

realism, the so-called materialistic conception, is a characteristically modern fact, and its acceptance by the modern socialists distinguishes them from all communistic or other radical diversions in the past. The attitude which this point of view should give is that of a passionless, un-eager, unwavering furtherance of the industrial development; for according to this materialistic conception the democratic collectivism is to come in as the due culmination and consequence of industrial evolution. Such, says Professor Sombart, is the attitude of Marx at his best, and such he finds also to be the attitude of the Marxian socialists in a greater degree and more consistently as time goes on. All this disillusionment and work-day apprehension of social development as an inevitable process does not hinder the socialists from holding to their ideal with fervor, nor does it hinder them from doing their best to hasten and aggravate the class-struggle through the means of which the industrial development at its culmination is to pass into the democratic collectivism. The logical and the only promising line of action for the socialists, according to Professor Sombart (pp. 110-118), is to strengthen and accelerate the growth and spread of the modern culture, and carry it to the highest pitch attainable. Oddly enough—though perhaps it seems less odd to an affectionate latter-day citizen of the militant Fatherland—this ideal cultural growth to which socialism should look, it is explicitly held, comprises a large unfolding of warlike activity. Socialism is, on this and related grounds, not apprehended to be, in strict consistency, an international (*à fortiori* not an anti-national) movement. It is a further curious feature of Professor Sombart's exposition of socialism that he finds no logical ground for an atheistic or undevout attitude in the accepted realism of Marx and his followers. This is perhaps as characteristically new-German a misapprehension of Marxism as the contrary misapprehension which makes Marxism "materialistic" in the metaphysical sense is characteristic of the traditional view among English-speaking critics.

V.

---

*Enquête sur la Question Sociale en Europe.* By JULES HURET.  
Paris: Perrin et Cie., 1897. 12mo, pp. xxiv+372.

THE interview is usually regarded, I believe, as an American product, and the boldness and success of the American interviewer is proverbial. We should have difficulty, however, in finding among us

a better example of the art than is presented by M. Huret in this volume. He has exploited and presented in a very readable form the opinions of many of the leading men of Europe on the interesting social questions of the day, especially on socialism. He has presented the ideas of laborers—peasants, sailors, factory hands, etc.—in regard to the present order and the future of society. We thus have in his book a series of social “views” sketched from almost every angle, and with the skill and feeling of a genuine artist. Among those who have contributed to the exhibit in this social picture gallery are the following: Baron Alphonse de Rothschild, Paul Leroy-Beaulieu, M. Cousté, president of the Paris Chamber of Commerce; in England, John Burns and General Booth; in Germany, Herr Bebel, Pastor Stoecker, M. de Hausseman, president of the Berlin Bank of Discounts, and Professor Adolph Wagner; in Austria, Prince Aloïs de Liechtenstein, leader of the Christian socialists, and Schaeffle, the renowned sociologist; in Russia, the leader of the socialists, Pierre Lavroff, and Soloviev, a professor in the University of Moscow; in Italy, the anarchist Malatesta, and in the United States, Archbishop Ireland. Interviews with these and many others, a few descriptions of typical industries, like the great foundry at Creuzot, and of social experiments, like the familistere at Guise, and the discussion of a few incidental subjects make up the body of the work. Prefatory letters from MM. Jean Jaurès and Paul Deschanel, the former an advocate of socialism and the latter opposed to it, praise the author in extravagant terms. Appended communications from two or three persons who are dissatisfied with the representation of their opinions qualify this praise to a considerable degree.

It is obvious that M. Huret's book, as I have described it, is for the general rather than the technical student. Those who have given social questions considerable attention are already familiar with the views of most of those who have been interviewed. In books and speeches they have given to the world their ideas on the topics discussed. These, of course, and not reports of an hour's conversation with them, more or less, however skillfully and correctly presented, are the sources preferred by those engaged in special study, and to whom they are accessible. And yet the book is not without value even to this class of students, for M. Huret, a special student himself, has conducted his inquiries so as to bring out into clearer light opinions which the authors questioned have only vaguely shadowed in their

published works. Moreover the book is well worth reading by the special student in this country, merely for the closer view it affords of the personality of men with whose names he has long been familiar.

