

## Review Articles

### *A Private Diary and a Public Document*

"I could see a Divine Providence guiding me most lovingly. This will determine my course largely thro' life . . . I will work to show my worth, & Mavor and Toronto will regret its action." "I believe that God has led me thro' the mist and is bringing me into a clearer day. That He has His hand upon [me] to achieve this work, and that He has brought me to an end."

Surely it is the diary that creates the thorniest problems both for the author and for reviewers of this notable biography.\* Professor Dawson, while he clearly found the more emotional effusions of the diarist somewhat distasteful, was well aware that the diary itself constitutes one of the most important documents in Canadian history. Indeed, the greatest tribute that can be paid to the author is to note his unflinching reproduction of considerable selections from that difficult document. For the diary reveals a man who consistently rationalized an almost demonic ambition for worldly success by telling himself that each personal decision, however obvious its practical motive, was directed by the hand of God. The passion with which King told his diary each night that he really wished to be selfless and then reflected upon the best means of personal advancement is dealt with thus by Dawson: "The two motives of ambition and public service became in this way unconsciously blended in his mind, and, in fact, remained that way all his life" (p. 57). While this sentence disposes of the problem in one way, it also begs several questions. What was the balance within the "blend", and what was the real nature of King's religious belief?

It may be argued that because this is a political biography these questions are beside the point; that the practical politics of King are thoroughly revealed by Professor Dawson, and that to ask for psychoanalysis in addition is to demand the impossible. But Dawson's book is far more than a political biography—that is one of the volume's great merits—and I think therefore that the questions are important. In short, at what point did King become aware that his diary would be a public document, and to what

---

\**William Lyon Mackenzie King: A Political Biography*. Volume I: 1874-1923. By R. MacGregor Dawson. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1958. Pp.xiii, 521. \$7.50.

extent does it reveal hypocrisy? These, like the question about his religious belief, are unpleasant queries, but answers to them must affect the manner in which we approach King's public actions and policies.

While Dawson describes some manifestations of King's religious feeling, and notes that "this concern [for spiritual matters] had its origin in the Christian beliefs and principles of his home" (p. 36), he does not analyze the problem. For example, we are told that in his seventeenth year King joined the Presbyterian Church. But everything else that is reported suggests Luther far more strongly than Calvin. Indeed, King's apparent preoccupation with sin, and what can only be called his maudlin approach to hymns and poetry, betray a complete absence of discipline in his religious thought. While he seems to have believed in his own destiny, that belief was certainly not derived from the *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. His doctrine of the elect was thoroughly diluted by fear of failure and the constant need of repentance. Again, the continual suggestion in the diary that God required assistance in advancing the righteous cause of rehabilitating the King family through the fortunes of its eldest son is so emphatic as virtually to dictate the conclusion that King's secular thought was but slightly overlaid by spiritual faith. The flimsy emotionalism of the religious superstructure is thrown into relief by the early advent of sheer superstition, as in the occult significance seen by King in the position of the hands of the clock in relation to the occurrence of important events. All this is admirably illustrated by the author, but its significance is underplayed. In dealing with King's revulsion from the life and work of Hull House in Chicago and his choice of a more congenial university environment, Dawson observes: "He had, in other words, followed the course which self-interest suggested rather than the other, but he hoped by reiterating his high resolves to quiet the pangs of conscience which kept reminding him of his earlier unselfish motives in coming to Chicago" (p. 60). Again, concerning the vicious letter with which King's mother annihilated her son's only serious chance of married love, and King's retreat into mother-worship, Dawson remarks not upon King's weakness, or on his self-deception after the event, but merely that "it was an unequal struggle" between family duty and love for the girl.

Describing these early decisions, the author recognizes the conflicting forces but draws back from any definite statement of King's hypocrisy. Perhaps the refusal to pass judgment is right for a biographer, but the reader is left to wonder whether the charity thus revealed may not have affected the treatment of other aspects of King's career, and even the choice of material to illustrate those aspects.

