

revolutionized economics and controls all scientific legislation. Yet he dismisses it as "a pretty piece of theorizing" that "looks on the surface as sound as could be wished." It is not to be wondered at that a writer who manifests throughout a strong Hegelian tendency in his philosophy should find little to sympathize with in the clear-cut reasoning of John Stuart Mill and others who have done most to develop Utilitarianism. Doubtless much can be said in criticism of that doctrine, but it is unfortunate that one who sees fit to differ from the prevailing tone of modern social writings should show that he either completely misunderstands the Utilitarian point of view or does not wish to present it in its strongest light.

In his treatment of the influence of education and its relation to social questions our author is at his best. He discusses three stages that go to make up a complete education; first, the acquisition of intelligence, that training which is necessary to produce a human being at all; secondly, the acquiring of abilities, or man becoming the particular individual for which he is by nature fitted; thirdly, the acquiring of wisdom, or the bringing of one's individuality into harmonious relationship with the rest of the world.

The suggestions respecting the opportunities and need of the church and other organized bodies in society disseminating knowledge on social subjects, and the reflex action of education on life, are especially worthy of praise.

SAMUEL M. LINDSAY.

THE PRINCIPLES OF STATE INTERFERENCE. By DAVID G. RICHTIE.
Pp. 172, London, 1891.

THIS volume is composed of four essays on the political philosophy of Herbert Spencer, J. S. Mill, and Thomas Hill Green. The reason for presenting these essays in one volume is found in the relation of the three authors to the general subject of political philosophy; Mr. Spencer being "perhaps the most formidable intellectual foe with whom the New Radicalism has to reckon," in other words, the leading advocate of

laissez-faire ; Mr. Mill being "in a process of transition from the extreme doctrines of individualism and *laissez-faire*, in which he was brought up, to a more adequate conception of society ;" and Mr. Green holding views of political philosophy most nearly in harmony with the true conception of the State.

The first two essays are devoted to a criticism of Mr. Spencer's views as set forth in "The Man versus the State." The essence of the criticism is that Mr. Spencer's "political individualism" and his organic conception of society are inconsistent. Incomplete or erroneous conceptions of the organic nature of society are the source of much that is misleading in current political theories. Mr. Ritchie has undoubtedly reached a sound conclusion when he states that "an appeal to the fact that society is an organism is no argument either for or against government interference in any given case." The errors of "a one-sided application of the conception of organic growth" can be escaped only "by recognizing a truth which includes them both. We must pass from 'organism' to 'consciousness,' from nature to the spirit of man."

In the third essay, Mr. Ritchie discusses "Individual Liberty and State Interference." The first part contains a criticism of J. S. Mill's negative philosophy. In general it may be said that Mr. Mill's conceptions of "liberty," of "individuality," and of "State interference," are false because they are only half truths ; e. g. liberty is "being left to one's-self," individuality is "diversity of one man from another." Having shown the insufficiency of Mr. Mill's political philosophy, Mr. Ritchie proceeds to discuss the "End of the State," and the practical application of the principles underlying this end. The end of the State is the development of man ; but since man's development is impossible apart from organized society, "in a way, the State is an end to itself." To the objection that such reasoning "involves the fallacy of arguing in a circle," that logic is against it, he replies pointedly : "So much the worse for logic ; i. e., the abstract logic of mathematics or of mechanics is not applicable to what is organic or more than organic. Wherever there is growth,

there we must expect to find what will not fit into one or other of the alternatives of an antithesis. No one has solved the puzzle whether the hen or the egg comes first. We cannot understand the one without implying the other ; and so it is with the individual and the State, with the actual morality of the age, and the ideal or end which determines that morality."

The essay on the political philosophy of Thomas Hill Green is least satisfactory, for it deals too sparingly with the subject. In his conception of the ethical end, Mr. Green may be called a utilitarian ; but the statement needs qualification, for, while any course of conduct is to be tested by its end, he holds that this end is not mere pleasure nor the greatest good to the greatest number in a society considered merely as an aggregate of individuals. The end is rather the self-realization of the individual and the common good. To Mr. Green these have identically the same meaning. From this conception of the "ethical end," the theory of "freedom" naturally follows, and from it, the conclusion as to "State action." "State action is expedient just in so far as it tends to promote freedom in the sense of self-determined action directed to the objects of reason, inexpedient in so far as it tends to interfere with this."

Mr. Ritchie in this, as in a former work, "*Darwinism and Politics*," appears as the advocate of the philosophical soundness of the reaction from the old theories that emphasize the supreme importance of the individual and place in antagonism State action and individual liberty. While this reaction is to be welcomed, it is to be hoped that in the new philosophy the lesson of the old will not be lost. A complete theory must give equal emphasis to the two facts: first, that apart from society the individual is a mere abstraction about whom nothing can be said "except that it is not any other individual," and, second, that apart from the individual, society is not even an abstraction. Rightly interpreted the one involves the other, but unless each be given due emphasis errors will result.

Mr. Ritchie's work is valuable not so much for its exhaustive treatment of the subject—indeed, it makes no such pre-

tention—as for its clearness and suggestiveness. The style is too combative to be strictly philosophical but not to be interesting. In general the conclusions follow logically. In speaking of the corn laws, however, without here passing upon the general correctness of the conclusions, it may be doubted whether the writer's reasoning admits of the application of *laissez-faire* in all economic conditions simply because they are economic. Mr. Ritchie has not freed himself from Mr. Mill's conception of the economic man.

FREDERICK C. HICKS.

University of Michigan.

THE LAND AND THE LABORERS: Facts and Experiments in Cottage Farming and Coöperative Agriculture. By CHARLES WILLIAM STUBBS, M.A., Rector of Wavertree; Author of "Village Politics," "Christ and Democracy," etc. Pp. 228. London: Swan, Sonnenschein & Co., Paternoster Square, 1891.

THE first impression upon reading this interesting book by Mr. Stubbs is similar to that obtained from the accounts of other co-operative enterprises. Such attempts at united effort in industry are certainly based upon correct and lofty principles and ought always to succeed, but somehow there are more financial failures than successes. Mr. Stubbs' book is confined to a consideration of different kinds of co-operative farming. "Twelve years' work as a country parson in a Buckinghamshire village have forced upon me two very definite conclusions. They are these:

"1. That of the many urgent social problems with which at the present moment Englishmen are confronted, there are few whose solution is not largely dependent upon such a revision of the English Land System, as shall permanently raise the social and economic condition of the English rural laborer.

"2. That any permanent elevation of the rural laborer's standard of comfort is impossible, unless there can be effected either (*a*) a great increase in the proportion of small agricultural holdings in England; or (*b*) the adoption of some system of agriculture, probably co-operative, which shall once more