

manded of us under pretense of extradition for crime? It is a shame upon us that we have any extradition treaty at all with the lawless Russian oligarchy. If our criminals escape to Russia, let them go. What punishment could we inflict that would be worse than exile to a country so despotically ruled? If the Russian oligarchy seek their escaped criminals here, let us tell them that we surrender no man—not even a criminal—to the vengeance of barbarians. This ought to be our attitude, even if no political considerations were involved. It is all the more important, if a treaty for criminal extradition is abused for the purpose of making Russian patriotism an international crime, and dragging Russian patriots from the shores of America to the scaffolds of the Czar. As a refuge for the world's patriots (noble or peasant) our country should be inviolable. It used to be so, and so it should remain. The Russian patriot whom the Czar cannot seize with his own authority, he should not be allowed to seize with the aid of our authority. Where he can not pursue boldly with swords and guns he must not pursue treacherously under cover of an extradition treaty and with the co-operation of Federal officials.

* * *

Castro of Venezuela.

The departure of President Castro of Venezuela for Europe, offers renewed opportunity to newspapers subsidized by the Interests in this country, or otherwise influenced by them, to hold him up to vicious attack or equally vicious ridicule. Under these circumstances the prima facie case is with Castro; the enmities he has made are indicative of his power and uprightness. But this is not the only proof in his favor. From direct and trustworthy sources it appears that he is intellectually a man of large caliber,—ferocious, perhaps, as one in his place must be to survive, but not murderous. In exigencies he seems to permit no one to decide grave questions for him, but keeps in touch with details and masters them for himself. He is master, and knows it. His methods are designed to force a realization of that fact upon others, and in Venezuela they have succeeded. He welcomes foreigners who ask concessions for development, but will have no more of speculators. If he were more diplomatic he might be more successful in some respects; but, on the other hand, he might then lose in directions in which by scorning tact he now gains. Advantage may be taken of him in his absence, as some correspondents predict; but evidently he has no fears, and doubtless he knows the situation quite as well as the foreign mischief makers.

THE SOCIAL SERVICE LAW OF EQUAL FREEDOM.

II. The Law and Its Application.

Come back with me now, Doctor, to our natural law of equal freedom in social service (p. 822),—in the natural social service, that is, which originates in and is maintained by the natural individual desire for self-service.

The reason that we have social disease under capitalism is essentially the same as the reason they had it under feudalism. If the planet had been held by feudal landlords truly in trust for the common good, so that the law of equal freedom could have operated, feudal landlordism would not have been so bad. It would have been a crude form of land communism. All the people would have shared fairly in the general benefits of the time, while each would have had the particular benefits of his own individual service. It was not landlordism that hurt under feudalism; it was the perversion of landlordism from a public trust to a private monopoly.

No, no, Doctor, I am not alluding to the arbitrary power of the military features of feudalism. They constituted a species of man-ownership, and owning men is one of the forms of slavery, as monopoly of land is the other; we have been over that ground, you know. What I allude to now is only the economic features of feudalism; although it is my firm conviction that equal freedom with reference to land would have greatly modified if not wholly eradicated the severity even of those military features. But, recurring to our point, let me repeat and with emphasis, that the evil of landlordism during the feudal regime was not landlordism itself. It was the perversion of landlordism from a public trust to a private usurpation, whereby the benefits of social progress were diverted from the people to the usurping trustees.

So now under capitalism. If the planet were capitalized for the good of all, instead of being capitalized for the profit of its capitalistic owners, capitalism would not be a bad thing. Indeed, Doctor, I think it might be a very good thing. Perhaps I may go further and say, as I believe, that in those circumstances capitalism would be the best possible system of social service.

The reason I believe so? Because I think that capitalism, if the capitalization of land were a common fund instead of a private fund, would establish substantial economic justice. How? By securing to each, on the one hand, the service of others in proportion to his contribution of serv-

ice to others; and by securing to all, on the other hand, an equal share in the benefits of social growth. It would do this because it would be in strict conformity to the social service law of equal freedom. You think me dogmatic? Very likely I am, but this is merely a statement of what I intend to prove.

The law of equal freedom in the social service market means, as I have already asked you to note, that each shall have full freedom to satisfy his own desires, within the limitation that he invade no one else's freedom to satisfy his desires. The equilibrium is necessarily equality of opportunity. Isn't that so?

And it implies two things, as I think you will also concede. From the idealistic standpoint it implies recognition of the doctrine of natural rights; from the utilitarian standpoint it implies the best results.

You may look at the law of equal freedom as if you were a narrow Eighteenth Century believer in natural rights, who pays no attention to practical results; or as a reactionary utilitarian, who neither cares for nor believes in natural rights; or as a true idealist, and therefore also a true utilitarian, who believes that utilitarianism and the doctrine of natural rights are but two phases of the same thing.

