

logical" and "cultural". If for these we substitute the more familiar terms, "heredity" and "environment" we will be able to follow the author quite as well through many an interesting speculation.

It is not a book to be disposed of in a few paragraphs even where we differ with its conclusions. It is a thoughtful and scholarly work and will repay careful reading.

*Social Change. With Respect to Culture and Original Nature. By William Fielding Ogburn, Professor of Sociology at Columbia College. 12 mo. clo. 365 pp., price \$2.00. B. W. Huebsch, New York City.

A STUDY OF HENRY FORD*

This is a study of the life and character of Henry Ford by his former pastor and one-time head of the Sociological Department of the Ford Motor Company.

Dean Marquis quotes Ford as saying: "There is nothing I want I cannot have. But I do not want the things money can buy. I want to live a life, to make the world a little better for having lived in it. The trouble with most people is that they do not think. I want to do things that will make them think."

Surely a man with such ambitions cannot go far wrong. We cannot believe that the weaknesses here attributed to Mr. Ford, or his peculiarities, will seriously affect his usefulness. The aspiration in the utterance quoted will keep him straight.

Nor are we disposed to lay much importance on his supposed intellectual shortcomings. His contempt of history has been shared by men more conspicuous for scholarship and more widely acquainted with history. Was it not Walpole who said to one who read to him in his last illness as to whether he desired history or fiction, replied, "Read me history, for that I know to be false."

The Ford Peace Ship may seem to offer a curious contradiction when we consider the practical genius of the man of business. How reconcile the idealism of this strange adventure with what we know of him as the efficient manager of the greatest industrial plant in the world?

Let us not jump to the conclusion that, impractical and even Quixotic as seemed the Ford Peace Ship, it was not without its usefulness at a time when men were more or less war-crazed. Ford did not need any advertisement, but the ideal of Peace which had departed from the world may have needed this dramatic gesture made by the first man of Business as well as the richest man in the world. Contrasted with our view of events at the time, and indeed with what appeared the rational views of human conduct, this seemed an adventure highly irrational. Yet so seems every spiritual striving when mundane things are uppermost, every attitude of prayer, every appeal to the invisible. May not the Ford Peace Ship seem in historical retrospect as an appeal to human tenderness, possessing the virtue of an invocation, a spontaneous appeal to the higher ideals of humanity where these had disappeared in a world racked with hate? Why not confess that we do not know?

One other consideration occurs to us. It by no means follows that because Mr. Ford has succeeded as a business man that therefore he would succeed as President. Nor does the reverse conclusion follow—i.e. that the qualities which have enabled him to succeed in business might not stand him in good stead as President. People have a lot of ready-made opinions and reason according to formulas. But these are wholly unsafe when applied to so extraordinary a character as Henry Ford. He does the unexpected things, but what he does is governed by a wide range of experience and a quick and agile mind. The customary formulas do not apply.

We are not booming Henry Ford for President, but we can conceive of greater national misfortunes, and we can name presidents whose achievements would not stand out in brilliant contrast to what Henry Ford might accomplish in the simplicity of his inexperience with world problems, but out of a quick and virile intellect and sympathetic nature.

Dean Marquis has made an interesting book dealing with a very interesting man. But we cannot help but feel that his analysis leaves something to be desired. He is so near the picture that something is left out. His statement, that, "No one can know Henry Ford who has

not lived for some time in his industrial family," seems to us to indicate the limitations of the writer who would place before us the true picture of Henry Ford. For it is not in this way alone that so varied a character, looked at from one single view-point, can be accurately limned. Dean Marquis has therefore presented us, despite the interest attaching to these pages, an unfinished portrait. —J. D. M.

*Henry Ford, an interpretation. By Samuel S. Marquis 12 mo. clo. 206 pp. Price \$2.50. Little, Brown & Co., Boston.

MR. FLACY TELLS IT AGAIN BUT DIFFERENTLY.*

With much simplicity of illustration, in plain language easily comprehended by the hurried business man or the worker in his few hours of leisure, Mr. Flacy has told the story of economic conditions and the cure. Our author is not an experienced writer and tells us as much. He has made no effort to clothe this thought in rounded periods. His is a plain, unvarnished tale of a man who trusts to simple words to explain simple truths.

To the Single Taxer there is nothing new in this work—to him it is the same story told in other words. But the language is modern, of the kind spoken by the "man in the street." And for this reason it has a power of its own, like the writings of Cobbett, Bunyan, Defoe, Thomas Paine—not in the same degree, of course, but measurably and efficiently.

Yet how it shames the work of the college professors who deal with the simple laws of economic science in elaborately learned treatises. How few of them would be capable of a thought like this, and how few would elect to express it as simply, or succeed in expressing it as well:

"Prescript and man-made rules which do not rest on the morals of nature are very technical and mischievous and not dependable, and place the administration of government and judiciary in a very awkward position to administer justly, and can never meet the requirements; but when desired, may be caricatured, with magic phrases, and dignity and affable composure, into almost any kind of verdict that is wished."

Mr. Flacy divides economic thinkers into two groups which he terms felicitously "artificialists" and "naturalists" and says:

"The Naturalists have a political party known as the Single Tax Party; they believe that all equitable and fundamental law can come only from the source of nature, both for individual and national life; that the injunction of the natural law and divine order must be fully obeyed in order to have equity, liberty and lasting peace and prosperity; that this is the only source that can be depended upon, as this alone can restore to man his natural inherited rights that are his by birth—his equal right to the use of the land, by which both the individual and the nation are lifted out of the deadly pit of self-defence, struggle and the strife of tooth and claw."

On the whole we heartily concur in the words of John Emerson Roberts, who writes a few words of introduction for this little work, when he says, "If a few million of people read this little book the dawn of a new and better day is at hand."—J. D. M.

*Constructive Democracy and the Science of Political Ethics. By William J. Flacy. 12 mo. clo. 188 pp. Published by the author. Box 65. Kansas City, Mo.

NATURAL LAW IN THE ECONOMIC WORLD*

In the flood of books dealing with economic questions it strikes as a bit of deliberate impertinence that these writers, for the most part, proceed with their more or less nebulous speculations as if a man known as Henry George never blazed a pathway for them. In blissful unconsciousness that the fallacies they elaborate as important discoveries have been exploded by Mr. George as the sheerest nonsense they continue their amateur maunderings, which they try to make pretentious by assumptions of scholarship and reference to books on economics as dead as Adam.

That there are natural laws in the economic world, and that one book, if not more, Henry George's "Progress and Poverty," has indicated a line of reasoning that has rendered nearly all the books on political economy wholly useless as authorities—to this they seem politely oblivious.