

sophy of society which discloses to us our final goal."

Precisely here came the split at Erfurt. On the one hand was the small group who for four days were the subject of hot attack under the name of the "Berlin Opposition." They prefer, for their own part, to be known as the "Young Democracy," and they concentrate their abuse on the "Old Guard," who thus far hold the power. Bebel they taunted as a dictator. He was, they insisted, in the pay of the Government. The party was held back by him to mere political opportunism. It could no longer be called a Socialist party, it was nothing but a party of parliamentary reform. Each such alleviation of present conditions only strengthened the present social order. It was for true Socialists to have no part in any such political questions, but to agitate directly for the "End-Ziel" of revolution. Bebel, of course, retorted that these irreconcilables were simply conspiring to get power in the party, and wanted to sit on the platform in his place; and this jealousy is more than probable. But the Radicals certainly had the great advantage in debate of being logically right. Thus, for instance, they held the only logical doctrine in a vital question which kept pressing to the front—the question of a possible European war. The Young Democracy maintained that Socialists ought to welcome international war, and should, when it came, refuse to take part in it, but let the resulting wreck of the present order come, and then step in with the new programme. Bebel, on the other hand, defends national unity against international Socialism. If, as he said, the Socialists stand aloof in the next war, they may suddenly find themselves in the hands of Russia, and their hopes would then be further than ever from realization. "Yes!" retorted the extremists; "but if, on the other hand, the war happens to be with France, then among our enemies will be the very men with whom at Brussels, only a few months ago, we swore eternal friendship." It was a clear issue between the logic of the situation and practical politics, and the German Government must notice with much satisfaction the position of the Socialist leaders. Dreams of a new social order may be lightly regarded by Caprivi, but, in the present unstable equilibrium of Europe, the possible contingency of a "strike" of half-a-million of soldiers just when needed for active service is worth consideration. The little group of five who thus for eight sessions of the Congress refused to be diplomatic, and insisted on being logical, were finally disposed of by a vote that they should present their grievances to a select committee. This they refused to do, and with much dramatic effect closed their portfolios and left the hall and the party; and, on their return to Berlin, were received and endorsed by a meeting of several thousand persons, as the anti-Bebel, true-blue—or rather blood-red—representatives of the movement.

At the opposite end of the Socialist problem lay the issue which occupied what was left of the meeting. The eloquent Von Vollmar had lately, at Munich, set forth the opportunist doctrine as the best diplomacy. The party, he had said, must, first of all, increase its members. It must, therefore, capture the whole working-vote. To do this it must emphasize immediate reforms, and it must have little to say of radical remedies from which the uninitiated would shrink. Only when the party was thus vastly larger could it demand the great things which lay beyond. Against this view, as against its opposite, the present leaders held out as long as possible. They re-

garded it as a new programme, growing out of the repeal of the Socialist law; and they insisted that no such moderate policy should be encouraged. They suggested that the conservatism of Von Vollmar was simply due to his own easy circumstances of life, and that the permissive policy of the present Government was more dangerous to Socialism than the suppressive policy of Bismarck. Liebknecht distinctly said that if he had to choose between using steam or brakes on his train, he preferred steam, and that if he must stand either for the opportunism of Von Vollmar or for the abandoning of all politics, as proposed by the Radicals, he for his part must be counted with the Berlin Opposition. A vote of protest against the view of Von Vollmar was proposed and was defended by Bebel. But the party was not ready to deal with so important a person as summarily as it had with the hot youths from Berlin. In spite of Bebel's personal appeal, the motion against Von Vollmar was defeated, and a second secession from the party was prevented. The Conservatives were held in the ranks by the defeat of the Centre.

