

land on such a date," or "This was the custom," &c. His description of the war he waged against the Ne-ar-Bians as King of Palti, and his reasons for waging it, are all admirable caricatures of some not remote incidents in our own history.

To attempt a description of this little book, or to quote from its most quotable pages, would be an injustice to its author. Suffice it to say that it ought to be in the hands of every reader who can appreciate a most excellent satire, not less earnest in its purpose because so frank in its assumption of unconscious hypocrisy and in its utter absence of all ethical understanding.

J. D. M.

THE SOCIAL UNREST.

It seems ungracious to criticise a book by John Braham Brooks, whose devotion to humanity is so great; but in his "Social Unrest" he, in common with other socialists, so persistently confuses terms and condemns private ownership of capital that exception must be taken to some of his statements.

For instance, he says, page 21, "It is this new consciousness of difference between a really private business, like a corner grocery store, and one that has ceased to be private in that sense, which so heightens the value of this type of industry (coal mining) as a special study." The attitude expressed by "I refuse to arbitrate because this is alone my business," is foolhardy in proportion as the business is obviously semi-public, as the hard coal business with its dependence on the railroad now is.

How is the grocery business any more a "private business" than coal mining? In the latter the absolute need of land is perhaps more obvious to the ordinary person; but land is just as necessary in the carrying on of the grocery business as it is in the mining of coal. Also the machinery used in mining is just as much private property as the stock in a grocery store.

If private property in land is just, then not only the mine-owner but the owner of a grocery store is perfectly right in refusing to arbitrate, for the business is his business and he has a right to do what he pleases with his own provided he does not aggress.

Mr. Brooks realizes that the land question is important but does not see that it is the most important one. He says, page 122, "An enormous private ownership of industrial mechanism, especially if coupled with land and mines, is now clearly seen to carry with it powers and privileges that may easily be turned against every promise of free and democratic society."

If mines do not come under the head of land would they be classed as capital or labor? They must be one of the three. That Mr. Brooks is not clear in his definitions is shown in page 146, where he says: "He (the workman) is told that in all

wealth-making, three factors are essential, land, labor and capital, or, by more recent refinement, 'natural opportunity, labor and directing intelligence.' Each, according to the service it renders, receives its portion of product: land its rent, labor its wage, and organizing management its profits."

In this "more recent refinement" capital seems to be left out. Strictly speaking, capital is a secondary factor in the production of wealth, being itself a part of wealth; but in ordinary parlance it is classed with land and labor as one of the three factors in the production of wealth, but evidently it is not an essential factor since in the beginning the first capital had to be produced by labor without the assistance of capital. The term labor includes all kinds of human exertion, whether of brain or hand; therefore "directing intelligence" is included in the term labor, and each of the three factors in wealth production would, in a just distribution, receive its portion of the product: land its rent, labor its wage and capital its interest.

In his chapter, "Man and Society versus Machinery," Mr. Brooks disproves the assertion sometimes made that machinery has on the whole displaced labor; and while he realizes the great good machinery has been to humanity, he sees that it has also made machines of men.

He clearly perceives the necessity of just wages, saying, page 208, "Philanthropies are a dangerous substitute for honest wage payment, shorter working time and increased influence over the conditions of the labor contract. What may be called the Great Bluff of our time is to put gratitudes and benefactions in the place of justice. There is no donation, however gaudy, that can fill the place of justice."

Mr. Brooks's aim is the same as that of other reformers—to make this world a better place to live in. He says, page 245, "If the goal is a society in which all can live out openly and healthfully every faculty they possess, then 'equality of chance' is as good a phrase as any to express the conditions that would make such life possible." And, page 244, "Our real problem, therefore, is to know how far opportunity to develop every gift is open to all; how far do artificial privileges restrict these opportunities to the few; how far does an imperfect social and industrial system handicap a portion of the people; above all, how does an unregulated competition select, stimulate and strengthen individual qualities and social ideals that thwart a genuine equality?"

It is possible only to touch on a few points in a brief review; but while "The Social Unrest" occupies the wrong standpoint and advocates a mistaken cure of social ills, still it is a book well worth the reading by all who would help their fellows to a better state of society.

BOLTON HALL.