

*Studies in Socialism.* By JEAN JAURÈS. Translated with an Introduction, by MILDRED MINTURN. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1906. Pp. xliii, 197.)

This work when compared with Baillie's biography of Josiah Warren, likewise reviewed in the current issue, brings before us something not always quite so tangible as one could desire, but after all something very real, viz: the difference between anarchism and socialism. It is commonly said that they are exact opposites; that anarchism desires the abolition of the State, and that socialism advocates the absorption of our entire economic life by the State. This is true in one way, and yet it is not the whole story. Both socialism and anarchism generally speaking look forward to a coöperative economic commonwealth. Even an individualist anarchist like Josiah Warren held that in its final form economic society would be coöperative. He thought that once all legal privileges were abolished, free competition would lead "to the adoption of the cost principle," and furthermore that the cost principle would "inevitably bring about coöperation and mutual aid" (*Josiah Warren*, by William Baillie, p. 106). Yet no socialist would say, as do the anarchists, that authority is *the* evil. As a result of this attitude of the anarchists we find a curious paradox, viz: that the writings of anarchists, if their peculiar views are only a little veiled, often appeal strongly to the very wealthiest classes. One of the most prominent anarchists of the day is the editor of a paper in one of our leading cities, which is more than any other paper in that city the paper of the rich. He is always nibbling away at authority, thinking that in this way he will undermine government as such. But this leads him to attack such measures as federal railway rate regulation and generally speaking measures of social control, and this is naturally well pleasing to those whom it is proposed to control. Jean Jaurès would not be likely to write editorials which would meet with applause on the part of American railway magnates. Socialists are not opposed to authority as such, although they may be opposed to the way that authority is exercised. They believe in increase in individual liberty and condemn present economic society because they say that economic forces enslave the ordinary man. Writing of *Socialism and Life* in chapter ii, Jaurès says that justice "has come to signify that in every man, in every individual, humanity ought to be fully respected and exalted to its complete stature. Now true humanity can only exist where there is

independence, active exercise of the will, free and joyous adaptation of the individual to the whole" (p. 10). The anarchist would not have added those last words, "adaptation of the individual to the whole." Socialists do not believe in the abolition of government, but some of them think that as men improve its repressive features will gradually disappear, and administrative functions in the management of the coöperative commonwealth will be very nearly all that is left of government.

The significance of the present work is that it is written by one who may be truly called a great leader, one who doubtless is the equal in estimation and influence of any living socialist, a man of learning and of eloquence. He represents the extreme right wing of socialism, but he is a man of such force that even the more radical socialists are reluctantly obliged to act with him. All countries where socialism has become a force, and this means substantially the entire modern world, have the two socialist factions. There are those who wish to make progress step by step and, while not losing sight of the ultimate goal, lay for the present chief emphasis upon immediate measures, in the attainment of which they are willing to work with others. In Germany we have Bernstein in the North and G. H. von Vollmar in the South; in England we have the Fabians; in the United States we have our socialist labor party and the socialist party. It is true that neither one of these parties in this country is so conservative as those who are mentioned in the other countries; but the same two tendencies are revealed here as elsewhere. The socialists of the right wing do not believe in any fatalistic evolution bringing a grand revolution and ushering in socialism, but they are adherents of the idea of a willed evolution, a revolution to be brought about gradually by intelligent and determined effort. They do not believe in a deepening misery finally terminating in a grand collapse, but in intelligent action following upon gradual improvement. While they are willing to work with others for the attainment of immediate ends, it is a mistake to suppose that they overlook their socialist goal and are to be regarded as simply democrats in politics and economics. This is an error that has been made by many superficial observers. Even socialists of the right wing like Jaurès are working for public ownership of productive property in order that such ownership may not yield private income. Income, they hold, should be personal, and the benefits of ownership of productive property should be diffused and be absorbed in personal income. It

is significant in this work by Jaurès that it gives us a well-written, interestingly presented statement of the most extreme conservative type of militant socialism. While Jaurès and those who think with him desire that public ownership of productive instruments should dominate our economic life, they are not fanatics in opposition to private property even in land and capital. They see that the journeyman may own his tools and the peasant may have his small farm, while at the same time our economic life is controlled by public ownership and public production. Socialists like Jaurès, moreover, do not think that socialism is to be reached by any one route, but hold that many forces working together will enable them to reach the goal that they desire. They look, therefore, to coöperation and labor unions to assist them in their work. They believe that education as well as legislation is indispensable. The general character of the present work is indicated by the two quotations which follow:

"We have, then, reached a point where it can be safely asserted that the substitute for the privileges of capital is not to be the depressing monotony of a centralized bureaucracy. No, the nation, in which is vested the sovereign social right of property, will have numberless agents—local government units, coöperative societies, and trade-unions—which will give the freest and supplest movement to social property, in harmony with the mobility and variety of individual forces. There is then a practical technical preparation for socialism just as there is an intellectual and social preparation. They are children who, carried away by the magnitude of the work already accomplished, think that all that is now necessary is a decree, a *fiat lux*, of the proletariat to make the socialist world rise up forthwith. But on the other hand they are senseless who do not see the irresistible power of evolution which condemns the unjust ascendancy of the middle class and the whole class system to extinction" (pp. 21-22).

"It is, then, perfectly chimerical to hope that the revolutionary tactics of a general strike would enable even a bold, self-conscious, and active proletarian minority to quicken the march of events by force. No trick, no machinery of surprise, can free socialism from the necessity of winning over the majority of the nation by propaganda and legal methods" (p. 126).

It remains only to say that Miss Minturn has given a useful introduction setting forth the aims of socialism, and that as a translator she has done her task well.

RICHARD T. ELY.

*Municipal Control of Public Utilities.* By OSCAR LEWIS POND, LL.B., Ph.D. (New York: The Columbia University Press. 1906. Pp. 115.)

This monograph, which forms the first number of volume xxv of the Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, is devoted to a study of the general attitude of American courts toward the increasing sphere of municipal activity. The writer begins by making clear the dual capacity of the American municipal corporation, its governmental or purely public capacity on the one hand, and its semi-private functions as a purveyor of economic or commercial services on the other. The former class of functions, such as the provision of police and fire protection, are mainly mandatory powers, and may neither be abridged nor delegated. As to the manner in which a municipal corporation exercises these powers the courts have been disposed to permit entire discretion, provided always that this discretionary power is not abused to the violation of private proprietary rights.

It is, however, with the other class of municipal powers—those which the municipal corporation exercises as a business entrepreneur—that the volume is mainly concerned; and Dr. Pond has set before himself the difficult task of setting forth, in terse form, the general attitude of the courts towards the increasing commercial activity of American towns and cities so far as this attitude may be discerned from the large mass of judicial decisions. In this connection emphasis is first laid upon the very liberal spirit in which the courts have usually construed the scope of powers granted to a municipal corporation by its charter. Having regard to the public nature and purposes of a municipal corporation, powers have been drawn very freely by implication, much more readily in fact than are ordinarily obtained by implication from the charters of private corporations. These implied powers which a large number of judicial decisions have attributed to municipal corporations have usually been based upon one of three different grounds. The first invoked perhaps most commonly is that various functions may be assumed by the town or city as a part of its "police power," a general jurisdiction which many decisions have given sufficient elasticity to include not alone the protection of life, health, and property, but the right to provide for the use and convenience of citizens public services such as water and light. The supply of electricity for private use by a municipal cor-