Such was the general issue of these prolonged discussions. The result of the meeting is variously estimated by the different political parties of Germany. The Conservative press points out with satisfaction that free speech led to a free fight, but it does not notice the equally important fact that free speech on the part of the Conservatives was not permitted to exclude them. The Socialist newspapers justly dwell on the size and power of the party, and on its capacity for intelligence and self-control, but they do not call attention to its discords. Spectators at the Congress might have been variously moved. Those who were inclined to scoff at such proceedings would have found much to stir their sense of humor. When Bebel, in answer to questions, calmly stated that though he could not tell when the revolution would come, he thought it might happen in three or five years, and that at any rate some of those present would live to see it, one could hardly help smiling at the accepting on such short notice of "so large a contract." When, again, the meeting broke up, there were some amusing scenes at the railway station, which a correspondent of the *National Zeitung* describes. Singer, the President, stood in the crowd, permitting the waiter to bring him a light—most undemocratic conduct, says the reporter—and then asks of his friends, "Are you going with me to Berlin?" The train arrives, and while the working-class delegates clamber into the third and fourth-class compartments, Singer, the leveller of social distinctions, throws himself down on the velvet cushions of a first-class coupé. "So the Socialists, too," says the *National Zeitung*, "are human!"

But, after all, the main impression made on at least one spectator—and, so far as I know, the only witness of the Congress not directly concerned with its affairs—was that of the pathetic isolation in which the working-class in Germany, as in most countries, is placed. Here were the representatives of the great majority of hand-laborers throughout Germany, seriously trying to devise plans for those better conditions of life which their brethren so sorely need. But to whom could they look for guidance? They were almost wholly in the hands of a few men, who may be honest, but who are certainly unfit for judicious leadership—men who are simply agitators and politicians, with no training in the complex questions with which they have to deal. Beyond these leaders the whole move-

ment is either tabooed or unnoticed. Few newspapers had anything to say of the proceedings at Erfurt. Most good citizens spoke of the meeting with horror. No competent adviser has so much as tried to meet the workingmen on their own ground. When the German Socialists meet before elections, they publicly invite their opponents to debate the matter with them; but no one goes. Not a single statesman has the confidence of the workingmen, not a single economist has approached them with counsel. No Christian minister has been able to make his Gospel seem to them a better message than the "good news" they hear of a coming social chaos. It has become a part of the creed of the working-class that Government, religion, and political economy are all alike their enemies. Every man's hand seems against them, and they mass their forces against the whole body of respectable opinion. Such isolation is not only pathetic, it is a reproach to the scholars, statesmen, and clergy of any civilized land.

FRANCIS G. PEABODY.

## Correspondence.

### THE MASSACHUSETTS ELECTION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: While the election of Gov. Russell is an important event, it is at least equally important that its significance should be clearly brought out. The first thing to be noted is the power of personality as an agent in politics. In spite of the energy of the traditional protest, the people are always much more interested in men than in measures. Instead of railing at them, therefore, for this incurable weakness, the part of wisdom is to provide them with good men instead of bad men to run after—a rule which, simple as it seems, is almost always reversed in our so-called practical politics.

The next lesson is, that the way to carry reforms is to identify them with persons, so as to combine the enthusiasm for men with the enthusiasm for measures. Of course, it is Gov. Russell's popularity which has carried the election; but that he has insisted on the false position of the Governor, has resisted the arbitrary exercise of power by the Council in rejecting his appointments, and has protested against the government of the State by irresponsible commissions over which the Governor has no control—I do not think these things have hurt his popularity, and I am very sure that his popularity has helped the things. The reflex action is to come. Personal popularity is evanescent. The people, having endorsed him this time, will think they have done enough, and will become indifferent. One more term would be the utmost extent of their good will. An election to Congress would change the scene from the State to a district. If he wishes to establish his hold, he must prosecute the reforms in vigorous earnest, and so make them work for him.

It may be asked, Why these particular reforms and not more practical ones, such as civil service, temperance, education, prison or law reform? The answer to that question has suggested itself in reading an article in the *Forum* by Mr. Herbert Welsh on "The Degradation of Politics in Pennsylvania." He narrates with some pride how a vigorous movement of Independents succeeded in showing that the whole Government of the State and of the city of Philadelphia was in the hands of a gang of the most abandoned thieves.

