usurers," who had dominated the republic for eight years, were about to be dismayed by the evils they had wrought. The next subject dealt with is the collapse of the speculative house of cards which the finance capitalists had erected, and the adamant refusal of Mr. Hoover to recognize and admit that we were in for a serious and long-continued depression. Then come excellent chapters on the campaign and election of 1932, the formulation and execution of the New Deal, the opposition of reactionary financiers, businessmen and Supreme Court justices, the appeal to the people in 1936, the new popular mandate, the snags which were struck in executing it—such as the Supreme Court fight—the deflationary follies of Secretary Morgenthau, and the treachery of Cactus Jack Garner and the predatory Democrats, the sources and character of the Roosevelt-Hull foreign policy, and the role of labor in the new dispensation. The book closes with a summary of the developments in sports, entertainment, literature, art, science, and social thought, with a thoughtful concluding chapter on the state of democracy in our critical period.

Perhaps the best chapters are the appraisals of the New Deal and the searching criticism of Rooseveltian foreign policy. Dr. Beard is favorable to the general aspirations of the New Deal but believes that it lacked the courage and consistency to attain success. But, with some few exceptions, its enemies have been a great credit to the Roosevelt program. The exposition and critique of the foreign policy of Hull and Roosevelt are unrivaled in our historical literature. It is the historical reductio ad absurdum of any interventionist plan of making the world good by force.

The treatment of contemporary American culture is excellent and that of social thought competent but far below the level of the rest of the book. For some strange reason, Dr. Beard ignores outstanding leaders in the social sciences in the last fifteen years, even those to whom he has paid a warm tribute elsewhere, and drags from obscurity names which can hardly claim recognition in a survey of such brevity and selectivity. But the general trends are made clear enough.

Harry Elmer Barnes

Cooperstown, New York


Books on Japan abound, but this is the first description, based on direct observation, of the life of a Japanese village community. With this statement, made in the Introduction to Mr. Embree's study, Radcliffe-Brown documents the new turn in social anthropology, viz., the investigation of
communities—generally, although not always, the more backward and isolated communities—in countries which have cities and central governments, literatures and histories, universities and modern industries.

Now what are the anthropologists doing in Japan, Quebec, Ireland, and Massachusetts? Radcliffe-Brown gives two answers. The first is that those significant generalizations about human society, which it is social anthropology's aim to discover, require comparison of diverse types of society. Preliterate societies are not enough. This is, I gather, the answer closest to Radcliffe-Brown's heart.

The second answer proceeds from the proposition that the outstanding feature of human history is the gathering of small, isolated, autonomous local communities into larger and larger social structures. Suye Mura is in the midst of this process, as are most if not all of the folk societies studied in recent years by Redfield and his associates, as well as by others. The social anthropologist is going to study this process in its various forms and phases.

These are good answers; any social scientist and more especially the sociologists should applaud them. But we must still ask what the anthropologist does that some other social scientist would not do. The answer is, in part, that he does what he did when he was studying more primitive communities. He gives a detailed account of terrain, houses, and crops; of the turning of seasons and of ceremonies; of the life-cycle of the individual; of the age and sex groupings and of other formal or informal groupings and ranks; of the significance of these groupings for the undertakings of the community. This he does mainly by observation and by use of informants. The anthropologist seems to have the edge on us in his more persistent, skilful, and perhaps more naive use of humble data drawn from humble sources. As a result, his work has body. When he gets a little closer to town, we are going to watch him carefully to see whether he can apply his method with equal success in more extensive and highly differentiated communities.

Mr. Embree does these things very satisfactorily for his village. In addition he gives us as seasoning throughout and as dessert, in a final chapter, some account of the changes being made by the great outside world of modern Japan, and especially by government agencies. The chief effect seems to be a weakening of the very rich complex of local co-operative institutions by which houses are built, bridges repaired, temples and shrines tended, and even umbrellas supplied. In contrast with other folk undergoing such changes, the rural Japanese seem to accept with a passive acquiescence the new things introduced among them.
The orderliness of change in this case doubtless is to be accounted for by the tradition of pious allegiance to the emperor and by the thorough planning of his representatives. It is not to be overlooked, however, that in Japan—in contrast with many other places—the active bearers of change are of the same language, religions, and national allegiance as the folk themselves.

Everett C. Hughes

University of Chicago


There is a good deal of confusion about the nature, application, and extent of martial law in this country, due partly to the fact that the fathers of the Constitution, in their optimistic anticipation of normalcy in political evolution, were unwilling to vitiate their work by envisaging the eventuality of emergency situations. On the whole, the United States was relatively free from situations in which "civil law fails," with the exception of the Civil War where a major constitutional crisis hinged just around the problem of constitutional or extra-constitutional use of emergency powers. It is by no means impossible, however, that our present complacency about a subject which in other countries has been instrumental for revolutionary developments, will be tested by future events. Considerable complications may arise from the concurrent and overlapping powers of president and Congress, and from the use of emergency devices by the governors of the states, possibly in conflict with the federal authorities.

Martial law, as part of the wartime powers of the executive, offers little of interest. On the other hand, peacetime martial law raises such vitally important questions as, What is an emergency justifying the application of the extraordinary measure of suspending the constitution for saving the constitution? Who is to be the judge of the existence of an emergency situation? What are the essential limitations placed on the exercise of the emergency powers through martial law?

In general, martial law as one among the various devices of emergency government is intimately related to the problem of emergency situations arising from political deadlocks which cannot be solved by constitutional means. From this viewpoint the problem deserves as much the attention of the political scientist as of the constitutional lawyer. The recent use of martial law in labor disputes and industrial strife is a danger signal which