

lectures on the subject of being "keepers at home" or of looking well to the ways of their households. But, as she frankly informs us that, like the German theologian, she "she does agree with Paulus" on all points, that part of her letter might better have been omitted.

I have no desire to be either "virulent" or "discourteous" towards "O," whose identity I have no means of guessing; but such unfair and unprovoked detraction of what I hold to be a salutary and hopeful movement, can scarcely be allowed to pass without pointing out for the benefit of uninformed readers the futility and irrelevance of the detraction. Let "O" bear in mind that though she may not see the need for such an organization, bringing so many representative women together, "to further the application of the Golden Rule to society, custom, and law," its need has been seen and expressed by many of our best and most patriotic thinkers, of both sexes, who welcome the movement and bid it God-speed. I am glad to see from the editorial remarks of the last WEEK, that it feels strongly that there is a worthy mission for such organizations in the body politic, and that it appreciates the services they can render. I would advise "O," in conclusion, even if she cannot sympathise with the *methods* of the Council, to endeavor to coöperate with it in spirit, in seeking to promote the general practice of the great Christian principle which would be the surest remedy for all our social troubles. And the more she throws her energies into positive effort in this direction, the less inclined will she be to invidious comments on others who are seeking the same goal, and the more will she be inclined to welcome all aid, from whatever quarter it may come, towards the promotion of the same great end.

FAIR PLAY.

The Evolution of Industry.*

SOCIAL science is demanding a good deal of attention from some of the clearest minds of the age. Difficulties, abuses, meet the student of human institutions on all sides, and he who thinks he sees somewhat more clearly than his fellows embodies his vision in a book—sometimes a help, oftener a stumbling block, to the uninitiated.

One of the latest efforts to cast some light on the darkness that hangs like a pall over the relationship of capital to labour, and of the individual to society is "The Evolution of Industry," by Henry Dyer. The title is something of a misnomer as in reality only two chapters deal absolutely with the evolution of industry. These are written very graphically, and with great succinctness. They rapidly sketch the history of merchant guilds, craft guilds, and state regulations, and trace industry from domestic industry, through the factory system—through companies—to monopolies. The bulk of the book, however, is not taken up so much with the evolution of industry as with the results of that evolution, and with an attempt to set people thinking rightly on the great questions of the time.

While there is nothing startlingly original in the book there is a great deal that is helpful and suggestive. By education and sympathies the writer is well fitted to grapple with the mighty problems that lie at the base of such a subject as "The Organization of Mechanical Industry," on a basis that will at once make a united humanity and preserve the individuality of the members of society. In the preface he clearly lays down his point of view: "I believe, therefore," he says, "that the solution of the problem I have mentioned" (to find a social organization corresponding to the modern conditions of production) "will not be brought about by a revolution, or a brand new organization, but by the evolution of movements at present going on and by the development of intellectual and moral training."

As might be expected from this quotation the book is a criticism of existing institutions, and an attempt to direct thought into proper channels. It lays down no scheme for universal brotherhood on a Socialistic principle, but it is a calm recognition of the principle of evolution as a great law of life and society that rolls on its course despite the sudden breaks that seem here and there to interrupt its progress. The author is a thorough scientist, and the book is impregnated with science and with scientific allusion. He, indeed, considers that "social science is only the final chapter of physical and biological science."

The book is not intended for scholars, but for the general reader, who "has neither time nor patience for minute accounts." At the same time it demands careful thought, a wide reading, and something more than a mere smattering in science. Indeed the author, in his determination to connect sociology with the natural sciences—by analogy at least—drags in a lot of matter that is irrelevant, and in the introductory chapter his disquisition on conservation and dissipation of energy, his lengthy scientific illustrations, tend to weaken rather than strengthen the truth he is enforcing.

He accepts Ruskin's dictum that "Government and coöperation are in all things the laws of life; anarchy and competition the laws of death." He ably criticises the competitive system, and shows clearly that it ultimately leads to our modern monopolies, trusts, and combines. He would in some degree do away with "the present industrial struggle which marks our competitive system, and gradually replace it by one in which coöperation takes the place of competition." He recognizes the dangers in the way, and sees that coöperation means, to some extent, Socialism; but, as he points out, a degree of Socialism is required to prevent the few from tyrannizing over the many, for in the end, under our present system, the Goulds, the Vanderbilts, the Carnegies, the Pullmans, soon take away all chance of competition by absorbing all the small dealers into themselves.

The chapter entitled "The position of women," is, perhaps, the noblest in the book. He believes in the emancipation of women, but he believes that the emancipation should be "from shallowness and ignorance, not from anything that is truly womanly." He would give them an "equal weight with men in the counsels of the nation." He deplores the fact that some nations pride themselves on their ability to manufacture cheap goods by means of cheap woman-labor, and declares that "no industry can be for the good of a nation which only survives on the degradation of its women." He would have men and women paid equal wages for equal amounts of work of the same kind. The race can never expect to reach anything like ideal development while the present iniquitous system—a system happily rapidly changing—lasts. "When women," he says, "are practically the slaves of men they have all the defects of slaves, and they avenge themselves by the training which they give their children, who come to possess many of their mental, moral, and physical malformations." This a stern truth, ably put, and one that it would be well for our educators and our legislators to ponder over. But while writing thus he would guard against having his reader suppose that the women have to become as men. "Their chief work is to be found in the home," he says, and instead of rushing into fields for which by nature men are peculiarly adapted, "they should seek to fully utilise both the bodily and mental energy of the men, so as to allow for the fuller development of their own."

To bring about a truer state of society he would have all the workers, and indeed the employers too, properly educated; and would go so far as "to make a training in the life and duties of citizenship an essential part of our national system of education. It, after all, resolves itself into a matter of ethics. No mere machinery can place society on a stable basis, and it is only by being morally educated that men can become truly altruistic. Mere intelligent education will not suffice. We have had that, and we have found it merely "a means of sharpening tools in the ever-increasing competition of the world." It has given us machines, and they "seem to have become our masters."

It is, then, by coöperation, in which an enlightened individualism would tend towards a stable social condition, by the elevation of women and by education, that the social difficulties are to be solved. We must not rest content with a "land of settled government;" at the same time we must be careful to use the material at hand for the construction of an ideal state of industry. In the opinion of the author all the struggles of the industrial mind can be used, and "Individualism, co-operation, trade-unionism, and the various forms of municipal and state control are alike necessary for the social and industrial organization of the future." He has in his study reached very much the same conclusion as that with which Richard T. Ely closes his able work, "The Labour Movement in America": "In the harmonious action of State, Church, and Individual, moving in the light of true science, will be found an escape from present and future social dangers."

The book must help all readers. It is written with con-

* "The Evolution of Industry." By Henry Dyer. New York: Macmillan & Co. Toronto: The Copp, Clark Co., Ltd.