

alliance between the British Radical and the British Socialist.

In France Socialism has taken on the color of the Gallic temperament. There it is revolutionary, factional, spectacular, rather inefficient, Utopian, and at times explosive. It is in France that that type of Socialism known as Syndicalism, with its disdain for parliamentary methods and its love for theatrical display and attempts at intimidation through force, may be said to be most at home.

In contrast with these and other national types of Socialism, that which flourishes in Germany is distinctively one on behalf of popular, as distinct from oligarchical, government. The German has no special love for revolution as a game, and he has no such faith in voluntary organizations, like trades unions, as have the English and Americans. He has, on the other hand, a deeply rooted devotion to the State, not only as an efficient organization of society, but, in a sense, as the end for which every individual exists. It was inevitable, therefore, that German Socialists, in attempting to bring about the Socialist ideal, should instinctively turn to the State as the one thing that should be converted to Socialism. They found, however, the German State formed upon oligarchical and feudalistic lines; and they found that the parties which existed in Germany were, with the exception of a small group of Radicals, devoid of the elements of democracy. The German Socialists, therefore, had not only to create Socialistic sentiment, they had to create a democratic public opinion. Thus it happens that the Social-Democratic party has grown to be virtually the only party in Germany which represents those ideas in government which we Americans take for granted. A Socialist victory in Germany, therefore, is not the triumph of a band of revolutionaries or doctrinaires, but a sign of the rising tide of democracy—of the principle of government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Those readers who wish to follow more carefully the differences in Socialists caused by nationality may find them well stated in Sombart's "Socialism and the Socialist Movement," or in that more recently published and extremely able volume by Professor O. D. Skelton, entitled "Socialism: A Critical Analysis," in which the national characteristics of Socialists are acutely discussed.

If, as Professor Skelton says, "every country gets the Socialists it deserves," the world

has reason to think well of the German Empire.



## WHAT IS THE USE?

It is currently reported that the Senate is willing to ratify the pending arbitration treaties with Great Britain and France, provided that the power to determine, when any question arises, whether it is justiciable or not is left to the Senate to determine. Which recalls some interesting history.

Years ago, at the first or second meeting of the International Arbitration Conference at Lake Mohonk, held before the first Hague Conference, a distinguished member of the New York bar, not now living, prophesied that the chief obstacle to a general arbitration treaty would be the United States Senate. He said—we are quoting from memory—that the effect of a general arbitration treaty would be to transfer the settlement of international difficulties from the Executive Department to a judicial tribunal. To such a transfer the Senate would be very loth to consent. No body, he said, was ever known to be willing to part with a power which it had long exercised.

In 1904 general arbitration treaties with ten nations were negotiated. Questions of national honor, vital interest, etc., were excepted. It was left to the President to determine in any given case whether the question came within the specified exceptions. The Senate refused to ratify the treaties unless it was left to the President and the Senate acting together to determine that question. The treaties were abandoned.

In 1908 and 1909 similar treaties, with nineteen different nations, were again negotiated, but they left the Senate, acting with the President, to determine whether the question involved should or should not be arbitrated. The Senate confirmed them.

In 1911 new treaties were negotiated with Great Britain and France. The exception was changed. In the new treaty the questions not to be left to arbitration were not questions of national honor, vital interests, etc., but questions which were not justiciable. And it was left to a Joint High Commission to determine whether any special question was justiciable. The Senate refused to ratify the treaties. Now it is proposed that the Joint High Commission shall be advisory only, and that the question as to what is justiciable shall always be referred to the

President and the Senate for final determination, and it is affirmed that, *with this change*, the Senate is willing to ratify.

The conclusion is plain. The Senate does not care what the exceptions are, provided the Senate is left to determine in each particular case whether the question at issue shall or shall not be arbitrated. It is quite as easy to say respecting any question that it is not justiciable as to say that it affects national honor or vital interests.

The treaties as amended, like the treaties which they will supersede, are simply tantamount to a declaration by the Senate: We approve of arbitrating all questions that can be arbitrated, provided it is left to us to determine, when each case arises, whether it can be arbitrated or not.

It can do no harm for the Senate to say that.

And not much good.



## CHARLES DICKENS

A hundred years crowded with striking events have passed since Charles Dickens was born in Portsea on February 7, 1812, in a home in which the children were denied the gift of happiness. He became "a very queer, small boy," with no outward prospects of prosperity, and almost as far off the beaten track to fame as the boy Lincoln, who was born three years earlier on the American frontier. We talk glibly about fortunate conditions, as if good fortune rested in ease and comfort rather than in the inward and outward conditions which combine in evoking the genius of a man. If fame and love and abiding influence are to be reckoned among the greatest gifts of life, the English novelist and the American statesman were favored by fortune above all the children of their time born in the palaces of kings.

The doors of the schools were locked in their faces, but not the doors of education; for both found in the school of life a training which equipped one to be the most graphic reporter of his time, and the other to understand the heart of a people, to speak for them in the gloom of defeat and in the flooding light of triumph—too noble for passion, too great to be inflamed by victory, too full of sympathy to reckon with men save as the children of an indivisible household. Both learned to use language with a skill

rooted in the vitality that gives words reality and poetic suggestion, and both were the children and, in due time, the interpreters of the democratic spirit.

It is easy to forget books; it is difficult to forget people; and it is impossible to forget people of marked features and striking individuality. If Dickens had been a great artist like Thackeray, his name would bring to mind a long row of books; it brings to mind, instead, a room full of people. To say this is, of course, to credit Dickens with extraordinary powers of characterization; it is to say that what makes him memorable is not the way he painted portraits, but the vitality of his work. Balzac created more than two thousand characters; but only three or four of them have gone into the directory of living people as have Dickens's people. Thackeray also had a genius for creating character; but his people belong in the Social Register rather than in the city directory. Dickens has created more memorable people, in the literal sense of the word, than any other novelist. Many of them are queer people, but they are not caricatures, as some critics have hastily said; they are exaggerated in manner because they over-emphasize some single trait or give permanency to passing moods. There is often too great a number of them in one place at one time; but they are all alive, and, if one will forsake the cab and ride on the top of the bus through East London, he will still find them in abundance.

These people had been in books before the Dickens stories appeared, but only incidentally. To the Greek tragedians, who were the great character painters of their race, they were subordinate and incidental figures whose human interest never passed the line of the elementary virtues, or, like Thersites in Homer's strong handling, they were braggarts or insolent and riotous. Shakespeare's view of life was great enough to include all sorts and conditions of men, but his people of low estate are mainly menial, or scheming, or humorous in a way that robs them of dignity.

Dickens knew very little of society, and was only partially successful when he attempted to paint people of the class in which Sir Joshua Reynolds found his sitters. Scott was born in Scotland, where plain people have found the doors of the universities open and have defied kings and bishops with irreverent but sturdy indifference to rank and