

Between Two Fires

COLLECTIVISM, A FALSE UTOPIA.

By William Henry Chamberlin. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1937. \$2.

ANARCHY OR HIERARCHY. By S. de Madariaga. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1937. \$2.50.

Reviewed by JOHN C. DEWILDE

MR. CHAMBERLIN and Señor de Madariaga are kindred spirits. Both refuse to accept fascism and communism as the only possible alternatives confronting the present-day world. De Madariaga belongs to that large number of Spaniards who have little sympathy for either side in the current civil war and can share his melancholy observation that "the true sense of mental and general liberty is absent from both, so that, now as in the sixteenth century, men of the Erasmian type can but look on and wonder into which of the two abysses their own sweet liberty is to be precipitated." Mr. Chamberlin has resided in the Soviet Union and Germany, and rejects all "totalitarian" state philosophies on the basis of his own experience. His book complements admirably the study by de Madariaga. While the former concentrates on "debunking" collectivism, the latter seeks primarily to show how public life can be reformed without sacrificing liberty and democracy.

In his indictment of collectivism Mr. Chamberlin finds little justification for distinguishing between fascism and communism. While the two may be at opposite poles in theory, he believes they are largely identical in practice. Their methods certainly have much in common: "Killings of political opponents, wholesale consignment of 'counter-revolutionaries' to concentration camps, extension of the number of offenses for which the death penalty is inflicted, punishment of individuals for the offenses of relatives and friends, complete repression of freedom of press, speech and assembly, regimentation of art and culture to serve the purposes of the ruling party: what item in this list is not just as characteristic of the Soviet Union as of Germany and Italy?" All three regimes show a similar tendency to sacrifice the immediate comfort and welfare of the people either to military ambitions or to grandiose schemes of economic reconstruction which are supposed to benefit future generations. Although the Soviet Union has actually socialized the means of production, the fascist states have had a similar aim in regimenting and directing economic activity. In Mr. Chamberlin's opinion, neither system has really enhanced the material well-being of the people.

Mr. Chamberlin believes that the accomplishments of democracy can stand comparison with those of dictatorships.

He pours scorn on those intellectuals who are "ready to sacrifice liberty lightly on the altar of some doctrinaire blueprint of the perfect state, drawn up in accordance with fascist or communist specifications." Yet he does not ignore the weaknesses of democracy. His suggestions for improving it, however, lack the philosophical depth and wisdom of those advanced by de Madariaga.

"Anarchy or Hierarchy" is a book that merits wide reading. Although a devotee of liberty, the author frankly analyzes the defects of liberal democracy as it is practised today.

Liberty understood as an absolutely individualistic right and extended to many individuals incapable of adminis-



SALVADOR DE MADARIAGA Flinn

tering it, or indifferent to the duties which it implies; equality, felt as a leveling agent, inimical by instinct to all hierarchy, to all specialization, to all competence, and even to all natural difference; democracy, transformed from the ideal and normative plane of aims to the immediate and empirical plane of methods; capitalism, left free to roam in search of its prey and allowed to fall back on the State for help when its chase has proved too dangerous; labour, convinced that in it resides the productive power of the nation and resentful of the other classes as despoilers of its own property—

all these forces are gnawing at the vitals of democratic institutions.

Señor de Madariaga believes in an hierarchical, organic democracy. Such a democracy would naturally consist of three classes. The lowest would be "the people" who possess little individual responsibility and who should not have rights of "active citizenship" because they easily fall prey to demagogues and may thus bring about the suppression of that liberty which the democratic state must preserve. The second class would be constituted by the bourgeoisie who are the active political participants in state life

and the intelligent technicians of democracy. And the aristocracy would form the highest group, the class of talented leaders and statesmen.

No one would quarrel with the thesis that only the politically conscious and intelligent elements should exercise political rights, or that an "aristocracy of talent" should be the real rulers. The difficulty lies in applying these principles. Señor de Madariaga does not contend that the actual class divisions correspond to the "natural" categories he suggests, although he believes that such is practically the case in Great Britain. He offers no criterion for the selection of the body of "active citizens" who will have the right to participate in political life. And with respect to the aristocracy, de Madariaga writes: "No one appoints, elects or chooses the aristocrat. He knows himself to be one because he hears himself called to his high and arduous endeavour by an internal voice—his vocation." Certainly the leaders of fascist Italy and Germany, and of communist Russia have also heard this "internal voice"! Señor de Madariaga ably distinguishes between "numerical" and "organic" democracy, between anarchic and true liberty, but he is no more successful than his many predecessors in devising the instruments and machinery to translate the ideal into reality.

John C. deWilde is on the staff of the Foreign Policy Association.

Belated Justice to an Unknown Patriot

OLIVER POLLOCK: THE LIFE AND TIMES OF AN UNKNOWN PATRIOT.

By James Alton James. New York: D. Appleton-Century Co. 1937. \$4.

Reviewed by ALLAN NEVINS

THE word unknown is correct; who ever heard of Oliver Pollock? Yet Dr. James's biography is an important new ray of light on the early history of the Old Northwest and Southwest, and on the American Revolution. Indeed, it is the weightiest addition to our knowledge of the role of the West in the Revolution since the publication of Alvord's "Mississippi Valley in British Politics" and Dr. James's own exhaustive life of George Rogers Clark.