After discussing some mild expedients of remedy, he adds that, after all, everything depends on the people, and that, if they will not come to the rescue, nothing can be done. I protest most earnestly against this implied accusation of the people. I say that the Government of Pennsylvania as well as of Massachusetts, of Philadelphia as well as of New York and Boston, is so organized that the mass of the people have very little voice in the matter, that they do not see what is going on or where the difficulty lies, and, if they did, are wholly unable to apply the remedy. If the ordinary business principles which are in force in every successful commercial house in the country were applied to public affairs, honest men would come into power and the knaves be ejected as a matter of course. Therefore it is that the alpha and the omega of our efforts should be organization; that the reforms which Gov. Russell has taken as his starting-point, and which, if but a first instalment, are the basis of all others, he should adhere to and prosecute for the sake of his own success as well as theirs.

May I point to the third lesson from the election? It is as to how State affairs can—in off years—be made more interesting than national. The burden of the Republican campaign was assumed by the Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge, stimulated, as is well known, by his ambition for a seat in the Senate of the United States. He has strained every nerve to push State affairs into the background, and to divide the voters on strict national party lines. As regards the Council and the Legislature, where there was no serious personal opposition, he carried his point; but, as to the Governorship, Mr. Russell, putting personality and cause together, has beaten him as fairly as ever a man was beaten. Shall we not lay the instruction to heart?

GAMALIEL BRADFORD.

Boston, November 7, 1891.

#### ABBOT AGAINST ROYCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Dr. Francis Ellingwood Abbot makes substantially the following charges against Prof. Josiah Royce:

- (1) That Prof. Royce libelled Dr. Abbot, and that maliciously.
- (2) That Prof. Royce used unfair means to stifle Dr. Abbot's reply.

I propose to consider impartially what the verdict of students of philosophy ought to be regarding these public accusations against one of the most eminent of their number.

The charge of libel has two specifications, viz:

- (1) That Prof. Royce warned the general public against Dr. Abbot as a blatant and ignorant pretender in philosophy.
- (2) That Prof. Royce accused Dr. Abbot of plagiarizing Hegel at second hand.

From the point of view of propriety of conduct in a student of philosophy, the only adequate excuse for the first of these acts would be that the fact proclaimed was so unmistakable that there could be no two opinions about it on the part of men qualified by mature study to pass judgment on the merits of philosophical writers. In case the act were not so justified, the offence would be enormously aggravated if it were dictated by malice. The first question, then, is: Did Prof. Royce, as a matter of fact, so warn the public against Dr. Abbot? He certainly did, unequivocally and with full consciousness of what he was about; that is the unmistakable import of his whole article in the *International Journal of Ethics* for October, 1890.

The next question is whether it is so plainly true that Dr. Abbot is a blatant and ignorant pretender in philosophy that it is impossible competent men should think otherwise? So far is that from being the case that philosophers of the highest standing, such men as Kirchheiss in Germany, Renouvier in France, and Seth in England, have drawn attention to the remarkable merit of his work. I am not personally intimate with Dr. Abbot, and am far from being a partisan of his doctrines, but as an humble student of philosophy, endeavoring to form my estimations with the eye of truth, I recognize in him a profound student and a highly original philosopher, some of whose results are substantive additions to the treasury of thought; and I believe that the prevalent opinion among competent men would be that Prof. Royce's warning is an unwarranted aspersion. Next, what excuse was there for such conduct, what motive prompted it? Prof. Royce and Dr. Abbot have their rival ways out of agnosticism. Both start from the same premises to come in the main (at least, so Royce says) to the same conclusion. Shall we say, then, that a passer-by cannot loiter near Dr. Abbot's shop, attracted by the placard, "THE WAY AND THE TRUTH," without Prof. Royce's rushing out and shouting from across the street that he can offer the same article at a lower figure? No; for how far a spirit of rivalry may have influenced him no man can know, Prof. Royce least of all.

Passing to the second specification, we ask: Did Prof. Royce accuse Dr. Abbot of plagiarizing Hegel? No; he only accused him of giving a maimed version of Hegel's theory of universals, naively supposing it to be a product of his own brain. That was no libel in the sense now considered. But, says Dr. Abbot, I have stated so clearly the antithesis between Hegel's view and mine that Prof. Royce cannot be sincere in saying they are identical. No matter; the more absurd the accusation, the less injurious; the less the truth, the less the libel. On this count Dr. Abbot is entirely in the wrong.

