

this expectation is disappointed by the author's conclusion that such a permanent international tribunal, able to judge successfully in all cases between nations, cannot be hastily erected by one conference of nations or even by one generation of humanity—but rather must result from a series of unsuccessful attempts.

The author explains that shortly before the World War he began this study to secure argument in favor of the early creation of a supreme court of nations as the easiest means of insuring international peace, but that he was gradually forced through his investigations to recognize limitations to the possibilities of such a tribunal.

The lack of some external force to drive selfish, earthly peoples to remain united he regards as the great difficulty in enforcing world peace. In the existence of the two sets of primary questions, *political* as well as *legal*, he indicates the crucial problem in establishing a world court. He doubts whether a world supreme court would have been more successful than a Hague tribunal *ad hoc* in composing the quarrel which precipitated the war of 1914, and concludes that the only way to compel obedience to decisions of a world court in all cases is to develop an international executive with enough power to enforce the decisions.

Mr. Balch urges that friends of peace "instead of trying to end war for all time by one stroke of magic by merely urging the erection of a Supreme Court of the World and a League of Nations to support it", should aim in a practical way to curtail by slow degrees the occurrences producing war, seek to eliminate probable sources of future wars, and try to transfer gradually as many as possible of political questions into the realm of legal questions.

J. M. CALLAHAN.

Why We Went to War. By Christian Gauss, Professor of Modern Languages in Princeton University. (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1918, pp. xi, 386, \$1.50.) "As an American of South German blood," writes Professor Gauss, "I confess readily to an inherited dislike and distrust of the Prussian. . . . For this reason, in dealing with the immediate causes of the war, in my desire to be fair I have treated the evidence the more scrupulously." His volume substantiates both the confession and the claim. As his title implies, it is our entrance into the war which constitutes the chief theme of the work. Thus, seven of the ten chapters deal with the relations of the United States to the war, from the period of Strict Neutrality (ch. IV.) to the Final Challenge (ch. X.). He demonstrates at length that there is "absolutely no basis of fact for the accusation that in our interpretation of our rights as neutrals we favored England as against Germany; an excellent case could be made out to prove the contrary". The Cause of the World War is compressed into a single chapter of twenty pages (ch. II.). The result is that the historical background of the war is of a somewhat sketchy character. The description of Fundamental Antagonisms (ch.

I.), is, however, unusually good. It is in the conception of *das Deutschtum* that Professor Gauss finds

the secret of this war, of its deep-rooted origin, its progress, and its continuance . . . as the Mohammedan fought and died for Islam, the German is fighting for *das Deutschtum*. It explains Nietzsche and *Kultur*; it explains Pan-Germanism; it explains the push into the Balkans and the Bagdad Bahn. . . . *Das Deutschtum* is above our ideas of right and wrong. It is beyond good and evil. . . . It is the mystic conception of the mission, the power, and the privileges of the German people, which is to be realized by the German state.

Except for the "mass of the population which does not think", and another group, a numerically large but "fairly impotent party of protest", Professor Gauss holds these ideas to have been the property of the German people generally as well as of their rulers. Thus, as he says in his preface: "I have done what Burke said he did not know how to do. I have drawn up an indictment against a whole people for their complicity in the crimes of the rulers whom they have accepted." That is why, writing before August, 1918, he thought we should not hope for any revolt against the Kaiser.

In addition to older sources of information, Professor Gauss makes good use of the newer ones also, the Lichnowsky and Mühlen revelations, along with the pamphlets of the Committee on Public Information. The materials are handled with skill and sobriety of judgment, and the result is for the American general reader or younger student one of the best volumes on the war.

SAMUEL B. HARDING.

CORRECTION

It has always been the practice of this journal to leave to reviewers entire freedom in the expression of their opinions respecting books which have been entrusted to them. To interfere with such freedom is to substitute the opinion of a managing editor for that of a reviewer chosen for a special competence, in a particular field, which the managing editor cannot pretend to possess, and is inappropriate to the conduct of a journal which has no doctrinal line of "editorial policy" to maintain—no policy but to give catholic admittance to all varieties of historical opinion. It is not, however, the intention of the *Review* to include in its book-notices judgments upon the ability or standing of the writers of books reviewed, except in so far as these may be inferred from the criticisms of the books themselves, the proper subject-matter of such contributions.

In a review of Mr. Edward Porritt's *Evolution of the Dominion of Canada*, on p. 287 of our last issue, the signalizing of several passages declared to be erroneous is preceded by the statement that "Mr. Porritt's familiarity with Canadian history is hardly such as to justify him in writing about it". The remark was intended by the reviewer to be prefatory to the recital of errors, and to be taken in close connection therewith, quite as if the sentence had ended with the additional words, "as witness the following passages, to wit". The managing editor so understood the statement. It has however been pointed out to us that some readers may, by considering it apart from all context, have taken it as a general declaration, not founded on the book. Such readers might justly regard it as violating the rule of practice described above. In that case we should wish to offer our sincere apologies for the ambiguity (for which the reviewer shares our regret) and for our inadvertence in publishing a statement open to misconstruction if not taken in what we conceive to be its natural sense. Mr. Porritt's reading in Canadian history is known to us to be extensive.

Again, the statement that "Everywhere he [Mr. Porritt] relies on secondary authorities, not always of a trustworthy nature", is to be taken as expressing the reviewer's judgment that such reliance is to be found in all parts of the book (as when one says, for instance, "Everywhere in the city one finds wooden houses"), and we should wish to apologize if any reader has thought the sentence to imply that no use had been made of primary authorities, for in fact a great many, perhaps most, of Mr. Porritt's citations are to sources of that class.

J. F. JAMESON,
Managing Editor.