I don't care how you regard this law of equal freedom in those controversial aspects. The point I make to you, if you are only an idealist, is that equal freedom is recognition of natural rights. The point I make if you are only a utilitarian, is that equal freedom produces the best results. The point I make if you see the identity of true ideals and worthy utilities, is that equal freedom is the shield of which they are the two inseparable sides. It is the natural law of which ideality is the principle and good results the fruit.

Now, it seems to me that the law of equal freedom, which I regard as a natural social law by every test of what constitutes natural law that you can put it to—it seems to me, I say, that this natural law points to capitalism as a natural form of that universal industrial co-operation which we have called social service. Aye, and I am rather inclined to believe that capitalism is not only a form of social service, but that it may be *the* form of social service.

Have a care, though, for I am talking of capitalism itself, and not of its perversions. Unperverted capitalism is not bad. Unperverted capitalism seems to me to be good. No, not good for special beneficiaries, for unperverted capitalism would have no other beneficiaries than those who

pay their way in the world with their own service. It would be good for us all. And whether or not unperverted capitalism is the best form of social service we ever shall have, it is certainly the best we ever have had. It is the best, moreover, that we are likely to have at any time not very remote. It is the best besides that we can have, within any such time,—except through destructive revolutions that would be as likely to send us backward as forward. I will go a little further, Doctor, and say that unperverted capitalism is the best form of social service that has ever been suggested. And I say this with most kindly consideration for the proposals of our socialistic friend and for those of our communistic friend. For capitalism unperverted utilizes the self interest of each in normal ways for the good of all. Although it may in time give way to a better form of social service, it is more likely to do this through the steady processes of evolution from a cruder to a better capitalism, than through revolution or out of premature decay.

True enough, true enough, capitalism has in fact subordinated the interests of all to the greed of a few, as our socialistic friend says. But that is not capitalism per se. That is not capitalism in and of itself. That is perverted capitalism. I am talking of capitalism unperverted; remember that—unperverted, unperverted.

No, not at all; I don't allude to perversions by individuals. A man may rob a hen roost, thereby diverting one kind of wealth from its owner; or may bribe officials, thereby diverting other kinds of wealth; but all this sort of thing is mere individual rascality. What I am trying to do is to distinguish individual from institutional perversions. I am not thinking of tainted money. I do not allude to any of the perversions of capitalism which the community wouldn't tolerate if the facts were known. These are not the perversions that make capitalism seem like a social ogre. The perversions of capitalism that do make it seem so, and to which I do allude, are the institutional perversions that are maintained by common consent, with full general knowledge of the facts, but in general ignorance of their industrial effects and moral significance.

Were it not for these institutional perversions, Doctor, I really believe that capitalism would produce, in a normal way, through orderly evolutionary processes, under the regulation of the social law of equal freedom operating in conjunction with the individual law of the line of least resistance—I truly believe that in the absence of those

perverting institutions, capitalism would produce a co-operative commonwealth of social service infinitely better than any which the fondest visions of utopian dreamers have ever revealed.

By evolutionary processes, I say; not by conventional contrivances. Conventional contrivances are arbitrarily coercive, and a true co-operative commonwealth must be free of arbitrary coercion. No co-operative commonwealth would be free in which, or over which, there were any who as king, or president, or governor, or committeeman, or legislature or bureaucrat, could coerce beyond the point of preventing each from invading the equal freedom of any other.

The only coercion beyond that would be on the basis of contract, free contract. And what objectionable coercive power could there be, let me ask, if all the parties to every contract were governed in their bargaining only by their own reciprocal desires and the necessity of leaving others in equal freedom? When each bargains freely and upon an equal footing, the resulting coercion must be equal. When the motive of each is the betterment that a free contract gives to both, and not the exercise by either of any power due to institutional advantages in negotiation, arbitrary coercion is almost unthinkable. And this is the distinctive characteristic of capitalism unperverted.

For in the last analysis a capitalistic regime is a regime of contract. As all things in the social service market are capitalized, men deal in them on a basis of value, value being the capitalistic measuring rod of social-service contracts, just as the terms of value are the capitalistic language of the social-service market. The whole affair is contractual, don't you see it is?

And since it is all contractual, don't you also see that our objective in dealing with capitalistic evils should be to secure conditions of contractual freedom? Don't you see that equality of contractual status is the underlying necessity? It is the truth, Doctor; it is the truth. Equal contractual freedom is the secret of beneficence in capitalism; unequal contractual freedom is the secret of such malevolence in capitalism as perverts it.