Passing to the second charge, we ask whether Prof. Royce used unfair means to stifle Dr. Abbot's reply? The ex-parte evidence indicates that he did contrive that Abbot's reply should be first postponed (as postponed it was over two numbers of the quarterly), and at last, as the third quarter was drawing to a close, should be excluded; in which performances Dr. Adler, the editor-in-chief, does not appear as very strong in the practical department of ethics. Afterwards Prof. Royce, through a lawyer, threatened Dr. Abbot with legal proceedings if he published his proposed reply at all.

All this would be abominable to the last degree in the case of a philosophical discussion. But then it must not be forgotten that the contention had never had that character. Prof. Royce's article was written with the avowed purpose, clearly and openly conveyed, though not by direct declaration, of ruining Dr. Abbot's reputation; and what little discussion there was was merely to subserve that purpose, not to ascertain or prove any truth of philosophy. Thus, it was a brutal, life-and-death fight from the first. Prof. Royce clearly perceived this, for he ends the article by saying that he shows no mercy and asks none! That's ethics. And his subsequent proceedings make it, in my judgment, as plain as such a thing can be, that his cruel purpose never left his heart. Dr. Abbot, on the other hand, stood like a baited bull, bewildered at such seemingly motiveless hostilities.

It is quite impossible not to suppose that

Prof. Royce conceived it was his duty thus to destroy Dr. Abbot's reputation, and with that the happiness of his life. A critic's stern and sacred duty, and all that! Besides, it must be remembered that he is a student of ethics; and it is not to be imagined that a person can study ethics all his life long without acquiring conceptions of right and wrong that the rest of the world cannot understand.

C. S. PEIRCE.

#### SOME MORE "SOCIALS."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The East is not disposed to acknowledge the superior fertility of the inventive mind of the West in the direction of "socials." Your article of October 15 on this subject shows that you have formed your opinion too soon; not from Chicago but from New York are to go forth the plans that will make "stiffness" impossible. In the *Christian Union* for this week, a writer tells of the means of developing the "Social Element in Church Life." I make a few selections in support of my position.

Under "impersonations" we are told: "It is quite possible to select incidents and qualities not generally known. For instance, the child life of Mahomet, or his business career, may be dwelt on. After each impersonation there should be a short recess . . . for the guessing of the name of the unknown."

Magazines are to be turned to account: "And the advertisements at the end of the magazine make a bit of fun. Sczodont, cod-liver oil, shaving soap, and cocoa are suggestive subjects."

The Chicago authoress will blush to think that she never imagined "a smelling contest: A dozen or more quart black bottles are used. Turpentine, vinegar, Pond's Extract, wintergreen, peppermint, coffee, bay rum, rose water, clove, cinnamon, ammonia, tar, and camphor are suitable for use. Each member of the company 'sniffs' and makes a list from memory."

The climax is the "Wrong-side Sociable: All the people are dressed wrong side before, with the hair drawn over the face, and a mask, home-made or otherwise, placed on the back of the head."

And thus we develop the social element in church life.

C. E. W.

#### BUCKING.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I read once more in your No. 1372, p. 296, in a valuable account of Kluge's 'Etymological Dictionary,' Heine's etymology of *Bücking*. The fact is, that the inventor of herring pickling was Willem Beukelsz, i. e., Beukel's son. Whether Beukel stands for *pekel* (Dutch for brine), and was a name afterwards given, or whether *Beukel*, *Bückling*, *bokking*, *bokkem*, etc., are next of kin, is rather difficult to ascertain. The fact is, that long before Willem Beukelsz was born, as early as the fourteenth century, there was a word *buckking*, meaning smoked herring, a fish quite different in kind from pickled herring.—Yours truly,

TACO H. DE BEER.

AMSTERDAM, October 26, 1891.

#### Notes.

PROFESSOR NORTON is preparing for the press a volume of essays by Mr. Lowell not included in the Riverside Edition of his works. It