

service than ever to the owners of this natural capital.

Observe further, Doctor, that co-operative labor, the aggregate labor energy of the social service market, not only could but actually does, day by day and year by year and generation by generation, replace and improve and add to the artificial instruments of production, but that it cannot add to the area or the substance of the planet. It can increase the supply of *artificial* capital by production; it cannot increase the supply of *natural* capital by creation.

Don't you think, Doctor, that if the planet, from which all these artificial instruments of social service must come if they come at all, and upon which they have to be utilized if utilized at all,—don't you think that if the capitalization of this planet were treated as a mass of common values, as *natural capital* which is fairly the inheritance and property of all, that an era of free bargaining would result, in consequence of which the capitalization of products, including *artificial capital*, would be distributed in pretty fair proportion to useful service?

Don't you think that under these circumstances those who served best would get most? that those who served least would get least? that those who didn't serve at all would get nothing? and yet that even those who got most would nevertheless have no coercive powers over even those who got nothing?

What would become of those who didn't serve? Why, that would depend. They might get charity for humanity's sake, though they refused to pay their way with service. They might get gifts for friendship's sake; or support from over-fond mothers or wives; or loving family care, or just and liberal communal care, if they were really helpless to serve. But they would get nothing as matter of contractual right. The worthy would not suffer. As for the unworthy—well, we could then say to them what it is now a mockery to say to idle men: "Go to work!" For in those circumstances, Doctor, there would always and everywhere be more profitable work to do than men to do it.

Don't you see it all, Doctor? Well, if you do see it in theory, let us pass on to the practical. If you grasp the principle, let's get down to the concrete.

By what practical method may we distinguish natural capital from artificial capital, so as to secure under capitalism, in common to all as social units, the benefits of natural capital, and to each individual in proportion to his service the benefits

of artificial capital? In other words, Doctor, how shall we in practice divest capitalism of its perversions, how establish natural socialism without artificial socialism, how apply in practice to capitalism the social service law of equal freedom?

Yes, it's too late to go into that here; but come along with me to my house and we'll finish our talk as we go.

## INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

### BRITISH SUFFRAGETTES.

London, England, November 15, 1908.—Your Editorial Correspondence of Sept. 4th (p. 535) deals somewhat erroneously with "the two households" of the suffragettes. The Women's Freedom League (which, by the way, does not interrupt at meetings, but merely asks questions at the end of speeches) is not an association of "socialistic suffragettes;" it is not the case that the Freedom League stands "for the most part for unlimited adult suffrage," nor is it true that "the immediate cause of the break seems to have been the urgency of a faction to bring the Union into co-operation with the Independent Labor Party." The object of the Women's Freedom League is to secure the Parliamentary vote on the same terms as it is or may be granted to men. A letter to the Labor Leader published Sept. 27, 1907, clearly states the League's independence of all political parties, as follows: "In your leading article you say: 'We do not trust Liberal and Tory women politicians.' May we say that we do not trust Liberal, Tory or Labor men politicians! Our reason for including Labor men is that we note, for instance, that the equalization of the laws with respect to marriage, divorce, illegitimacy, guardianship of children, intestacy and inheritance, all of which press unfairly on women, does not find a place on the programme of the I. L. P., and her political enfranchisement is only placed at the bottom of the said programme. Women will be unwise to trust to any political party until these things are given a just place and appear in the King's speech." This was signed, among others, by Mrs. Billington Greig, Hon. Organizer, by Mrs. Despard and by Mrs. How Martyn. The cleavage was caused by Mrs. Pankhurst, who on Sept. 10th of last year, within a few weeks of the annual conference, declared: (a) that the annual conference of delegates from the branches would not be held; (b) that the terms of membership and the title of the society would be, from henceforth, added to; (c) that the existing committee should be that day altered; and that the newly appointed committee should sit permanently until women got the Parliamentary vote; (d) that from thenceforth the affiliated branches were disbanded and must constitute themselves into local autonomous unions, without electoral rights as to the constitution of the National Women's Social and Political Union, or as to its executive or officers. Full details of the course of action adopted by those who opposed this autocracy on the part of an organization which, while demanding votes for women "in the

bush," rejected votes for women "in the hand," may be found in the verbatim report of the second annual conference of the Women's Social and Political Union, held Oct. 12, 1907, published (price 4 pence) by the Women's Freedom League (as the constitutional and democratic section was called after a referendum of all the branches), 1 Robert street, Adelphi, London, W. C.

