

or a "wanton desire to destroy the Union." With great wealth of quotation, he calls upon the Virginians and also men from other states to prove his positions. His style is terse and clear, his development of his subject is logical and his arguments have great force. No more effective description of the dire evils of slavery has been given than that which is found in Chapter 19. The "Specimens of deeds and wills emancipating slaves" are of great interest and, as they are drawn from the manuscript county records, they are a distinct contribution to our knowledge. The author's proof that the importance of the breeding of slaves for the interstate traffic has been much exaggerated, is quite convincing. Virginia's part in the forming of the Union and her desire to preserve it are clearly put. Mr. Munford has successfully avoided partisanship and has never misrepresented facts. His perspective is good, save that in his desire to establish his side of the argument, he has so neglected the statements of the pro-slavery advocates that one reading the book without further knowledge of the subject might easily think them less in number and importance than was really the case.

His final conclusion is that the "attempt of the Federal Government to coerce the Cotton States" was the occasion or, as he calls it, "the proximate cause of Virginia's secession" and, in this conclusion, the verdict of history will agree with the author. On the very last page of his text, he writes of the Virginians that they "exhibited the strength of the idealist, combined, on the part of many, with the limitations of the doctrinaire" and, undoubtedly, their possession of these characteristics goes far to explain their actions.

BERNARD C. STEINER.

*The Conflict Between Individualism and Collectivism in a Democracy.* By Charles W. Eliot. (New York. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1910. Pp. 135.) This volume contains three lectures given by Dr. Eliot on the Barbour-Page Foundation at the University of Virginia, and now for the first time presented to the general public. They deal with the conflict between individualism and collectivism in industries and trades, in education, and in government respectively. The position taken is midway between individualism and socialism. The author holds that the complexity of modern life, and the interdependence of social groups make individualism entirely inadequate and render inevitable the predominance of collectivism. Collective action is carried out by voluntary associations, and by the local, state, and

national governments. With regard to governmental action, Dr. Eliot apparently takes the position of the "new nationalists." Matters calling for collective action through governmental regulation, such as "big business" and the conservation of natural resources, must, he thinks, be attended to by whatever branch of government has "range and power enough" effectively to supervise them. (p. 109.)

Though admitting the necessity of government regulation, Dr. Eliot would not take the further step towards the socialization of government ownership and operation of industries and public utilities. But the reasons which he assigns for not doing so do not seem to be altogether satisfactory. He maintains, for example, that "it is well to have many different employers competing with each other for good service, rather than a single employer, the government." (p. 110.) But since in a monopoly there is, *ex hypothesi*, only one employer, and since competition for good service between different industries is negligible, this reason would seem to have little weight. A much stronger reason, viz., the difference in the ends sought to be attained by government and by industrial enterprises, and the incompatibility of attempting to attain both ends by the same machinery, Dr. Eliot alludes to only by implication.

The central idea of the lectures, developed with admirable skill and effectiveness, is that, although individualism as such must be abandoned, the collectivism which takes its place is not destructive but constructive, and that collective action, though narrowing the limits of individual action, tends to make safer and more certain the exercise of individual rights within those limits. As thus presented, collective action is not necessarily anti-individualistic, but conservative of the true spirit of individualism.

The book gives evidence of clear vision, a mind thoroughly open to the meaning of facts, in whatever direction they may lead, and a constant effort to bring theory into harmony with fact.

J. M. MATHEWS.

The fact that the West Indies lie so close to the United States, and that our country is so immediately concerned with the conduct of affairs in certain of them, gives peculiar interest to all happenings of moment in those islands. In March, 1909, Sir Robert W. Boyce, Professor of Pathology in the University of Liverpool and Dean of the Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, was sent by the British Secretary of State for the Colonies to investigate an epidemic of yel-