

and friend and companion of John Brown in the Kansas border warfare. He is a thorough democrat and has often made a wealthy patient wait while he treated a poor washer-woman.

To claim that even a slight pressure upon a nerve, or a small deviation of a vertebra from its normal position, would cause serious trouble in some other part of the body, and to say that to put the human machine in perfect order, thus allowing a free flow of blood through the body, would cure any curable disease was too ridiculous for the ordinary "regular" physician to believe. But this is the fundamental principle upon which osteopathy is founded; and when to this heretical doctrine is added the fact that osteopathy has cured many so-called "incurable" cases, we have sufficient cause for bitter opposition to the new science on the part of organized medicine. From the earliest history, opposition to new and decidedly different ideas has always been "for the protection of the dear people." It seems impossible for the majority of men and women to have any definite conception of what equal freedom means. Those in power feel that they must regulate the lives of their fellow-men or dire disaster will follow.

Dr. Booth gives a detailed account of the legislative fights for legal recognition in the various States, and they who are unacquainted with the methods employed by the "ins" to keep out the "outs" would be surprised to find that machine politicians are not alone in using every means to prevent legislation that is opposed to their interests. The statements are sustained by proof which cannot be doubted.

The book also contains a chapter on various other methods of healing, and the more than 400 pages are well worth careful perusal by all who wish to judge of a system on its merits and not on the testimony of its opponents; also by those who care to see another example of the struggle of a new and radically different idea for recognition.

Dr. Booth has done a great service in compiling this history, especially as he was able, Dr. Still and the other earliest practitioners being still with us, to give their personal experiences, an advantage which later historians will lack.

FLORENCE A. BURLEIGH.

#### EVOLUTION OR REVOLUTION.

**Evolution — Revolution; Which?**  
By H. M. Williams. The M. W. Hazen Co.

Here we have a book laying out a scheme of government with an amount of detail which indicates that the author, who evidently thinks his plan evolutionary, has no appreciation whatever of the idea of evolution as a law of growth. He approaches the subject as one of Alice's friends in Wonderland opened a conversation:

"The time has come," the Walrus said,  
"To talk of many things:

Of shoes—and shops—and sealing wax—  
Of cabbages—and kings—  
And why the sea is boiling hot  
And whether pigs have wings."

The author seems at times to analyze, but his analyses are not logical distinctions; they are arbitrary classifications. Some notion of this, and at the same time of the general character of his book, is suggested by his theory of legislative checks and balances.

He finds in society "three sources of power, muscle, brains, money"—money meaning not currency, but property—"as represented in true manhood, education, and the homes of our citizens." Therefore he would divide Congress into three houses: The Commons, to represent the muscular power, the House, to represent the brain power, and the Senate, to represent the money (or property) power. For the election of this legislative body, every man would have one vote—for representation in the lower house; every man educated up to a certain standard would have two votes—one each for representation in the lower and the middle house; every educated tax payer (paying a certain amount of taxes) would have three votes—one each for representation in all the houses; every educated woman would have one vote—for representation in the middle house; and every educated and tax-paying woman would have two the middle and the upper houses.

Though this seems rather fanciful, it is not more so than many institutions which we accept as matter of course, because we are accustomed to them; such, for instance, as hereditary legislators in Great Britain; and a large popular assembly automatically registering only the will of the speaker in the United States.

The book as a whole is given over so completely to detail without principle, that it ought to delight the heart of the publicists who while insisting upon government declare that there are no natural laws of government.

#### ETHICS OF IMPERIALISM.

**The Ethics of Imperialism: An Inquiry Whether Christian Ethics and Imperialism are Antagonistic.** By Albert R. Carman. Boston: Herbert B. Turner & Co. Price \$1.00 net.

With apologies to that hackneyed chapter on snakes in Ireland, one might say that Mr. Carman could have made his monograph on the ethics of imperialism the shortest in literature. He need have written no more than this: "There are no ethics in imperialism." Evidently he felt this himself, for while he has extended the thought over a hundred and sixty-odd most readable pages, he has really not altered it.

At times one suspects that Mr. Carman may be slyly laughing at innocent imperialistic readers who imagine that imperialism is ethical after

all and that Mr. Carman is demonstrating it.

The trend of his discussion is through that labyrinthine no-thoroughfare philosophy which so divides human motives into egoistic and altruistic as to leave no room for the profound philosophy of the golden rule, which recognizes an egoism that includes others and an altruism which includes self. Rigidly defined, altruism doubtless does lead logically to suicide; but egoism, rigidly defined, leads as certainly to murder. The equilibrium is found by whatever name we distinguish it, in loving others neither more nor less than self but equally with self.

Ignoring this equilibrium, Mr. Carman seems to find ethical elements in imperialism, the ethical elements of national self-defense. In all progress, writes Mr. Carman, there has been a preservative or defensive "fighting unit": the individual, the family, the tribe, and now the nation; and the question on which the ethics of imperialism turns with reference to imperialistic wars is merely a question of whether "the war will strengthen the chances of the imperializing nation to survive."

To this ethical theory Mr. Carman looks for the extension of liberty. He regards liberty as a gift of egoism to which altruism has been the persistent foe; for "men who have felt it laid so heavily upon their consciences to care for the interests of others that they would resort to means to force 'good' upon others which they would not willingly endure themselves, have in many cases well-nigh murdered human liberty in their altruistic zeal for human betterment." But that observation, a most welcome one, condemns imperialism, which is now as always heretofore resorted to for precisely such "altruistic" ends. This is not the altruism of the golden rule, as Mr. Carman himself testifies when he adds: "They have done unto others what they would that these others should not do unto them; and the result has been disastrous to all concerned."

In so far as Mr. Carman seems seriously to ascribe ethics to imperialism, its ethics are those of brutishness and savagery and not of civilization. What he says in criticism of altruism is very true, as he understands altruism; but we conceive that injustice to others for one's own good is quite as reprehensible and as pregnant with ultimate disaster as injustice to others for their good.

#### MONOPOLIES PAST AND PRESENT.

**Monopolies Past and Present. An Introductory Study.** By James Edward Le Rossignol, Ph. D., professor of economics in the University of