The question of hypocrisy (both internal and external) remains *the* question about King. Bruce Hutchison and others have argued that despite his foibles and calculated vacillations King was a genuine reformer. Ferns and Ostry in *The Age of Mackenzie King* contended that King was a self-seeking, anti-labour defender of social peace and the *status quo* who knew that he must appear friendly to both the main ad-

versaries in an industrial society. The present volume concludes that "he was thus a sincere advocate of social reform and wished to bring about a greater degree of social equality" (p. 317.). But every time the subject of reform is discussed by King himself, it is indissolubly linked with political victory. In 1919 he told his diary: "I welcome these new forces [of labour and farm] as showing 'the interests' that a wise conservative leadership of radical forces is better than reactionary Toryism. Time will have its effect on these 'sectional' movements. Two parties in the end will be necessary and I shall win the leadership of the Liberals and other radical forces, through being true to Liberal principles" (p. 316). This kind of reformism has upon it indelibly the stamp of Mirabeau; but our Mirabeau had the good fortune to come upon the scene before basic reform forces obtained a serious political grip—and he did not die prematurely of debauchery. To the present reviewer the evidence which is now produced from the King papers goes a long way to substantiate the argument of Ferns and Ostry that King was a political "realist" who successfully analyzed the emerging problem of industrialism, but one who had no inherent desire for reform and whose interest in ameliorating the lot of the underdog was invariably overcome by his desire to win personal financial security and, finally, supreme power. The really incredible thing now is that Mr. Hutchison could ever have believed that *Industry and Humanity* was a conscious attempt to chart social reform—a plan which King would slowly, patiently implement against all the forces of St. James Street and Bay Street.

The foregoing is an attempt to indicate the intractable problems of interpretation that confront the reviewer of Professor Dawson's book. There is no doubt that this volume will for long remain the basic reference on King's early career. But it is equally probable that it is not the definitive work—if such there can ever be. It is distinguished by its polished scholarship, by its broad and intensive research, by the team-work of the assistants under Dawson's direction, and by the very evident straining for impartiality. Impartiality as a conscious goal is evident at many points: in comparisons of Meighen and King, for example, or in the comments on King as a leader: "The danger of pursuing King's policy is, of course, obvious, for the party leader may well confuse the retention of office with the necessity of maintaining party unity, and jettison all principles in a frantic effort to stay in power at all costs" (p. 320). But it is nevertheless true that the author's approval of the results of King's methods has materially softened his judgment on the methods themselves, and even on the character of his subject.

Because of the vast wealth of sources available and the world-wide problems with which King, in one way or another, was connected, a high degree of compression was inevitable. In general, an admirable balance has been achieved; but one is tempted to ask why the volume was extended to 1923 instead of being brought to a close with the 1919 convention. Achievement of the leadership marks a much more definite

turning point in King's career than does the middle of his first administration. The answer, one guesses, is that the author's own primary interest was the evolution of dominion status, and that the temptation to end the book on the triumphant note of the Imperial conference rather than on the dubious one of the leadership convention was thus overwhelming. However defensible the choice may be in terms of a central theme, or in terms of a predetermined length of the whole biography, it seems unfortunate that the large research base should sustain so compressed a final product.