Pollock, a Scotch-Irishman who had migrated to Pennsylvania in 1760 at the age of twenty-three, is memorable as one of the hitherto-obscure cast who aided that footlight hero George Rogers Clark in the conquest of the West. One by one the chief figures of the group have been made known—Col. Francis Vigo, Indian trader in the Illinois villages; Captain James Willing, leader of a bold raid down the Mississippi to lay waste British plantations. But Pollock now emerges as the greatest of them all. The outbreak of the Revolution found him in New Orleans, a

highly successful merchant, trader, and planter, the representative of the great Philadelphia firm of Willing & Morris, and on intimate terms with Spanish officials, who granted him contracts and entrusted him with funds for investment. Worth at least \$100,000, commanding credit to a quarter of a million, he was easily foremost among the New Orleans traders. In 1776 he resolved to support the Revolution by personal aid and by winning assistance from the Spanish Government. Dr. James cannot explain his motives, but the Quebec Act must have played a part in them. His aid proved of far-reaching importance. He communicated with Congress; obtained gunpowder from the Spaniards; shipped supplies upstream to Pittsburgh; by sending goods enabled American agents to cope with the British for control of the Northwestern tribes; and in 1778 gave Clark indispensable support. Neither Clark nor Gov. Patrick Henry had spared much thought for the supplying of their hastily-organized expedition. When Clark's ready money was exhausted he relied chiefly on drafts upon the willing Pollock. In the vital six months of 1778 which brought Vincennes, Kaskaskia, and Cahokia under American control, Pollock furnished Clark \$18,000 in credit. To hold the country thereafter he furnished far more. And when the British counter-attacked from Detroit, "Pollock was the magic word" which held the French habitants in line.

The common fault of such books as this is that they exaggerate the services of the hero. Mr. James's monograph is not open to this charge; he tells an unvarnished tale, fully documented, and conservative in statement. Thus soberly told, it is all the more impressive. A somewhat digressive chapter discusses the old question whether the British in the Treaty of 1783 gave the United States the Northwest because Clark had conquered a corner (none too firmly held) of it, or because British statesmen were generous. Alvord and Solon J. Buck have leaned to the view that Clark's expedition had but slight and indirect influence on the peace treaty; Dr. James offers some new evidence for believing the influence was large and direct. Later chapters describe Pollock's harrowing financial difficulties after the war, and the tardy and incomplete payment of his claims by the Federal Government and the State of Virginia. He suffered the ingratitude that the young republic meted out to many of its early financial helpers. But this scholarly and interesting volume at last does justice to "a patriot," as Dr. James says, "whose eagerness to serve and willingness to suffer . . . for his country have not been surpassed in our history."

It may be added that an appendix, based upon Pollock's accounts in New Orleans, offers indisputable evidence that our dollar mark evolved from the abbreviation for pesos; the two letters Ps, with the 's' superimposed upon the P, gradually becoming the sign '\$'.

Making a Hero

LORD BOTHWELL AND MARY QUEEN OF SCOTS. By Robert Gore-Browne. New York: Doubleday, Doran & Company. 1937. \$4.

Reviewed by CHARLES DAVID ABBOTT

HISTORIANS are seldom unanimous in their verdicts. They are particularly apt to disagree in their judgments of individuals: one man's hero is another man's scoundrel. But they have been pretty consistently of one mind in their attitude towards James Hepburn, fourth Earl of Bothwell. During the three and a half centuries which have passed since his death, he has figured in their pages as the lowest of traitors, a black-guard with a reputation so unsavory that epithets nasty enough to do him justice were impossible to find. At long last, however, he has in Mr. Gore-Browne an apologist and a defender who is suspicious of so much unanimity and who has been bold enough to work his way through all the clouds of vilification down to the solid earth of the facts as contemporary sources display them.

The obvious flaw in the historians' Bothwell is that he is too bad to be true. Not nature, but man's imagination alone, could produce such a monster. For his creation Mr. Gore-Browne very acutely finds a reason: "the urge," he says, "which forces historians alternatively to blacken or to glorify the memory of the Queen of Scots, has embittered their judgment of her third husband. Since he shared her downfall, a chorus of reprobation suits

both camps. The enemies of the Queen hope to blast her reputation by linking her with the villain of a Hollywood melodrama, while Mariolaters are glad to find a scapegoat." And so was born the legend of the nefarious Earl, the legend which Mr. Gore-Browne undertakes to dissipate in this book. He brings to the test of reason all the contradictory evidence which files of state documents, letters, and memoirs yield; with rigorous justice he sifts the true from the false, and reinterprets the provable facts to present a Bothwell who, if no saint, is at least a credible human being.

Loyalty was his besetting virtue. In an age when success waited upon the Machiavellian policies of Elizabeth and Cecil and Maitland, he possessed no understanding of their slippery and treacherous statecraft, but adhered to the principles of outworn feudal chivalry. A man of action, brave, blunt, hasty, and somewhat stupid, he was a tragic pawn in the great game which Elizabeth's ministers were playing against Spain and France. Their craft and subtlety were too much for his plain, headlong ingenuousness. Mary, to whom he was consistently, though often clumsily and tactlessly, loyal, was potentially England's greatest danger, and her downfall was essential to English policy. Unwittingly he played directly into the hands of her enemies. His stiff honesty, his forthright vigor, were untimely gifts. They paved the way for Mary's destruction. His marriage to her which, insensitive to political currents, he saw as a move necessary to her and his own safety,



A MODERN INTERPRETATION OF MARY STUART AND BOTHWELL
Helen Hayes and Philip Merivale in "Mary of Scotland" by Maxwell Anderson
(Courtesy of the Theatre Guild).

Vandamm Studio