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If this little book did no more than to furnish a brief and clear summary and criticism of legal rights according to Stammler and Kohler, it would be a great service to the profession. Both Stammler and Kohler have just claims to the title of "philosopher"; and both Stammler and Kohler were trained in the law so that they were professional lawyers as well. Indeed in the case of Kohler it must be conceded that he was a philosopher who had a remarkable accomplishment in the field of legal work both in writing on straight legal subjects and the holding of judicial office. He brought all his professional learning and his professional experience to his work as a legal philosopher where he could synthesize his vast data for his philosophic product. Professor Hocking, who is a philosopher without being a technically trained lawyer, approaches these two men and analyzes their doctrines with a completeness, and simplicity, and mastery that has not been given to their writings hitherto. Professor Hocking does not make his conclusions so guarded as to render them meaningless. He is courageous in fixing upon the points at issue and separating them from the other material. He clearly and simply places the differences side by side and evaluates the conclusions of each.

But we are not to assume from Professor Hocking's modest title and the brevity of his book that it contains only a discussion of the work of others. Indeed most of the book is given over to a development of Professor Hocking's own theory of rights. He takes the position that rights in contemplation of law are presumptive rights and that presumptive rights cover what the law expects may be true in the future although it is conceded not true at present. Thus he indicates that the law presupposes equality of man and reasonable actions under given circumstances, although it is well known that men are not equal and do not act reasonably under all circumstances. Professor Hocking considers that any determination of legal rights or values upon the past or upon the present is inevitably inadequate and erroneous. "Man never is but always to be blessed." Thus we are told that the important thing is not the rights that we have had in the past or the present interests that require protection, but rather what is necessary for the future development of individual man. Thus the one inevitable natural right that every man has is the right to his own fullest development. Professor Hocking says that we must talk in terms of absolute rights and that in so far as man has an absolute right to his own development, it can never be curtailed. He indicates, however, that the absolute rights of a man to his own fullest development could never interfere with the fundamental social developments in the future. Perhaps it may be suggested that a contest between these two will at least appear to exist when particular problems come up for decision; consequently the judge and the lawyers will have to make a decision between the apparent claims or absolute rights in the individual and the apparent conflicting claims of society. It seems that for one to say that individual rights and social interests will never conflict does not necessarily prevent them from conflicting at least in appearance if not abstractly. And if it is mere appearance, this remains the great difficulty, for the courts to decide actual cases as they appear at the time of decision, and if the philosopher gives the court no guide by which he can resolve this apparent conflict there is little to be gained by assert-
ing an abstract harmony. Then, of course, if we concede that it is im-
portant to consider man’s further development as a part of his legal claim
we have still the question of what particular development he is entitled to
and how to prevent one kind of development over another. Thus one’s
fullest development may turn him into a saint or a murderer and it is
for the law to decide which shall be approved. We must have some guide
for preventing one kind of development or the other and Professor Hock-
ing does not give us this except in so far as he says that the individual
must have his fullest mental and moral development. Of course “mental”
and “moral” are vast words which are not helpful in the work of the law
unless the philosopher puts some content into them. Perhaps we may feel
that the lack of content in these concepts leaves us in fact much the same
uncertainty which Professor Hocking complains of in other philosophies
of law.
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With the December issue the North Carolina Law Review begins a new
volume and a new plan of publication. The reader notices one of the
changes as soon as he sees the cover for no table of contents is indicated
on the cover but the periodical appears with a cover indicating only the
name of the review and presenting the university seal. A complete table
of contents is given on one of the inside pages. This table of contents is
admirably full, giving the subjects of each of the editorial notes and each
of the recent case comments together with the name of the book, and the
author, and the review in the case of book reviews. One feature of this
review which is perhaps unique is the department entitled “Open Court” in
which correspondence is printed dealing with legal questions, especially
questions dealing with active practice. Through the generous co-operation
of the University of North Carolina the Law School is able to mail the
Law Review to every lawyer in the state without charge. It would seem
that the North Carolina Bar Association should co-operate with the Law
School in carrying some of this expense. It is a fortunate thing that the
University has the money to render this service to the profession through-
out the state. In any case, regardless of who carries the expense, it would
surely be fortunate if the organized bar in North Carolina would take an
active part in furthering the interests of the North Carolina Law Review.

The December issue contains four articles that seems to be of good
quality and in addition it contains three editorial notes on important legal
questions and seven recent case comments on decisions that are important
for that jurisdiction. All of the editorial notes and the recent case com-
ments are signed by the writers and all of them are written by students
of the Law School. This is an admirable accomplishment. It is usual in
most Law Schools for the editorial notes to be written by members of the
faculty or of the active bar. The student editors of the North Carolina
Law Review deserve great credit for doing so much work of good quality.
The reader notices that there is only one book review, but this review is
printed in regular sized type and is a thorough piece of work. The promi-
nence given this book review seems an admirable innovation. No doubt the
editors plan to have a larger number of book reviews in the future.
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