The major themes are the steady evolution of a political method and the use of that method to reunite a shattered party and to advance the cause of national independence. As a result of Professor Dawson's compression, and of his predilections, one finds in Ferns and Ostry a clearer and more critical statement (if no less weighted) of the industrial condition of Canada throughout the period, as well as of such particular events as the student strike at Toronto, the strikes at Valleyfield and against the Grand Trunk Railway, and the Royal Commission on Industrial Disputes in British Columbia. In the Dawson description of these events there is no effective answer to the criticism made by Ferns and Ostry that King's goal of social peace worked essentially to debilitate the bargaining power of labour. Again, Professor Dawson's account of King's work for the Rockefeller interests, while it does give fresh material, does not specifically deal with the evidence produced by the more critical biographers; it accepts King's own justification of that work and the evidence of F. A. MacGregor, yet it does not refute the generally accepted American view that the company unionism which resulted was a retrograde step. Surely, also, it is stretching impartiality to the breaking point, when one knows the conditions existing in Colorado, to note with approval that King "was disposed to blame both sides for the strike [against the Colorado Fuel and Iron Co.] and its excesses" (p. 239). Compression also produced a curiously superficial treatment of some aspects of internal Liberal party organization. A. C. Hardy, for example, is referred to only as "an old friend", and Alexander Smith, Laurier's chief organizer in Ontario, is not mentioned at all. King's relations with the Liberal machine in Ontario were of some importance, particularly in the months prior to the 1919 convention, yet Dawson appears to accept the diary's version that King "had no organization of any kind and did not seek the support of a single man." Indeed, the chapter on the leadership ends by tacitly endorsing King's diary comment: "There was no thought of winning in my mind . . . I thought: it is right, it is the call of duty. I have sought nothing, it has come. It has come from God . . ." One recalls the remarks of the Republican campaign manager who, when Benjamin Harrison attributed his 1888 victory to Providence, said: "He ought to know that Providence hadn't a damn thing to do with it." Probably Domville, Smith, or Hardy were thinking similar thoughts in 1919.

Because King's many professions of concern for social justice and his declared "suspicion of great wealth" are taken at face value, the treatment of the years 1919-1923 is rather remarkable. The themes that are most significant to the author are carefully described and fresh evidence provided on the Progressive-Liberal relationship, but the social question is virtually untouched. What did King really think about the Winnipeg strike and the national industrial crisis? Did he agree with what Lapointe and Power said in the House, or with Gouin? Again, if King really believed that the forces of farm and labour were compelling a return to "real Liberal principles", why did he not inform himself prior to the debates in the House on such things as the Bank Act revision, the operations of the R.C.M.P., the failure of the Merchants' Bank, or the conduct of the British Empire Steel and Coal Company in Cape Breton—all subjects about which he appeared totally ignorant? The King government was as quick to apply military force against the workers in Cape Breton as the Borden government had been to use force in Winnipeg, but of this we learn nothing—although even Arthur Meighen referred to industrial relations in Nova Scotia in 1922-23 as constituting class war. Indeed, practically the whole area of interest covered by *Industry and Humanity* is ignored by Dawson's treatment of these years, a treatment which concentrates on King's personal politics and "diplomatic" history.

In the diplomatic field, the story of the Chanak crisis and the 1923 Imperial conference is told in considerable detail. Here the evidence appears to be virtually complete and King's victory total. Comment, therefore, must focus upon the interpretation. The author's primary assumption is that when King followed the general isolationist sentiment of North America and by simple negativism frustrated Curzon, Smuts, Amery, Chamberlain, Bruce, and Massey, he experienced "one of the great triumphs" of his career. This is a perfectly legitimate and even orthodox point of view. But the implication that King's success in stopping any endeavour to work out a practical form of "continuous consultation" was necessarily good, and indeed the only method by which the Commonwealth could have been saved, is at least debatable. This whole problem is viewed by Dawson almost exclusively from an official Liberal position, and certainly it is not placed in the historic context of the Liberal tendency towards North American continentalism that King's policies did so much to emphasize. When one considers the present relationship of Canada to the United States in the area of military obligations and policy-making, one is inclined to raise an eyebrow at the following comment on the 1923 policy: ". . . Canada at least was no longer willing to accept an unreal participation in British policies in exchange for a very real and costly support in emergencies" (p. 479).

In this first volume of the official King biography, the author and his assistants faced a mountain of material and thus an extremely difficult task of scholarship. However much one may raise questions of selection and interpretation—and they are inevit-

able about so controversial a subject—there can be no doubt about the debt which Canadians owe to Professor Dawson. His volume is a work of great dedication and an ornament to Canadian scholarship.

