

sor A. T. Hadley criticises unfavourably Professor Ely's last book, "Socialism and Social Reform," and takes strong ground in favour of the old, individualistic system. Professor Ely's article shows him to be far enough from accepting the modern socialistic theories, though he is almost equally at war with the intense individualism of the old system of Adam Smith and his successors. While admitting that in the past strikes have been a necessary evil, and have resulted in good to the industrial population, he holds that, under the present changed conditions of society, they can no longer be successful and should no longer be tolerated. "What we have lately witnessed in railway strikes is," he avers, "barbarism and not civilization." He fully approves of rigorous measures being taken, if necessary, by the national authorities, to put down such strikes as interfere with the public interest. Strikes are a form of war, and even war is sometimes necessary. But the war must not be permitted to interfere with certain primary institutions, such as railways, gas-works, telegraphs, etc. "If wrong and injustice are done to employees, effective means must be discovered to remedy them without a disturbance of domestic peace." In what direction the "effective means" is to be sought for, or how it is to be applied, Professor Ely gives no hint. Hence it is evident that he casts no light upon the darkest spot of the difficulty.

The larger part of Professor Ely's article is devoted to the consideration of the peculiarly public industries which are called natural monopolies. These are streets and highways of all sorts, the means of communication and transportation, and lighting-plants. They include railways, telegraphs, telephones, harbours, canals, street cars, elevated urban railways, gas-works, electric lighting-plants. Some of these are local, some national, in the scope of their operation, and some intermediate between the two extremes. Experience in the United States has, he says, demonstrated that there are two, and only two, ways of dealing with monopolies. These are private ownership and operation with control by Government, and Government control and ownership. One of these the Legislatures have decided must be had. In the case of private ownership, Government control comes in to supply the lack of the competition which regulates operations in agriculture, manufactures, and commerce. After admitting very fully the vast difficulties which exist in the way of public ownership and management, and setting them over against the evils which inhere in the system of private ownership, with all its tendencies to corruption, and the dangers arising from the great power the corporations come to exert over Governments, Professor Ely inclines to the belief that in State ownership will be found the ultimate solu-

tion of the problem, "though it does not seem likely that such a decision will be reached, except for some local monopolies, and perhaps the telegraph and telephone, in any near future."

But even this is not Socialism, and the concluding part of the article shows clearly enough that Professor Ely is no Socialist. In fact, so far as his general social philosophy is concerned, he avows himself, and those who read his remarks in this connection will agree with the avowal, "a conservative rather than a radical, and in the strict sense of the term an aristocrat rather than a democrat." He takes pains, however, to explain that when he uses the latter term he has in mind a natural, not a legal aristocracy. It is at this point that the most interesting part of the discussion arises. We touch here the broad question which is causing so much unrest in all the more progressive countries of the world at the present moment.

Another phase of the question is discussed in the article by Professor Hadley, which follows, though it is pretty clear to the reader of both, that Professor Ely would hardly recognize as his own the views which form the object of Professor Hadley's attack. This discussion deals with the difference between the individualistic and the socialistic conceptions of industrial life. We are sorry that our space will not permit of our following out the discussion on these lines, as we had intended. Every thoughtful observer knows that it is the struggle between these two conceptions which is agitating the civilized world to-day, as perhaps it has never before been agitated. Professor Hadley devotes much of his strength to an attempt to prove that the current representation of the old political economy, by socialists, is incorrect; that political economy does not regard the individual as an end in himself; that "rational egoism and rational altruism tend to coincide." It may be admitted that in seeking to promote his own personal gain the individual often promotes the general welfare of the community. This simply means, the Socialist might retort, that things are so wisely and beneficently arranged that the intense selfishness of the individual is often over-ruled for the good of others. The fact is far from proving that selfishness should be approved and cultivated as the ideal force in social economics. But then, on the other hand, grant that genuine altruism would be both a much nobler and a much more promising force for working out the social well-being, the question arises, What can legislation, or any compulsory social compact, do towards effecting the change of motive or aim in the individual? Some influence other than external compulsion is necessary to accomplish that. And of what use would be the most elaborate socialistic machinery without the necessary force to put and keep it

in motion? In short, must not the attempt to substitute by legislation an altruistic for an individualistic aim in the world of industry necessarily result in failure?

On the other hand, we can imagine the Socialist making reply to Professor Ely's doctrine of aristocracy, his assertion that "the eighteenth century doctrine of essential equality among men is pernicious; that men are essentially unequal in power, capacity, requirements," etc. Grant the fact at any given moment. How large a part of the inequality is due to the inequality of conditions and opportunities which is the offspring of the existing social system? In other words, to what extent is the inequality natural, and to what extent the product of environment? And how much of that part of the inequality which we ascribe to heredity may be due to the influence of previous environments for which the social system was largely responsible?

The controversy is endless, though it forces itself upon the mind and is well worth pursuing. But do not both parties, after all, forget that it is "a condition and not a theory" which confronts us? What are the socialistic tendencies of the time but a necessary accompaniment of the advance, the now resistless advance of democracy? Are those tendencies really anything else than the outcome of the determination of the triumphing democracies to legislate with a view solely to the interests or supposed interests of the industrial classes, just as much of the old legislation was undeniably the outcome of the natural tendency of the special ruling and legislating classes to legislate solely in their own interests? The end who can foretell?

Professor Giulio Fano and Dr. Giulio Masini, of Genoa, Italy, have recently made an interesting series of experiments, described in the *Journal of Nervous and Mental Diseases* (New York), to determine the inter-relations of the auditory apparatus and the respiratory centre. They find that loss of the semicircular canals of the ear causes profound modifications of the mechanism of respiration, which are much less notable when only the cochlea is extirpated, the canals appearing to inhibit respiration, while the cochlea causes an acceleration of respiratory rhythm. The respiratory movements approach the normal when, after destruction of the semicircular canals, the cochlea is extirpated, so that there seems to be a sort of functional antagonism between the canals and the cochlea. Respiratory movements reflect very sensitively the impressions made upon the ear, so that they may be employed as a sort of test of auditory sensitiveness, and thus one may demonstrate how sensitive the acoustic nerve is to auditory impressions.

Verdi's new opera has for its subject not King Lear, as has been reported, but Count Ugolino, and the Tower of Famine from Dante's *Inferno*. In preparing it he has had examined a musical setting to the episode written in the sixteenth century by Vincenzo Galileo, the father of the astronomer