

For Lippmann is a Platonist. He begins with a reference to Plato's theory of ideas. He closes with an endorsement of Plato's plea for a government of philosopher-kings. The modern philosopher-king, however, is to be no superswordsman, like Plato's selected guardians, but a kind of superstatistician.

Many modern Platonists seem to misunderstand the other great fountain of political theory, Aristotle. Lippmann quotes Aristotle only once, and then he quotes Aristotle's defence of slavery only to condemn it. But it is possible to understand Aristotle's defence of slavery, not as a feeble attempt to justify the then existing institution, but as a radical attack upon it. For Aristotle justifies the enslavement only of those whom nature has designed for slavery, and it is clear that he did not deem these identical with the actual slaves of his time. So today the existing wage system can be justified, if at all, only upon the Aristotelian logic. But the critic must not disparage the work of the Platonist on the ground that he is not an Aristotelian. Lippmann's is a true masterpiece. It will give much aid and comfort to all teachers of political science, and there will be no fairer test of the quality of their instruction than to ascertain whether their pupils find the reading of it a pleasurable and a profitable exercise.

The author's concern is primarily with the sources and process of formulating public opinion rather than with its content or manner of expression. If space permitted it would be interesting to compare his definition and treatment with earlier discussions by Bryce, Dicey and Lowell, and the more recent work of A. B. Hall on *Popular Government*. Bryce and Lowell are quoted, but there is no reference to Dicey.

A. N. HOLCOMBE.

*Harvard University.*

*The Conduct of American Foreign Relations.* By JOHN MABRY MATHEWS. (New York: The Century Company. 1922. Pp. xi, 353.)

Foreign relations have so long been a subject for historical treatment that this volume by Professor Mathews breaks new ground. The purpose of the work is to consider the foreign relations of the United States from the standpoint of political science. A great number of topics have been arranged with sound judgment and discussed in an interesting manner. One should not be disappointed if he does not find the finished style that marks the volumes of Trescott or the fullness

of treatment which John Bassett Moore bestows upon the fundamental problems of American diplomacy in his most recent book. Neither is necessary to the achievement of Professor Mathews' purpose.

The really important chapters outline the governmental organization for the conduct of foreign affairs, set forth the problems of diplomatic intercourse, and consider from the standpoint of constitutional law as well as political practice the various phases of the treaty-making power. Diplomatic events furnish illustrations of the principles under discussion. There is always a danger of repetition in the topical treatment of numerous subjects, a fault from which the book is not wholly free.

The dictum of Jefferson that "the transaction of business with foreign nations is executive altogether" is transformed in this volume into a conclusion that the presidential office is fundamentally and intrinsically better adapted than a legislative body for the control of foreign relations. But the author suggests that "it may, however, be not only a necessity of practical politics, but also a moral duty of the President, so far to coöperate with the other branch of the treaty-making power as to consult with the Senate, or at least to take into his confidence influential members of the foreign relations committee, during the course of important negotiations" (p. 151). The debate between Senator Bacon and Senator Spooner in 1906, in which the former contended that the rights of the Senate extend to all stages of a treaty negotiation, while the latter insisted that these rights were restricted to the stage between the affixing of signatures to a treaty and its ratification, is correctly estimated as involving no necessary conflict between what were once thought opposing views (p. 138). Legal control by the Senate can be exercised only in the final stages incidental to ratification. The position of Senator Bacon can mean only that the Senate is free to proffer advice to the President at any stage in the negotiation of a treaty. But anyone can do this. It is the fact that such advice proceeds from the body which will subsequently be called upon to ratify the action of the President that gives it weight.

The volume is well documented and shows painstaking investigation. It will not only be helpful to the reader who desires to find the specific principles which determine the course of governmental action in the conduct of foreign affairs, but will prove of value in connection with college courses in diplomacy and international relations.

WILLIAM S. CARPENTER.

*Princeton University.*

*The History and Nature of International Relations.* Edited by EDMUND A. WALSH. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1922. Pp. xvi, 299.)

The contents of this volume may be divided into four parts. There are two papers dealing with the development of international organization in the past—one on international organization and practice in antiquity, by Professor Rostovzeff of Wisconsin, formerly of the University of Petrograd; and one on mediaeval diplomacy, by Professor C. J. H. Hayes. There are four papers on the structure and methods of international governmental relations in our own time, including two papers by Dr. James Brown Scott and Professor John Bassett Moore. These six papers constitute two-thirds of the whole book. There follow a paper on the content of international economic relations by Professor Laughlin and three papers on the content of international political relations—Latin-America, the Far East, the United States—by Drs. Rowe, Reinsch, and Borchard. The last three papers occupy about one-third of the volume, the essay on economic relations being very short, not, presumably, because there was some desire to neglect the economic foundations of international relations, as one irate economist seems recently to have supposed, but because the students in the School of Foreign Service at Georgetown, where these papers were originally read, have a full training in international economic relations as a part of their regular work.

It is, of course, no reflection upon any of the authors of these various papers to point out that, to the average reader, certain of them are of much greater value than others, or, rather, that just at the present time it is especially desirable to have published such papers as those dealing with the methods of international government which are available for settling the various economic and political controversies arising among the nations. Granted the existence of the latter, and irrespective of their exact content at any one time or in any particular case, what we need is a study of the machinery and procedure necessary for their regulation and control. Hence the value of the six papers first mentioned.

It is to be hoped that such propagandist utterances as those in the third and fourth paragraphs of the preface and in the appendix will not be too common in subsequent numbers of the Georgetown Foreign Service Series.

PITMAN B. POTTER.

*University of Wisconsin.*