

support of a proposed amendment which would permit all citizens over twenty-one years to vote anywhere in all elections if they were resident in the state six months and in the precinct three months, save only those in confinement for crime and persons of unsound mind.

There is little new ground covered in the book. There are many wearisome passages and some arguments based on inconclusive evidence. However, the author did some thorough investigations and tedious compilations. He does appear to have been disturbed at the very existence of American federalism, believing that suffrage remedies could emerge only from Congress—at least not from the states. He insists that Congress does not now have the power to outlaw the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting in national elections.

The author's main attack is upon the poll tax. It should be eliminated, but is it the chief reason why so many otherwise eligible stay away from the polls? Would removal of all legal restrictions send millions to the polls? In our zeal for unrestricted universal suffrage, are we not overlooking the need for other reforms, such as voter education and increased party responsibility? Lifting the legal yoke will not cause most nonvoters to make a mad scramble to vote. Anyway, the goal is not merely a high statistical count of adults who vote.

It is unfortunate that the author did not develop other deterrents to voting, such as bossism (p. 152), the one-party system in some states, low educational standards, and near illiteracy.

The book is directed to laymen, but it is doubtful that many laymen will read it. It will be useful to civic groups, educators, and perhaps legislators in their quest for an ideal in universal suffrage rules. There are nine pages of notes and an index. The notes would be of greater use if contained on each page rather than at the end of the book.

A. C. BRECKENRIDGE

University of Nebraska

MICHEL'S, ROBERT (Eden and Cedar Paul, Translators). *Political Parties*. Pp. ix, 416. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1949. \$4.50.

This is a reprint of the 1915 English translation. The central theme of Michels' book—the organizational limitations which preclude realization of the ideal or theory of democracy—is a matter of eternal and not transitory concern. The publishers are to be congratulated for making this study again readily available.

Based on his extensive observation of trade unions and of socialist political parties, primarily in Germany and Italy, Michels developed in this book his famous "iron law of oligarchy." He noted the paradox that organizations which professed to be democratic and to rest upon rank-and-file control tended to become hierarchical in structure, with the power of determination "gradually withdrawn from the masses to be concentrated in the hands of the leaders alone."

This tendency of democratic organizations to fall under the domination of an oligarchy, according to Michels, rests primarily on the indispensability of technical and professional leadership. Furthermore, psychologically, the rank and file easily assume the attitude of hero worship, and on many matters do not know and little care what their leaders do. Soon the leaders consciously or unconsciously begin identifying their own interests as those of the organization. Nor do the leaders restrict themselves to matters of management, but invade the rank and file's domain in the area of fundamental aims. The leaders give a conservative twist to organization aims, because continued existence of the organization, with consequent retention of their own paid jobs, has the highest priority.

That there is a tendency toward oligarchy in democratic organizations, no one can doubt. But evidence of a tendency does not justify Michels in his positivist claim that there is a "law." The weakness of the analysis is in the failure to investigate the counteracting forces which prevent the leaders from permanently ignoring the rank and file. The leaders are only apparently completely independent, for there is a subtle interaction between leaders and led, a two-way communication, which Michels' analysis does not sufficiently reflect. If the leaders fail to in-

terpret the wishes of the rank and file they may (albeit with difficulty) be replaced by an internal organizational change, or, in the case of political parties, competing parties may attract adherents away. The oligarchical tendency operates up to a point, but counteracting forces then cut in.

Michels' pessimistic observations on democracy are perhaps less timely today than they were at the time of the original English edition. Today, after two World Wars, the "inevitability of democracy" is much less apparent. The deluge of psychological literature on the irrationality of political man has introduced a greater degree of sophistication into discussions. Michels' erudite analysis was historically important for introducing a note of skepticism and doubt. Although he professed to favor democracy, his ideas have fitted into the pattern of anti-democratic thought where they have continuing vitality.

JOHN W. LEDERLE

University of Michigan

GRIFFITH, ERNEST S. (Ed.). *Research in Political Science*. Pp. vi, 238. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1948. \$3.00.

The Director of Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, edited the work of the panels of the Research Committee, American Political Science Association, and reflectively pointed up significant aspects and trends observed through the panels' work.

Scholarly panels in which leading political scientists of the country participated were set up in ten fields of political science to formulate a broadly conceived strategy of research for areas already explored and areas which offer a creative future. Although the panels met individually only once or twice, extensive memoranda were circulated among each panel, and final reports were made by chairmen or their designates.

The approach of the panels to their problems was most scientific and objective. Within each there was considerable soul searching and respect for the insights that would come with utilization of and liaison with other social sciences. There were also similarity of approach, common agree-

ment in continued planning, and an expressed need for some form of permanent agency for research and for liaison with other disciplines.

Group research was frequently mentioned as an effective and efficient method of assembling and evaluating the tremendous data.

The human element in the structure of government, rather than the structure itself, was stressed in a noteworthy psychological approach. The emergence of the government's role and the importance of the United States as a world factor were also noticeable trends throughout the panels.

The importance of the study of successful operation of representative government was considered one of the crucial problems of our times. Another problem was the need for a statement of objectives in American political theory in terms of ideas and ideals.

The study of war was felt to be the province of the political scientist, particularly the specialist in international relations.

Each panel reported with great vigor and evidenced the fact that infinite study had gone into the assembling of material. Although it was apparent that the participants derived considerable satisfaction from the exchange of opinions, it may be hoped that their enthusiasm will not be lost but will offer stimulus for further action. This book should be of interest to students in the field of political science and to those within the profession who are interested in the most intimate procedures for research.

VERNON E. KEYE

Wayne University

KOHN, HANS. *The Twentieth Century*. Pp. ix, 242. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1949. \$2.50.

Professor Kohn is a historian who writes a book only when he has something worth while to say; and he always says it well. A man of wide erudition, meticulous scholarship, and deep insight, he has given us in his several studies a rational and clear-eyed view of the ideological conflicts of our time. His new book focuses these