

may be highly suggestive in such cases, but the results need to be stated with more reserve than the author seems to think necessary. A few bits of direct evidence are indeed offered to support a psychopathic interpretation, as, for instance, a "constitutional tremulousness of voice and hand"; but they seem hardly sufficient for a confident diagnosis. Is not Mr. Harlow's formula too simple for the complexities of history and human personality? Does it quite adequately explain the place which Adams occupied in the estimation of his neighbors and contemporaries?

In his rather cavalier treatment of the American Whig argument, particularly on the constitutional side, the author is in excellent company; but there is somewhat more to be said for the American case than the reader of this book would suspect. Students who wish to know this "other side", as presented by a thoroughly competent scholar should consult McIlwain's *The American Revolution; a Constitutional Interpretation*.

It would be unfair to close this review without a more positive appreciation of what the author has done. Indeed one of the chief reasons why one regrets the over-positive reiteration of what can at best only be regarded as possible, or probable, interpretations is that it tends to obscure the merits of a really able book, based upon extensive and thorough research, and throwing new light in several directions on the processes through which political controversy developed into revolution. The style is clear, vigorous and distinctly readable.

EVARTS B. GREENE

Political Action. By SEBA ELDRIDGE. With an Introduction by Edward A. Hayes. Philadelphia, J. B. Lippincott, 1924.—xviii, 382 pp.

Professor Eldridge strikes out into new fields in his attempt to apply the "naturalistic method of inquiry" to the economic and political struggles between labor and capital. By "naturalistic method" the author means a method of inquiry which appraises the net effect of hereditary traits, physical environment, traditions and intellectual processes on a social situation. The main part of his book was begun prior to the recent controversy between the "behaviorists" and the followers of McDougall. Professor Eldridge thus makes much of the instincts or instinctive tendencies catalogued by the McDougall school—the instincts of hunger, fear, repulsion, pugnacity, the sex and parental instincts, acquisitiveness, self-assertion, submissiveness, curi-

osity, constructiveness and the play tendencies—and attempts to show the result of the interplay of these tendencies on the economic struggle in contemporary life.

His analysis leads him to the conclusion that “all attempts to bring about an harmonious cooperation between the capitalist and the labor classes are doomed to failure”, and that indications point to the gradual ascendancy of labor over the capitalistic group. “Judging from historical experience, however, that would not mean the total disappearance of private capitalism”, Professor Eldridge continues, “but only its relegation to a subordinate place in the economic system.”

Applying the same method of analysis to radical political action, Professor Eldridge sees little hope of social transformation through a labor party. The dominant press, according to the author, will be able to prevent a large proportion of the laboring class, tied down by habit and tradition, from seeing where their interests lie. Farmers and small tradesmen will be more easily deterred, while court decisions will render many legislative victories worthless. Labor will probably resort to other weapons, as, for instance, the general strike, in order to obtain a shift of power, though political action may *register* that shift.

Professor Eldridge claims that “liberals” (as opposed to conservatives on the one hand and radicals on the other) have failed to adopt a scientific attitude toward progress. They have fondly imagined that social behavior is largely determined by the processes of reason, whereas it is a result of “habit, tradition, suggestion, class interest and other facts having little or nothing in common with reason”. Liberals should thus think and talk much more in terms of interest and power and much less in terms of ideas and ideals. He further maintains that most liberals who speak of “freedom of discussion” as a means of progress are disregarding the fact that if one is to secure *positive* freedom of discussion, “equally large and constant audiences must be available to rival ideas and programs,” and that such is far from the case at present.

In his introduction, Professor Hayes, the editor of the Lippincott series, agrees with the author in his contention that our so-called political democracy has not provided for the *formation* of a public will in accordance with justice and experience, but only for the means of *expressing* that public will through the ballot. As a practical step toward a *positive* freedom of discussion he tentatively suggests a constitutional requirement that :

every newspaper attaining a given circulation should pay for the most valuable of all franchises and give a guarantee for its share in the greatest of all powers, by placing certain space in every issue at the disposal of each of the four political parties that cast the largest votes in the preceding state election. . . . The deadliest of all monopolies—the monopoly of access to the mind—would be overthrown, and a habit of the public would be developed which in itself might solve the unsolved problem of the technique of democracy, prevent revolution, and assure orderly progress.

Exception will undoubtedly be taken to many of Professor Eldridge's conclusions. The "behaviorists" will insist that too much weight has been given to inherited tendencies, not enough to environmental factors. The political radical will point out that, despite the obstacles in the way, the success of a labor party is in the realm of *Realpolitik*. The farmers have shown that they are capable of uniting with labor. The victories of labor in Great Britain and in a number of American states against the combined opposition of the press have indicated that the press is not all-powerful in molding opinion. More enlightened judges can be appointed. A third party need not obtain an absolute majority in order to effect political changes. The conservatives and liberals will object that a number of conclusions reached are based on inadequate data.

But despite detailed criticisms, all students of politics must unite in congratulating the author on his pioneer work of attempting to obtain an objective and scientific view of all of the forces making for fundamental social change, and of endeavoring to consider this problem in the light of the latest discoveries in economics, sociology and psychology. It is hoped that the author may be able to deal in a similar fashion with economic action and the class conflict, and that other students may be stimulated to investigate this fascinating field.

HARRY W. LAIDLER

NEW YORK CITY.

My Rhineland Journal. By HENRY T. ALLEN, Major-General, U. S. A. Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1923.—xvi, 593 pp.

Many of the actors, both civil and military, in the great world tragedy of 1914-1918 have presented to the world their apologies for the parts which they played in it. Most of these productions have been characterized by special pleading, and many have not risen above the level of partisan propaganda. It is a relief, therefore, to find a man who played a distinguished part, both as soldier and diplo-