While the value of the book to the specialist in social science is considerable, it will be more warmly welcomed by the much larger class of readers who wish just the brief sketches which it contains. Such readers will find in them a great number of facts and ideas in regard to social structure and the future of civilization. They may gain a clear idea of the criticisms and demands of modern European socialism, as well as the objections that are urged against it. They may learn, too, from the existing anarchy of opinion the hopelessness of an early consensus in regard to social reform. Each man interviewed, as M. Deschanel remarks (p. xiv-xv), with rare exceptions, confounds his own function with the interests of society, and sees the social problem only as it regards himself; each one seems shut up in his own compartment—his field, his shop, his bank, his store, his party, his sect, etc.—in complete intellectual isolation. One glorifies socialism, another individualism, while another establishes himself in an intermediary region. One defends the classic political economy, another opposes it, etc. Perhaps the readers of this JOURNAL may be interested in a few of the opinions expressed. I turn first to the interview with Dr. Schaeffle.

Dr. Schaeffle is described as a man of about sixty years, tall, strong, and full of nervous energy. Approached on the subject of socialism he expresses himself emphatically. "I am not a socialist," he says, "not at all! I wrote, indeed, the *Quintessence of Socialism*, which is an exposé of the Marxian doctrines, but an exposé only. My personal opinion was not involved, and I do not understand why theories are attributed to me which are not mine. On the contrary, I published, some time ago, a book on the *Impossibilities of Social Democracy*. Why is it that the socialists who pretend that I am with them are silent about this book? It is because I have refuted in it, one by one, the principles of collectivism" (p. 229).

"You believe, then," asks M. Huret, "that collectivism is without a future?"

"Absolutely without a future," he replies. "I believe it unrealizable, not only in the present, but in the most distant future. Another question entirely different is whether certain things now under private management may not pass over to public control" (p. 229). Such a

change, says Dr. Schaeffle, may take place, but only gradually and without the abolition of private capital. Another quotation revealing his conception of the implications of socialism will throw light on his attitude towards it. "Collectivism contemplates not only a radical change in the economic order, but also a new conception of all phases of human life. It wishes atheism in place of religion, republicanism in the state, integral collectivism in production, unbridled optimism in ethics, materialism in philosophy, the destruction of the family, intervention of the state in education, instruction for everybody; in a word, absolute liberty and equality! What a chimera!" (p. 230.) This may not be the true conception of socialism but it is Dr. Schaeffle's.

How different the whole matter appears from the socialistic points of view may be indicated by a few selections from the interview with Herr Bebel. "Personally," he says, in speaking of the social transformation he desires, "I believe that before the end of the century it will be an accomplished fact" (p. 281). There is optimism for you! And yet he declares "there is no contradiction between the theory of evolution and our hope of an immediate revolution. On the contrary, we are all evolutionists. But we think that social evolution advances at such a pace that the day is not distant when society can no longer exist as it is now. The social order will be transformed from top to bottom and collectivism will appear as a necessary result of a gradual evolution; it will be one of the stages of this evolution, just as the French Revolution was another stage" (p. 278).

Those who are not already familiar with Herr Bebel's views on the family will be interested in the following: "I have shown in a book," he says, referring to his *Die Frau und der Socialismus*, "that there is no family sentiment which is the basis of the institution of marriage, but that marriage is solely the product of economic relations. When inheritance is suppressed, when private property is abolished, when the education of children is public, what is left of the family? The affection of man for woman? Well, we shall prevent nobody from living in the family. You may be together as much as you please. But the family as we know it today will dissolve of itself. Today a young woman looks upon marriage only as a means of living or of increasing her income. Ninety out of every one hundred marriages are economic unions. When women are assured a comfortable living why will they wish to bind themselves for life? And besides, as a matter of fact, what is the family to the workingman? He spends twelve

hours a day in the factory. On his return often the wife goes, in order to help make the living. The children themselves are there too. Yes, I say, what is the family to the workingman?" (p. 279.)