*United College, Winnipeg*

KENNETH McNAUGHT

### *Politics by Comparison \**

The study of Comparative Politics is an ancient one. The science of government, according to Aristotle,<sup>1</sup> “has to consider what kind of government would be best and most in accordance with our aspirations, if there were no external impediment, and also what kind of government is adapted to particular states”. The political theorist has to consider what is meant when it is said that man is a political animal: to enquire into the nature of the state and to ask in what sense the state is essential to man and to his attainment of all that is within him to attain. Such philosophical speculation is indispensable if there are to be concepts by means of which existing politics may be understood and criteria by which they may be judged. There could, of course, be no political theory without empirical study of different states and the comparisons and contrasts that such a study enables one to make. To Aristotle, if not to all his successors, it was clear that political studies depend upon a subtle understanding of the mutual dependence of ideas and institutions.

The fact that the study of comparative government is indispensable if a General Theory of Politics is to be formulated has not been lost sight of, although greater awareness of the difficulties involved has led many scholars to talk in terms of a “conceptual framework” rather than a general theory. The classical approach to the subject, kept in vogue for long by jurists, assumed that the nature of man is such that human beings in the aggregate will react more or less alike to the same institutions. Emphasis was therefore put on formal structure, the arrangement and relationship of offices and the rational perfection of the constitutional instrument. It was in this spirit that Montesquieu made his celebrated analysis of the English constitution, exposing what he thought to be its essence: a threefold division of power between legislature, executive, and judiciary.

---

\**Modern Governments*. By Harold Zink. Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1958. Pp. xv, 804. \$7.50.

*Interest Groups on Four Continents*. Edited for the International Political Science Association by Henry W. Ehrmann. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1958. Pp. xiv, 316. \$6.00.

*Democratic Institutions in the World Today*. Edited by Werner Burmeister. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Inc. [Toronto: Burns and MacEachern], 1958. Pp. x, 157. \$6.25.

It was left to the Americans to use this ideal model when they "gave themselves" a written constitution which was to be the only one of its time to survive and in consequence one of the most difficult of existing constitutions to reconcile with the facts of life of the twentieth century.

The complexity of modern life, and the changed and changing role of the state in that life, have given rise to a shift of interest from form to substance. There is now much more emphasis on the influence of history, and of economic and social forces, on political life. In the words of Professor Oakeshott, "The study of another people's politics, like the study of our own, should be an oecological study of a tradition of behaviour, not an anatomical study of mechanical devices . . . Only when our study is of this sort shall we find ourselves in the way of being stimulated, but not intoxicated, by the manners of others."<sup>2</sup> But some students of politics have become so overawed by the national idiosyncrasies which seem to determine so much of the government of states that they have come to abandon the comparative and *a fortiori*, the evaluative, aspects altogether. This does not mean that what is left is not worth undertaking. A penetrating study of another country's politics is likely to dispel a number of illusions current in that country and abroad, and to help all concerned to gain a deeper understanding of its institutions. It is no coincidence that the best accounts of some countries' politics have been the work of foreigners. It need hardly be said that such an advance in knowledge is not only of use in itself to students and practitioners of government, but that it is also invaluable to those who study, and to those who are responsible for the conduct of, international relations.

The more interplay there is between domestic and international factors in politics—for example, the more a change of government or a change in constitution in one country affects even the domestic life of another—the more urgent becomes the need for knowledge of foreign governments.

