until the 24th, upon the expectation, presumably, that meantime the lodges might reverse their insubordinate action; but on the 19th President Shaffer announced that the South Chicago men who had remained at work were no longer members of the Amalgamated association, and that if they should strike hereafter it would be upon their own responsibility. On the day of Mr. Shaffer's announcement, the 19th, a dozen or more highly skilled employes of the South Chicago mills followed the example and advice of their district vice president, Mr. Davis, in joining the strike as individuals. This individual action at South Chicago appears to be even more extensive, though most of the workmen who quit work do not avow their motives, but plead illness or other personal excuses.

As organized bodies, however, the local lodges remain insubordinate. They issued an address on the 20th, to labor organizations and the public, in which they explain their position. They claim to have been always union men, and to be conforming to union principles in the present instance, since their refusal to strike is based upon an existing contract with their employers. On that point they make the following statement of facts:

The members of our organization work under a contract with our employers, which is perpetual, unless terminated in a manner provided for in the contract. It is specifically provided that this contract can be broken under no circumstances except by either party to the agreement giving three months' notice of its intention, the notice to be given previous to October 1. A copy of the contracts under which we are now working, as well as every change made in the

agreements from time to time, are sent to the officers of the national lodge and placed on file there for their inspection and approval. These contracts are signed by a committee representing the lodge on behalf of the members, and the general superintendent on behalf of the company. After taking legal advice we feel certain that President Shaffer's claim that our contracts are void because the Illinois Steel company, with whom our agreement was made, had been absorbed by the United States Steel company, is without foundation.

This address concludes with the assertion that Mr. Davis, the district vice president, who is now trying to induce the lodges to reverse their insubordinate action, originally supported them in it.

Whether or not Mr. Davis did originally advise the South Chicago lodges not to join the strike, it is certain that he himself joined it when the lodges refused, and has been active ever since in urging others—both individuals and lodges—to follow him. More through his assistance, doubtless, than from any other cause, Mr. Tighe was able to induce the lodges at Joliet and Milwaukee, which have similar contractual obligations to those of the South Chicago lodges, and which had decided to follow the Chicago example, to reverse that decision and join the strike. The question came first before the Joliet men. They met on the 15th, and were addressed by Mr. Tighe, who was accompanied by Mr. Davis. Four days previously they had voted not to strike; but at this meeting of the 15th, after a discussion lasting several hours, a secret ballot resulted in the necessary two-thirds majority for the strike, and a successful motion making it unanimous. There are three lodges in Joliet, and the number of men now out in consequence of the strike there approximates 6,000. From Joliet, Mr. Tighe and Mr. Davis went to Milwaukee, where they addressed a meeting of the Bay View mills workmen on the 17th. These men also had decided on the 11th against joining the strike. But after discussing the subject five hours on the 17th they reversed that decision and decided to go out by a vote of three-fourths, afterwards made unanimous. The vote was secret. This adds about 1,500 men to the men who are out.

A news dispatch of the 17th from Pittsburg asserts that not more than

half of all the strikers are out of work. This is its explanation:

The closing down of the United States Steel corporation's mills caused a boom in the business of all the independent concerns, and moreover furnaces that have stood idle for years have fired up, and every man who could be put to work has been engaged.

The dispatch names more than a dozen independent plants that have started up since the beginning of the strike, and which are employing strikers, besides several other independent plants that are nearly ready to start up.

The war in South America comes next to the strike in importance as a news event. Ecuador has now joined in this complex warfare, in which only Colombia and Venezuela, each with an insurgent party, were previously engaged. The dispatches do not make the situation very clear. Judging by them exclusively, the war is nothing more than a very much mixed factional fight. But read in the light of the larger history of Ecuador, Colombia and Venezuela, these dispatches indicate that a great question is at stake. Originally the three nations were Spanish provinces—New Granada and Venezuela—united in one viceroyalty. In 1810 they rebelled and set up a republic under the presidency of the great South American liberator—Simon Bolivar. It was called the Republic of Colombia. When the republic achieved independence, after a long struggle, the external dangers that had held it together were succeeded by internal dissensions that forced it apart, and the republic was divided into three independent nations. One of these was Colombia as it now appears upon the map. It took the name at first of the Republic of New Granada. The other was Venezuela and the third was Ecuador. That was in 1831. Various changes have since taken place in all three, including the change of name from New Granada to Colombia in 1861; but the old union sentiment would appear never to have wholly died out. It seems now to have become vital and to be dominant with the liberals in all three countries.

President Castro, of Venezuela, is the leading spirit in this movement for reunion. He came to the presidency through a revolution in 1899 (p. 280), and is being fought by

reactionary insurgents. In Colombia the government is conservative, and is accused of giving aid and comfort to the reactionary insurgents of Venezuela; while within its own borders an insurrection is in progress under Gen. Uribe-Urbe, who represents the reunion sentiment in Colombia and is aided by Castro, of Venezuela. Now comes Ecuador into the conflict, apparently in support of the reunion policy. Ecuador had been neutral as between Colombia and Venezuela until her recent presidential election, at which the liberals ousted the conservative government. But on the 18th and immediately after this change a dispatch from Quito, the capital of Ecuador, told of the advance of Ecuadorian troops across the Colombian border.

Another dispatch, received at Washington on the 17th, from the American consul at Maracaibo, Venezuela, reports an invasion of Venezuela by Colombian troops near Cucuta, where a battle took place and the invaders were driven back. The report of last week that the Colombian insurgent, Gen. Uribe-Urbe, had been killed in battle is now denied. He is reported to be moving on Bogota, the Colombian capital.

The war in South Africa is evidently not yet ended, despite the Kitchenier proclamation described last week; for reports of deadly conflicts still come to London, not all of which are favorable to British arms.

In the Philippines (referred to last at page 250), though the war is understood to have been ended long ago, a five hours' fight took place in Batangas province on the 7th; and on the 15th the Americans captured Col. Cabrera, which is described as the most important capture since that of Aguinaldo. Cabrera is said to have controlled all the insurgents in southern Batangas and also those west of the city of Bantangas. It was announced on the 16th that Archbishop Chapelle is about to return to the United States. He went to Manila last year in behalf of the Catholic church as apostolic delegate. It is understood that his mission was not successful.

The Chinese settlement, last mentioned at page 249, is still under advisement, the protocol not yet having