

trinal animosity—throws star-shells of trenchant criticism into the German social-democratic camp that illumine for the American reader some of the obscurer passages of political thought and action in the Central Powers during the period when the German revolution was incubating among the masses unfathered and unrecognized by its natural protectors.

VICTOR S. CLARK.

Japan or Germany: the Inside Story of the Struggle in Siberia. By Frederic Coleman, F.R.G.S. (New York, George H. Doran Company, 1918, pp. xi, 232, \$1.35.) This little volume, written by a journalist in a loose, conversational style, contains much general information, more or less disconnected, and a certain amount of current public opinion of Japan and the Pri-Amur region for the year 1917. The purpose of the book seems to have been to show that unless Japan intervened in Siberia Germany would get control. The first fourth of the book deals with the political forces and ideals of modern Japan and the remaining three-fourths with the conditions in eastern Siberia.

Now that the war is over Germany's menace in Asia is no longer a live question, but Japan's intervention is a fact of immediate importance. Some of us would like to know what attitude the Japanese government has toward Siberia, but the book does not enlighten us on this point. To the question which the author raises, "Should Japan go to Siberia?" he replies,

By all means Yes, emphatically Yes, if she goes in the right spirit, and if when she goes a campaign of education and explanation goes with her. If Japan is merely to go to guard a pile of stores from the Huns, or even to prevent Bolsheviki disruption along the path of the Trans-Siberian, and the echo of the tramp of her legions bears no other significance than these, then No, a thousand times No.

Did Japan go "in the right spirit"? It is exceedingly difficult to answer this question from the book. On one page it tells us that Japan is materialistic, imperialistic, self-seeking, and on another page that Japan will not seize territory in Siberia. The author is lavish with strong statements, but he qualifies them in such a way that they lose their force and the reader is left in mid-air. When, however, Mr. Coleman discusses the Russian bourgeois he is quite sure of himself, and with one sweep of his brush he paints the countless brands of Russian bourgeois so black that he would rather be a Bolshevik than a bourgeois. It is a pity that the author with his ability to collect current opinion had not a better background for his Asiatic studies, for he could have made a really valuable book.

F. A. GOLDER.

Source Problems in American History. By Andrew C. McLaughlin, William E. Dodd, Marcus W. Jernegan, and Arthur P. Scott, of the Department of History of the University of Chicago. (New York and

London, Harper and Brothers, 1918, pp. xii, 512, \$1.30.) This book is one among several evidences that we are making progress in teaching history. For it shows that some college teachers are frankly and fearlessly accepting the "problem" method.

The problems, for the study of which source-material is provided in this volume, are, 1, the Battle of Lexington; 2, the Preliminaries of the Revolution; 3, the Power of the Court to Declare a Law Unconstitutional; 4, Religious Toleration and Freedom in Virginia; 5, Relation of Eastern States to the Development of the West; 6, the Slavery Problem; 7, Fort Sumter and the Outbreak of the Civil War. In the view of the editors, "Five of the seven problems . . . are of very profound significance in American history. . . . Two of the problems are chosen partly because of their continuing interest, partly because they give exceptional opportunity to weigh evidence and ponder probability." The reference is to numbers 1 and 7. The first of these is practically designed to enable students to evaluate the evidence on the question "who fired the first shot at Lexington"; the last to understand what might be termed the diplomacy antecedent to the Civil War.

Preliminary to the presentation of the documentary matter in each case, the editors provide an introductory statement under the caption, the Historical Setting of the Problem. There is also, in each case, an Introduction to the Sources, and a group of Questions and Suggestions for Study.

The several introductions constitute original contributions of considerable value, though they are not uniform in scope or in thoroughness. Mr. Jernegan's contributions are both longer and more complete than the others.

The illustrative documents seem to have been selected with care and the questions and suggestions have considerable pedagogical value.

The book arouses in the mind of a teacher the feeling of grateful appreciation because it facilitates the reorientation of historical teaching in colleges, so widely recognized as necessary if social studies are to fulfill their normal function.

The plan of manufacture of the series makes the book a little book and a cheap book—two decided advantages. One does not look for minor errors; if such exist the editors will find and correct them before reprinting the book. But from the reviewer's point of view, it would be hard to write an essay on religious toleration and freedom in colonial Virginia without at least a mention of colonial Rhode Island, and it would seem risky to write on the slavery problem without recognizing the existence of the Garrisonian movement, whatever the final verdict on that movement.

The editors admit that the first problem, who fired the first shot at Lexington, is not of great historical significance. One wonders why, under the circumstances, some other more important problem should not hereafter take its place.