But the study of another country should also help to get one's own institutions into better perspective. One should at least be led to ask significant questions which had not presented themselves before, and perhaps gain intimations of how to answer them. "He who knows only his own side of the case, knows little of that."<sup>3</sup> Once again, such efforts will be helpful to the man of action. There is no doubt that international trade in national institutions is fraught with great dangers. Nevertheless it is a trade that has been thriving for countless generations, and one that is certain to continue in full spate. This should surprise nobody. Nor is it helpful to assert that "to range the world in order to select the 'best' of the practices and purposes of others is a corrupting enterprise and one of the surest ways of losing one's political balance."<sup>4</sup> A year does not pass now without a new state coming into existence or an old one doing its best to be born again. In the first case there is often no national tradition of government; in the second, it is from the past that men are trying to escape: in both cases, men have to make use of the ex-



perience of others. The very profusion of ways and means of attending to the governance of man is an indication of the range of choice confronting today's "founding fathers": the entire world has an interest in the choices which it pleases them to make.

Quite apart from attempts to start afresh, however, the statesman "should be able to find remedies for the defects of existing constitutions."<sup>5</sup> Here, as before, he will be guided by what seems desirable, as well as being compelled by what is possible: here, as before, the task of fitting appropriate foreign institutions to the environment and needs of another society is a major exercise in Comparative Government. It will be clear from what has been said already that it is in fact impossible to exclude the "comparative" from politics. Casting one's eyes abroad brings no sudden change in vision. However, if the answers obtained do depend on the questions posed, it is also true that one gets a number of answers to questions that one did not ask. Problems are always formulated in the light of some experience of the facts: further experience gives rise to a reorientation of the problem. Likewise, in casting one's mind back—and the dependence of the study of politics on that of history has already been alluded to—the use of such terms as "state", "party", "administration", and "class" is unavoidable. The dependence is therefore mutual: however much it may be desired to free the portrayal of history from any meta-physical overtones, it is agreed that political theory has at least the task of trying to elucidate the meaning of terms in such general use as "authority" or "class".

But this is to return to the contribution of empirical studies to philosophical speculation. Many deny the possibility of such a contribution and prefer modestly to confine themselves to the scientific quest for objective truth. Salutary an operative goal as this most certainly is, to go no further is to suggest that the man acquainted with the facts is the least qualified to pronounce upon their implications. Moreover, it is doubtful whether the value judgments implicit in analysis itself can be eliminated, for analysis depends upon selection of facts and this in turn must involve some criteria of significance. This is not less true when the pattern imposed upon the data by the enquiring mind is one that commends itself to other minds. But even if all that can be made explicit has in fact become so, one cannot segregate choice and fact in any final fashion: for "nature is made better by no means but nature makes that means." So why draw back at the open door of moral appraisal beyond which lies the realm of action? Others will not, and cannot, be so self-effacing.

Professor Zink's *Modern Governments* has little to say on these deeper aspects of the subject. It is designed for use in the general basic courses "offered" by colleges and universities in the United States. It employs the country-by-country approach and surveys the political systems of Great Britain, France, Germany, Norway, Sweden, the Soviet Union, Canada, Latin America, Japan, and India. The author finds that "the problem of compressing into one manageable volume an examination of a sufficiently



representative number of governments abroad is becoming increasingly difficult." One wonders whether the effort is worthwhile.

Since the book is intended as a text for students, one needs to consider the place of Comparative Government in an undergraduate curriculum if one is to appraise it. The study of such a subject clearly requires a context: that of political science, history, and the other social sciences. If such a course is simply one of many diverse fields from which students can pick and choose quite freely, it is likely to result in their assimilation of ill-digested, *ad hoc* scraps of information. The "broader" and the more diverse the background of the students and the more extensive the territory covered in the course, the more will this be the case. If the market principle is to continue to apply in large measure to the undergraduate curriculum, and if A. L. Smith of Balliol College, Oxford, was right when he said that "education is what is left when the student has forgotten every fact he has ever been taught", then it would seem desirable to restrict the number of countries to be studied and to take up a number of general problems that were first encountered in a basic course on national institutions, bringing the comparative method to bear for their elucidation. It might then be possible to compensate in some way for students' lack of "background". It is eminently desirable that students learn what is involved in studying *any* foreign country and why they are involving themselves in it. There is more to be learned from some countries than others, and Professor Zink has wisely recognized this fact in allotting space to the countries that he has selected. But what is to be gained from seventeen pages on the Government of Canada which include a page on Public Administration and less than a quarter of a page on Local Government? It is not surprising that his treatment is superficial, that the style is flat, and that much of the information imparted is without apparent significance. If it be objected that the book is essentially a work of reference—and it is true that the bibliographies should be useful to the more enterprising and energetic pupils, although the omission of constitutional texts is serious in such a work—then surely the author would have been better advised to employ the usual procedure in compiling an encyclopaedia and deal with Canada under the letter "C". But perhaps that would have reduced the number of "adoptions".