KATHARINE MANSON.

+ + +

### A BOSTON ECCENTRICITY.

Boston, Mass., November 29, 1908. — "When I was a freshman at Harvard," said a Minneapolis lawyer to me some weeks ago, "it happened that I was invited to a Thanksgiving dinner by a classmate from the Back Bay section of Boston. After the coffee my Beacon street host escorted me to his den on the third floor, where we indulged in the luxury of a smoke. The cigars were above reproach, but even as a raw Westerner, I was a little surprised to notice that my accomplished classmate spat with a good deal of accuracy into the open fire. Perhaps I was not sophisticated enough to hide my feelings; at any rate, after the fourth or fifth illustration of his dexterity, my host remarked: 'I am taking the liberty of spitting into the grate. But don't you dare to imitate me. What in me is a mere eccentricity of a Bostonian would in you be the vulgarity of a Westerner.'"

I was reminded of this story in reading Charles Francis Adams's letter to Congressman McCall on the subject of our American tariff. He divides protectionists bluntly into two categories—thieves and hogs—and proclaims that he belongs to the former class. How our Bostonian friend would have been shocked had Bryan used this language! The vulgarity of the Westerner would have been revealed. But coming from Mr. Adams, in whose family bluntness is hereditary, the expression is merely the eccentricity of a Bostonian.

BRYANITE.

---

## NEWS NARRATIVE

---

To use the reference figures of this Department for obtaining continuous news narratives:

Observe the reference figures in any article; turn back to the page they indicate and find there the next preceding article on the same subject; observe the reference figures in that article, and turn back as before; continue until you come to the earliest article on the subject; then retrace your course through the indicated pages, reading each article in chronological order, and you will have a continuous news narrative of the subject from its historical beginnings to date.

Week ending Tuesday, December 1, 1908.

### Russian Extradition.

A large mass meeting was held at Chicago on the 29th to protest against extradition to Russia for political offenses under cover of accusations of crime. Two Russian revolutionists are now in the custody of the Federal government upon these accusations—one at New York and the other at Chicago. The Chicago meeting was presided over by ex-Mayor Dunne, who spoke in behalf of continu-

ing to treat the United States as an asylum for political refugees. The other speakers were A. M. Simons and Raymond Robins. Letters were read from Louis F. Post and the Rev. Peter J. O'Callaghan, who were unable to attend in person. The meeting, which was held under the auspices of the Political Refugee Defense League, adopted the following resolutions:

Whereas, The right of asylum for political refugees from all countries is one of the proudest traditions of this nation, itself born of revolution; and

Whereas, The Russian government, after having conquered the revolution at home, is now making an effort to reach its political enemies who have found refuge in this country, and seeks to compel our government to surrender two political refugees, Jan Pouden and Christian Rudovitz, by virtue of the Russian-American treaty for the extradition of criminals; and

Whereas, Our judicial procedure is not adapted to dealing with political offenses which are unknown to our theory of law, built as it is upon the ideas of political freedom and the sovereignty of the people, and because it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, for any refugee to prove by evidence, competent in a court in this country, the political character of an offense committed thousands of miles away; therefore, be it

Resolved, by the citizens of Chicago, at the Seventh Regiment armory, on the 29th day of November, 1908, in mass meeting assembled, that the right of asylum for political offenders which has been the policy of this government from time immemorial, be religiously preserved, and that the tribunals of this country should exercise the greatest care in passing upon all cases of extradition, and only grant the writ of extradition when they are satisfied that the alleged crime is wholly of a non-political nature.

It was ordered that copies of the resolutions be sent to the President, the President-elect, the State Department, and to both Senators and all the Representatives in Congress from Illinois.

+ +

### The Emperor Franz Josef Relinquishing the Reins.

Franz Josef, Emperor of Austria and King of Hungary, now seventy-eight years old, celebrates this week the sixtieth anniversary of his accession to the throne of Austria (p. 276). Enfeebled with advancing years, the reins of government have been slipping from the old Emperor's able hands, and for months his nephew, the Archduke Franz Ferdinand, son of his deceased brother, Karl Ludwig, is said to have been the practical ruler of the dual monarchy. Had the conservative, tactful, peace-loving Franz Josef been still in the saddle it is not believed that Austria would have taken advantage of the late constitutional revolution in Turkey to claim the provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina which she was administering under the treaty of Berlin (pp. 708, 758). And had he not had still the appearance of being in control it is likely that these aggressions would