Far different is the opinion of Professor Adolph Wagner. He, like Dr. Schaeffle, is a strong partisan of the family. "Suppress the family," he says, "put all children in charge of the state and would you not increase population in enormous proportions? Will production follow the same progression? If not, what will become of your society of starvelings?" (p. 286.) Professor Wagner, by the way, is a partisan on several other matters, religion, militarism, taxation of bequests, progressive-income tax, and state intervention. As to the latter he says: "In my opinion it is the only solution to hope for. I am an extremist in this matter. I am in favor of the monopoly by the state of railways, canals, mines, and, in general, of all great public organizations" (p. 286). He justifies this position on the ground of the possible diminution of taxes. Speaking of militarism he says: "If I had my way there would be more soldiers than there are. The army is the best possible school for our agricultural population, who are instructed and disciplined in it. Consequently war has been for us a good. It has served to unite us. Even from a moral point of view its influence has been salutary. France and Germany could not be friends prior to 1870, because to be friends they had to respect one another, and France had too much contempt for Germany. But we do not wish war with France. We love the French more even than we do the English, although the latter are our cousins" (p. 291). But Professor Wagner has not the same sentiment for the Russians. "My greatest happiness," he declares, "would be war with Russia! I hate Russia! I hate her for her absolutism, for her intolerance, for her language, for her religion, for the corruption of her officials. I hate her because she threatens German civilization. I hate her, in a word, for the profound antagonism which exists between the Slavs and the German race" (p. 291). Pretty strong language, one feels, for a partisan of religion.

It would be interesting to quote from others; from the interview with M. Paul Leroy-Beaulieu, for instance, who declares that with the exception of Fourier, perhaps, there has not been a single serious socialist, and that Karl Marx and Ferdinand Lassalle are not worth consideration (p. 341), but space will not permit. Every reader must admire the skill with which M. Huret has drawn out the opinions of

those whom he has interviewed, and his success in keeping in the background whatever views he himself may hold. At the same time he will feel a growing discouragement in regard to the possibility of reaching something like a consensus of opinion on *la question sociale*.

I. W. HOWERTH.

---

*Domestic Service.* By LUCY MAYNARD SALMON. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1897. 8vo, pp. 307.

THERE are few phases of the labor problem about which people profess to know so much and in reality know so little as about domestic service. In every community there are many good people who seem to think that years of personal experience, no matter how restricted in character, give them the right to have very fixed views as to possible methods of improving household labor in general. A company of women seldom assembles without attempting an argument in behalf of one or more so-called solutions of the problem. It is true, indeed, that no unusual experience is required to show that the problem is a real one which faces every householder in a most practical way. The urgent need which exists makes the fact the more strange that Miss Salmon's work is the first serious attempt to deal with the subject in a truly scientific spirit.

That she is a pioneer in this field is evident from the author's own prefatory words, in which she sets forth the purpose of the book. With the end in view of tabulating and presenting "facts which may afford a broader basis for general discussion than has been possible without them," and with the hope that writers on economic theory and economic conditions will include domestic service in their scientific investigations of various industries, Miss Salmon has drawn from many sources a large amount of historical and economic material which she has put together in most readable form. In addition to this she has introduced what she chooses to term a "theoretical" discussion of doubtful and of possible remedies. The reader who expects to find the theoretical views of a closet investigator will be impressed with the large practical knowledge and shrewd common sense which the author shows.

The introductory chapters deal with the historical aspect of the subject. The changes in the amount and character of household labor which have come about through the substitution of the factory