| *Interest Groups on Four Continents* is the record of a round-table conference that took place under the auspices of the International Political Science Association in September, 1957. The greater part of the book consists of studies of interest groups in Australia, Finland, France, Germany, Great Britain, Japan, Sweden, and Yugoslavia which were circulated before the conference, and an American paper concerned principally with research and "methodology" delivered at the conference. It was appropriate for this particular subject to be discussed in the United States because the shift of interest from form to substance referred to earlier is not better exemplified than in the attention given to pressure groups in that country in recent years. The very term

"pressure group" brings to mind Professor Lasswell's definition of political science as "the study of influence and the influential . . . the influential are those who get the most of what there is to get" (*Politics: Who Gets What, When, How*). Indeed, for some time American preoccupation with group influence on political decision gave rise to the impression that pressure groups are almost a distinctively American phenomenon! If there are any lingering illusions on this score, they will be dissipated by the evidence adduced in this volume.

A working paper entitled "The Comparative Study of Interest Groups", which was distributed to the participants before the conference, is reproduced. Its purpose was to guide those preparing national reports, in order that they might use similar schemes of classification and address themselves to common questions—questions regarding internal characteristics of groups and the relationships between them and the political process, public opinion, political parties, the legislative process, and the executive. The paper concludes by asking that consideration be given to the need for and possibility of developing a "conceptual framework" for the role of interest groups in politics, as well as to any contribution that a comparative study of this kind might make to the advancement of political theory. The working-paper also provided agenda for the round-table proceedings with which the book concludes.

The problem of terminology and definition is a particularly difficult one in a symposium of this kind. A number of contributors did not attempt, and did not wish to attempt, a definition of "interest group." Professor Lavau uses the terms "pressure group" and "interest group" interchangeably, and Professor S. E. Finer prefers the term "lobby" to describe "all groups or associations which seek to influence public policy in their own chosen direction, while declining to accept direct responsibility for ruling the country." The Yugoslav paper asserts that "these groups, in the final analysis, are linked together through the interests of those groups that occupy strategic positions in social production." There seemed to be a wide measure of agreement, however, that Professor Finer's definition was a satisfactory working one, provided it be remembered that the distinction between such groups and political parties is not always sharp; indeed, that there is an inherent tendency for some groups to develop party characteristics and for some political parties to become mere interest groups.

As might be imagined, the national papers varied considerably in their approach as well as in their findings. For example, the French contribution emphasizes the way in which public opinion in France, following the precepts of Rousseau, is ever ready to condemn partial societies which interpose themselves between the citizen and the expression of the sovereign, general will. "This hostile ideological and moral climate surrounding pressure groups in France reacts in its turn upon their behaviour." Later, during the discussion, however, Professor Lavau added that "not the deputies but the administrators can afford to be Jean-Jacques' disciples." This provided an interesting contrast with Pro-

