able. A way must be found of socializing these great collective personalities which have so often in the past manifested anti-social disruptive tendencies. Organized labor is the natural complement of organized capital, and the alternative to organization is, on the one hand, anarchy, on the other, industrial disintegration. The division of labor means the socialization of industry, since it makes the welfare of one group of laborers dependent upon the conduct of other groups, and the extent of this interdependency of industrial groups measures and determines the right of the community to interfere to preserve industrial peace.

The history of the labor movement in any country is, as M. Halévy observes, only partially written out, while the greater part of that history has perished with those who enacted it. The wage-earner has been occupied with his labor, silently achieving his own emancipation, and he has not concerned himself with making a record of his purposes, his failures, or his victories. He has gained a point here, resisted an encroachment there. M. Halévy regards the organization or co-operative association of labor in any form whatever as a means of further enlightenment and of concerted action. It is, therefore, he thinks, a means of industrial and social progress, and herein lies its sufficient justification. The labor movement is not national in character, but international, and the movement in France, while possessing features peculiarly French, presents, in the main, the experience and course of that movement in other countries as well. It is a movement toward organization, reflection, regulation, and direction of labor forces toward a régime of negotiation, conciliation, and amicable adjustment of difference. On the whole it is a movement toward industrial peace.

One does not put by M. Halévy's volume without feeling increased respect for French scholarship, and French genius for felicitous and final statement. The fine art of clear thinking, of adequate expression, and of tactful persuasion is the particular glory of French scholars.

JOHN CUMMINGS.

Grundbedingungen der gesellschaftlichen Wohlfahrt. By SAMUEL RÉVAL. Leipzig: Duncker und Humblot, 1902. 8vo, pp. xxxi + 692.

It is a favorite maneuver of the Utopian to draw up a mile-long indictment of Things-as-they-Are, knowing well that no imagination is competent to picture with equal vividness and detail the shortcomings

of Things-as-they-Would-Be. In this vein Herr Révai denounces the economic system of today root and branch, and to our complete enlightenment on the subject nothing is lacking save a companion volume surveying with an eye no less jaundiced the communistic system he recommends as so much better.

The root of all social discord and misery is, it appears, the institution of private property. The system founded thereon is a pitiable failure even as a scheme of production. It does not get the right man into the right place, it does not spur each to do his best, it produces too much of one commodity and too little of another. Then, too, it jars upon the moral sense. With division of labor and exchange, property loses the ethical character it has in a simple society where objects remain in the possession of the maker. The persistence of theft after centuries of preaching proves there is something against nature in the command "Thou shalt not steal." By the same token why not argue from the persistence of rape that there is something unnatural in giving a woman control of her own person? In the presence of the rank growth of property rights beyond the sanction of moral desert or social welfare Révai calls for the axe, while soberer thinkers bid society apply the pruning hook in the form of factory legislation, anti-monopoly decisions, or inheritance taxes.

Our author is, in fact, one who hankers for better bread than can be baked from wheat. There is hardly any ill of life, save unrequited love and old age, that he does not lay at the door of our economic system. As he inveighs against competition as well as monopoly or inheritance, scouts the idea of over-population and denounces the "prudential check" in the family, it becomes clear that the real malefactor is not Private Property but the Struggle for Existence. With this slight correction the economist can accept the indictment and pronounce the verdict "Guilty as charged!"

EDWARD ALSWORTH ROSS.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA.

Les causes de la dépopulation de la France. By G. CAUDERLIER.

Paris: Guillaumin & C^{ie}, 1901. (2d edition.) 8vo, pp. 51.

THIS brochure is rather a strange product of a mind presumably trained in the exact science of engineering. It attempts to formulate a law of all the movements of population, valid in all places and all times—an effort at over-generalization which smacks strongly of the