Let there be true contractual freedom among individuals for the interchange of services, and capitalism will give us a co-operative commonwealth that will grow better as it grows older. Let the present contractual inequalities remain in capitalism, and they will multiply until capitalism develops not into a co-operative common-

wealth but into a plutocratic tyranny inconceivably worse than any tyranny of which we know.

Abolish capitalism! Why that would be to substitute authority for contract. Our socialistic friend? I know he does—he always insists that the abolition of capitalism would promote freedom of contract. But every practical suggestion I have ever read or heard of for abolishing capitalism certainly does involve a more or less complete abolition of contractual methods—absolutely complete so far as large transactions are concerned. Isn't it true, at any rate, that every proposal our friend suggests is either utopian, in the sense of being dreamy and impracticable, or else is so arbitrary that no room for free contract is left?

And so it is with him as to abolishing competition. No, I shan't go into that question again, except to ask you to observe that the choice is not between competition and something better. It is between competition and bureaucratic regulation. Bureaucratic regulation is destructive of free contract; competition is of the essence of free contract.

In his indictments of capitalism, however, as distinguished from his notions of reconstruction, our socialistic friend has no thought of abolishing contract. His complaints against capitalism are all directed not at the element of free contract but at the element of inequality of contractual conditions. In other words, Doctor, when you sweep away our friend's book patter and his "soap box" phrases, and probe his thought, you find that he and I are pretty close together. His complaint is really not against capitalism. That term is only one of his habituals, like "proletariat," "bourgeoisie," "wage-slave," and so on, which are his "he-gods" and his "she-devils." It is not really capitalism, I say, that he condemns. It is the perversions of capitalism.

Be fair enough to him to get at his thought back of his words. Through his flood of socialistic terms you will find that his intellectual guns are really leveled, not at the contractual characteristic of capitalism, but at the conditions of privilege which destroy freedom of contract—destroy it by investing some bargainers with contractual advantages and placing others at contractual disadvantage. And if you follow his earnest thought with sympathetic thought of your own, you will find, as I think I have found, that the capital which he thinks of as monopolistic is not every kind of capital, nor even every kind of large capital, but *natural* capital as distinguished from *artificial* capital.

Yes, I know, he always includes large machinery, which is artificial, of course; but when you get him down to specifications, his monopoly of large machinery always turns out to be, or to depend upon, monopoly of land—except as it may now and then be a patent monopoly, or some other form of governmental privilege which is at bottom analogous to landed privileges.

What we need, Doctor, in order to produce a civilization of social justice, and what I think our friend will yet agree to, is not the abolition of capitalism with its ideal of free competition and free contract, but the abolition or readjustment of institutions which pervert capitalism.

Only the other day I was talking with him about his program. It was during a political campaign. He said he really had no program except to raise the working class to political power. "How can I foretell," he asked, "what the working class will do when it gets into power?" Of course, I agreed that he couldn't foretell at all. Indeed, I agreed with him further. I agreed that the working class ought to be in power—meaning by working class, you understand, not a personal class composed of particular grades of workers, but those impersonal industrial interests of all degrees that may be distinguished in the mass as working interests in opposition to privileged interests. But I told him that the working interest cannot get into power as long as the planet is monopolized. "Let me have monopoly of the planet," I said to him, "and single handed I'll keep the great army of labor out of political power till the crack of doom." And I reckon I could, don't you?

To return, however, to what we were saying. Something very different from the abolition of capitalism, with its ideal of free contract, is needed to establish social justice. What is needed is the abolition, or readjustment, of institutions that pervert capitalism. Let me follow that thought a little further. We should not abolish contract, which is the essential characteristic of capitalism; on the contrary, we should make contract free by removing obstacles and securing equality of contractual opportunities. In other words, we should release capitalism from the institutional ligaments that prevent its normal operation.

Quite likely you are right. The method or methods by which that would have to be done would be socialistic. I don't see how it could be done by leaving things alone. Society in its organized form—government if you please—would have to act; and it would have to act co-operatively, as the organized agent of unorganized society. A true saying was that of William J. Bryan in one

of his non-partisan speeches in 1908—that government exhibits two influences, the coercive and the co-operative, and that the coercive declines and the co-operative advances with the advance of the common intelligence. I suppose that that is socialism in a sense. So is what I should propose for the redemption of capitalism from its institutional perversions. It is socialism in a sense.

Understand me, however, that I would not try to appropriate the name. "Socialism" is a word that has obtained currency with different meanings from mine in some respects. But neither would I shrink from acknowledging it, for it has a significance which no other word serves to express. Isn't there a tendency in human affairs which is best described as socialistic? It seems to me to be a reaction from the individualistic tendency, due I think to the fact that the two tendencies are natural and correlative, and that each, under the influence of the other, is by action and reaction seeking equilibrium. If, however, what I am aiming at is socialism, then I must call it *natural* socialism to distinguish it from the arbitrary or conventional or *artificial* forms of socialism that are often proposed.