fessor Finer's belief "that although the British public firmly believe in Rousseau's view that the public interest transcends any particular interests, the practical administrator and minister tends *in fact* to work in the manner of Bentham and tries to reconcile the conflicting interests of particular groups in such a way as to make all of them as happy as they can possibly be . . ." Unfortunately, the point was not pursued further, and indeed one criticism that may be levelled against the last part of the book concerns the way in which a number of pregnant ideas emerge only to be lost in the subsequent melee. Being a verbatim record of the proceedings, this section, the designedly comparative section of the book, is not easy to follow because a number of the contributors seemed determined to say what they had intended to say regardless of the flow of the discussion. For instance, the one and only contribution of Professor Djordjevic of Yugoslavia, occupying two and a half pages, was followed by the British delegate's "coming back to the question with which Professor Ehrmann opened today's meeting." At times one gets the impression that everyone is talking and nobody is listening. The discussion was probably more edifying to hear than to read, and most valuable of all no doubt were the informal, unrecorded conversations; for publication, however, the material should have been better ordered.

This is not the only respect, however, in which the book could have been improved. It has obviously been put together hurriedly. Apostrophes are omitted, someone is referred to as holding office during good pleasure, and one even finds a repetition of Pope Gregory's schoolboy howler concerning angles and angels. But worse of all is the appalling jargon. What a collection! One finds *simplistic, etatistic, de-etatization, elitist, voluntaristic, hierarchize, bureaucratization, reconceptualization*, not to mention words improperly used. There is no doubt that the rich connotative character of the English language makes it difficult to achieve conceptual clarity and mutual, precise understanding. But the language need not be murdered in order to secure what Professor Sam J. Eldersveld calls "the objectification of research techniques." It is perhaps a sad commentary that the best-written parts of the book are papers written by foreigners in English—papers which require no further translation. If it is desired to do more than make "probabilistic statements about reality", then the example of the mathematicians should be followed and symbols should be used: it would then be easier, also, to separate the pseudo from the science.

The national papers offer little guidance for those who would develop a general theoretical framework. For instance, Professor Townsley asserts that "to the outsider any evaluation of the Australian political scene must stress the strong sense of nationality." The Finnish "paper makes no pretence of discussing the deeper aspects involved in the problem of pressure group activities [even] in Finland." Professor Lavau asks whether "the constitutional texts empower the representative organisms to express the general will and [whether] the present mode of representation [is] adequate"—questions that would

presumably evoke different answers in the light of the new French constitution. His concern is to "guarantee as far as possible the autonomous decision of the instruments of political power," "especially for the sake of the unorganized interests." Dr. Hirsch-Weber of West Germany insists that even when it becomes possible to theorize, "a theory of interest groups will remain a kind of middle-range theory." Many of the participants in the discussion pointed out weaknesses in existing assumptions and concepts; this should remind readers that theorizing in such a field must always be tentative and inclusive but not necessarily unhelpful or unrealistic.

All in all, the book will be found useful as a foundation for further studies. Scholars interested in this field will be better equipped for having read it to pursue their special interests with pertinent questions in mind. In its present form, however, there is little to attract the general reader.

The last book under review, *Democratic Institutions in the World Today*, on the contrary deserves to command a wide, non-specialist audience. At the outset Mr. Burmeister draws readers' attention to the close relationship that exists today between the form of a nation's government and its alignment in the international community. However, he warns that "it would be short-sighted and useless to expect the emerging nations to establish institutions exactly like those which have functioned in the very different conditions of advanced industrial nations. In the contest for the minds of the uncommitted nations in which we are now engaged, it will be of crucial importance for the West to show enough imaginative understanding so that these inevitable differences will not prevent the growth of partnership."

The fulfilment of countless hopes and aspirations in all parts of the world depends upon the success or failure of experiments in self-government in a few crucial states. If democracy can become firmly established, so much the better, but the test for partnership "cannot be whether the other nation has already organised itself on democratic lines." Should the test be that of Mr. Burmeister: "whether such a development is still open to it, and is being seriously pursued"? This is questionable. The struggle for power in the world does not allow the simple application of such formulae; neither "the West" nor the Communist bloc has been or can be too censorious regarding the credentials of partners, although it must be admitted that each expects its "backward friends" to learn by association. It may be said, however, that the West has committed itself too much to regimes on the basis of their mere hostility to Communist penetration—and has paid the price. This suggests that a test is needed: one that is based on some estimate of the future line of march, one that distinguishes a regime from the forces operating upon it, one that may or may not be that of Mr. Burmeister. At the same time, it is only too easy to overlook the fact that the Western world is itself undergoing dramatic development, that the whole world is in a state of flux. Can one discern any direction? Is the world being "won for democracy"? What is democracy anyway?

