

In *La Question d'Afrique* (Paris, Librairie Félix Alcan, 1918; xi, 391 pp.), Professor Raymond Ronze seeks to explain the share of African problems in bringing on the Great War. To this end he has traced the relations of Europe and the Dark Continent from their origins up to 1914, successively increasing the amount of space devoted to the later periods, so that rather more than half of the work is taken up with an account of the developments since 1885. In view of the fact that many excellent treatises have been written on specific portions of the general subject, the author has tried to synthesize them and make a connected story. As might be supposed, the work of France bulks large in the treatment, but without being assigned an emphasis altogether inordinate. The main thesis laid down is that just as there has been an Eastern Question, Near and Far, so there will be an African Question, which must be settled either by co-operation among the European nations now holding nearly all of Africa or by the inhabitants of the continent themselves, in proportion as they rise to a consciousness of the power of numbers reinforced by intelligence and by material means of defence. Because of the abundance of books that dilate upon the various phases of international politics, it seems unfortunate that Professor Ronze has not discussed at length the extent to which the process of Europeanization hitherto carried on among the natives has imbued them, or seems likely to imbue them, with an appreciation of the right and the ability to order their own destinies. To this aspect of the matter, however, he assigns barely a dozen pages of epilogue.

A very convenient index to the problems that have beset the deliberations of the Peace Conference is that furnished by Lothrop Stoddard and Glenn Frank in *Stakes of the War* (New York, The Century Co., 1918; xiv, 377 pp.). Dividing the geographical field into western, northern and eastern Europe, the Balkans and the Near East, along with appropriate subdivisions devoted to localities treated, it provides in each case a summary of the historical background, statistics of area and population, a survey of social, economic, political and military conditions, an account of the conflicting claims and interests involved, and a statement of the various solutions that have been proposed, as well as an estimate of their possible significance for the future. Serviceable maps and bibliographies also are supplied. An appendix on colonial problems completes the volume. The compilers, certainly, have tried to keep their viewpoint throughout impartial and objective. Their success in this respect, added to the succinct yet suitably comprehensive way in which they have presented their material, makes the book decidedly useful to the general reader.

A tardy comment on *Socialism and War* (New York, New Review Publishing Association, 1916; viii, 267 pp.), by Louis B. Boudin, may be justified on the ground that the first half of the title, though submerged by the second half when the volume appeared, has, like the infant that wails resistance to its bath, demonstrated its vitality and staying power by emerging from the ordeal refreshed and more lusty than ever. The author ascribes to economic causes the most important part in bringing about international conflicts and looks to socialism for the remedy. As a socialist, he espouses the class struggle theory of progress. All races are, so he maintains, essentially capable of developing along the lines of civilization. Differences of development are in degree, not in essential kind. As civilization improves, historic differences should disappear in a superior common type, representing a merger of "all national cultural differences . . . in a higher, pan-human culture." In looking to this end, the author assumes, necessarily, that the class struggle differs fundamentally from national struggles in that it fights not for superiority, but for equality, and seeks to destroy, not the entire order, but only certain of its evil attributes. In the present condition of things he holds that the working class of each country is vitally interested in preserving the freedom of that country from alien dominion and that the socialist is ready to go to war to defend that freedom, so that another obstacle may not be placed "in the path of the final emancipation of the entire human race from the inequalities, degradations, and miseries incident to class-society." On the same ground he rejects the theory of neutrality, while suggesting that the practical comparison of probable costs with probable results may dictate abstention in a particular instance, the criterion being always the effects on "the international working class and its struggle for emancipation." On the other hand, he maintains that, by regarding the "enemy" in any case not as a certain nation but as "a certain government, representing at most the governing class", it would be easier to make a real peace, with resumption of friendly relations and cooperation in peaceful pursuits. Perhaps it is not out of place to remark that the old nationalist conquerors were much in the habit of proclaiming to their enemies that they came "not to make war upon the people, but only upon the government", but the distinction did not save the "people", after the "government" was gone, from loss of territory and the imposition of indemnities.

Two years ago Harvard University appointed a committee on economic research, of which Professor Charles J. Bullock was chairman.