

profoundly the Russian willingness to abide by agreements. For different reasons, but sufficient for themselves, the Russian regime seems to have a similar mistrust of the West. These conditions, therefore, make it essential that sure guarantees of observance be provided."⁵

At several points, Mr. Clark, while insisting on the moral strength of the American position, recognizes that our suspicions may have contributed greatly to Russian suspicions of our purposes. His observations recall one of Mr. Truman's speeches in the campaign of 1948. Addressing the American Legion in Miami, the candidate in effect promised to take steps to dispel "the present poisonous atmosphere of distrust which now surrounds the negotiations between the Western Powers and the Soviet Union." Instead, he turned immediately on his inauguration to the policy of "overwhelming force" which in the past three years may have cost us the peace for which the President has worked. Mr. Clark, like Mr. Truman in 1948, seems to have isolated the general character of the phenomenon which so far has made the hope of world government a poet's enthusiasm or a lawyer's draft.

The difficulty is psychological, not administrative. The real obstacle to Mr. Clark's simple and sensible solution is that combination of pugnacity and fear, but mostly pugnacity, which contributes to the formation of suspicion. There is an occasional simple marauder in history, like Genghis Khan; but the commonest situation is one in which a number of peoples and their leaders are expressing unconscious dispositions, whether innate or conditioned, in the permitted mutual hatreds of foreigner for foreigner.

MALCOLM SHARP*

Public and Republic: Political Representation in America. By Alfred de Grazia. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1951. Pp. xiii, 262. \$3.50.

Dr. de Grazia's topic of representation is very old but also very new. We are called upon today to discuss ward representation and world representation; to discuss state representation and the national legislature; and many other diverse forms of representative agencies. We must deal with the initiative and referendum and with a hundred bewildering varieties of proportional representation. Furthermore, we must deal with private governments as well as public governments; with corporations, with unions, with countless societies, representing interests which are territorial, professional, religious, grouped in endless forms, demi- and semi-political. And again we find demands for "representation" in administrative agencies far and wide.

We may diligently inquire: just what does a representative body do? What's what and who's who in representation? In our system the executive may also be a representative. The mayor, governor, the President of the United States is

⁵ Page 66. See also pages 36, 49-50, 52, 55, 59, 62-63, 64-67, 71.

* Professor of Law, University of Chicago Law School.

each a representative of his unit taken as a whole. We have a legislative body with executive powers and an executive with veto and other legislative powers as provided in the original Constitution. In any system operating under the consent of the governed the problem is great because of the effort to deal with the community ends and means. Some may rashly assert that representative agencies have no known use and might better be forgotten. But if they were all destroyed, then conciliar and representative bodies would spring up again; for they serve a very fundamental purpose.

Dr. de Grazia has a tough job which he attacks valiantly—that of defining the concept of representation, tracing the growth of American representation over some three centuries of changing conditions, and finally undertaking to indicate modestly what is coming or what the shape of things might be. The contrasting theories of representation are examined; the trends of thought upon representation are classified, described, and interpreted. The development of lobbies into interest representation over the last fifty years is depicted. Dr. de Grazia employs psychological, social, and magical influences in interpreting the continual struggle in men's minds over representing the whole public or a workable combination of major value interests.

I have wandered over this field for a long time, beginning with a study of representative government in Virginia in the 17th Century, down to the present hour when lobbies, pressure groups, and political parties weave their way through our 150,000 independent governments. I can sympathize with the worthy and energetic doctor in his battle not only with semantics and theories, but with "pluralisms" of various sorts, "integrated" and otherwise. These forms and forces leave him sometimes wearied, and sometimes a little worried. Readers might find aid and comfort in *The Political Community* (1949) by Sebastian de Grazia, a very near relative of the writer.

All scholars in the field of political science and particularly those in the area of representation are under lasting obligation to the writer of this volume for a learned and helpful treatment of one of the major problems of our times. The book will enrich the literature on this very important subject. Fortunately the writer does not attempt to solve all the problems. This is for another day; *speriamo*.

CHARLES E. MERRIAM*

Security, Loyalty, and Science. By Walter Gellhorn. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1950. Pp. viii, 300. \$3.00.

This is the first product of a Rockefeller Foundation grant to Cornell University for a study of "the impact upon our civil liberties of current governmental programs designed to ensure internal security and to expose and control disloyal or subversive conduct." It confirms the wisdom of the grant.

Gellhorn's assignment deals primarily with government security activities in fields relating to science—atomic energy, military research and development, and traditional government scientific activities ranging from the Fish and Wild-

* Morton D. Hull Distinguished Service Professor Emeritus, University of Chicago.