No attempt is made in this volume to provide agreed answers to these questions. No definition is postulated at the beginning to guide contributors or inferred at the end by the editor from the material provided by the six essays. This is an improvement on Lord Bryce's classic, *Modern Democracies*, in so far as that work was inhibited by the author's naive view of democracy as "nothing more nor less than the rule of the whole people expressing their sovereign will by their votes." On the other hand, it is difficult to see what the editor has done, apart from writing the chapter on Western Europe. Professor Bernard Lewis says in Chapter III that "democracy is one of the magic words of our time, with a wide range of different meanings in different parts of the world." So magic, in fact, that as Mr. Tinker points out, Asians claim that their pattern of democracy is something that they themselves have worked out: hence the inclusion in the book of a discussion of the People's Democracy of China as well as of the parliamentary democracy of India.

This book in fact is not concerned to elaborate the meaning of democracy, but rather to consider how people in different part of the world are faring in their attempt to operate institutions which they regard as democratic. With the exception of the chapter on the United States, the subject of each essay is a part of the world rather than a country, comparisons being drawn between India and China, France, Germany, and Italy, and so on. Such comparisons are not easy to make in so small a book, and there would therefore have been much to be said for a final chapter in which some of the general observations made earlier could have been explored further. For example, it is no doubt true that "all historical experience shows that without prosperity, or hope of prosperity, democracy cannot function." But both "prosperity" and "democracy" are relative terms, and it is important to know the nature of peoples' expectations if such experience is to be a useful guide for action.

The book is a very short one for so far-reaching a subject, and there is in consequence a great deal of over-simplification. A few examples will suffice. The emergence of Christian Democratic parties in Western Europe is of the utmost importance; in Western Germany the C.D.U. has played a decisive role although there have been many factors that have contributed to the building of stable government in that country; but the role of the M.R.P. in France has not been at all comparable, or decisive. Very little is said about the development of supra-national institutions in Europe. In view of the global struggle for power, is it not going too far to say that "America's interest in China . . . is almost purely sentimental"? May it not be said that Egypt's old political order was not only unrelated to that country's past and present, but also inadequate for the realization of her future aspirations? Only in the chapter on Africa is much space devoted to local government, which has of course been of enormous importance on that continent but not unimportant elsewhere. Mr. Oliver has, it seems, underestimated the strength of feeling in certain quarters in the United

Kingdom regarding the future of the African in the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland. Mr. Tinker rightly emphasizes the importance in India of English notions of "The Rule of Law", but he disposes too quickly of the French concept of *droit administratif* and the extent to which a system of adjudication based upon it might ameliorate the consequences for the individual of rapid industrialization under state direction.

Such criticisms raise the question of the audience to whom the book is addressed. It is not likely to attract the general reader because of the price and its becoming out of date. This is unfortunate, for it is a stimulating little volume which would encourage readers to explore the subject further. One lesson that clearly emerges from it is that of the futility of devising theories or trying to establish practices of government without paying proper regard to circumstance—and to principles.

*Dalhousie University*

D. J. HEASMAN

#### NOTES

1. *Politics*, Book IV.
2. Michael Oakeshott, *Political Education* (reproduced in Peter Laslett, ed., *Philosophy, Politics and Society*, Oxford, 1956), p. 19.
3. John Stuart Mill, *On Liberty*, Everyman Ed., p. 97.
4. Oakeshott, *op. cit.*, p. 19.
5. Aristotle, *Politics*, Book IV.