Arbitrary socialists would abolish capitalism by means of conventional or artificial reorganizations of social service. They would thereby do away with the contractual mode of social service, and substitute regulations by government, or bureau, or guild.

But natural socialism would retain and perfect freedom of contract by divesting capitalism of its perversions. Capitalism divested of its perversions would be natural socialism.

How is the thing to be done? By recourse to the social service law of equal freedom.

And that? By securing equality of contractual conditions for all.

And that? By practically—no, not virtually, but in actual practice—distinguishing in the social service market the two essentially different kinds of capitalism. Yes, I refer to natural and artificial capital—they must be distinguished according to their essential differences. What I mean is that equality of contractual conditions are to be secured by some practical distinction, with reference to capitalistic rights of property. We must distinguish between capitalized artificial instruments of production, and capitalized natural instruments of production, between artificial capital and natural capital.

How would that secure equality of contractual opportunity? In the same way in principle that the analogous distinction would have done so un-

der feudalism. If the land—the planet, you know—had been treated in feudal times as the sacred inheritance of all, and its products as the sacred property of the producers and their contractual representatives, there would have been basic equality of contractual opportunity. Social servitors would have interchanged their individual services in such freedom as to have produced approximately the ideal of service for service. Feudal landlordism would then have been a social blessing instead of the social curse it was.

In those circumstances the people themselves would have been the real landlords, and the nominal landlords simply social trustees; and wouldn't freedom of contract have had opportunity then for full swing? Of course there might still have been arbitrary interferences with interchanges of service, and these would have been deadly if largely tolerated. But with the basic freedom established, which is freedom of access to the natural sources and sites of service, the advantage of position would have been with the people. Who would have been a cringing serf, yielding to arbitrary interference, where none were landless? What producer could have been coerced contractually where landed opportunities were equal? Men would have bargained in freedom and upon an equality even in feudal times, if the land had been for all. Nothing short of personal enslavement, direct physical coercion, could then have made any man say "lord" or "master" to any other; and that coercion would have been exceedingly difficult to impose had rights to land been equal.

Precisely so in principle, Doctor, in these post-feudal times, when modern capitalism has grown up out of feudal landlordism. Were we to treat capitalized land as the sacred inheritance of all, and its capitalized products as the sacred property of the producers and their contractual representatives, equality of contractual opportunity would forthwith appear, and capitalism would be a blessing instead of the curse it is. The people themselves, all together and in common, would then be the *land-capitalists*; while each for himself would be a *machine-capitalist*, either alone or in voluntary co-operation with others.

If you would slightly realize the importance of making land-capital a common inheritance—*natural* capital as we have called it in contradistinction to machine-capital, or *artificial* capital as we have called that,—if you would but faintly realize the importance of this change, my dear Doctor, just look up the statistics of land capitalization as

opposed to the capitalization of what is strictly capital. Look up the capitalization, that is, of the natural instruments of capitalistic production, and compare it with the capitalization of the artificial instruments. The data is exceedingly defective to be sure; but its defects are against me, not for me. Full and accurate data would show the aggregate of land values to be much more in excess of machine values than the defective statistics do. But defective as they are, the statistics of land capitalization are monumental as compared with the other kind of capitalization, if you look a little below the superficial figures.

Contrast, for instance, the values of city, town and village sites with the values of the improvements. In Greater New York it isn't far from three to one. Contrast the value of railroad rights of way, especially terminals, with the value of tracks and rolling stock. Contrast the value of mineral deposits with the value of mining machinery. Contrast the value of all the farming sites of any community or all communities, whether the sites are cultivated or not, with farm improvements. Why, Doctor, the capitalization of the natural instruments of production is enormously greater than the capitalization of artificial instruments.

And then think of another thing. The artificial instruments are wearing out. Each particular one of them is of less value every year than it was the year before. All of them together, aside from repairs and replacement, are worth less as a whole at any time than at almost any time theretofore. Not so with the natural instruments. Although the soil of farm sites wears out, and the deposits of mining sites give out, and sites of all kinds here and there depreciate in value in consequence of shifting population, this is not so of most sites nor of all sites together. Sites as a capitalized whole, the land, the planet, this great natural instrument of production, upon which we depend for all other instruments, this *natural* capital, is worth more and not less from generation to generation. So that when the artificial instruments of any generation, the *artificial* capital which comes to that generation from the preceding generation, when this has all gone or almost all gone back to the land whence it came, and is of no more use and no more value, *natural* capital is more valuable than before and is capitalized higher than ever. It is the same old earth, the same revolving planet, with no extension of area and no addition of substance; but its capitalization has risen, and in consequence those who wish to exchange service for service must yield a larger

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