

Where their topics overlap, Wright and Larson tend to be in agreement. Populism, for example, was not irrational and anti-Semitic in Colorado and New Mexico; rather, it anticipated progressivism and the new nationalist shift of political authority and responsibility to the federal government. Fusion ultimately wrecked the populist movement here as elsewhere, but in its wake there emerged a vigorous two-party system in both places.

The authors exhausted the available manuscripts, newspapers and other sources. By Larson's admission, there were barely enough primary materials to support his study. In contrast, Wright had plentiful sources and he used them skillfully. He appended a useful description of the statistical manipulations he used in his analysis, and Larson included an equally informative bibliographical essay.

Wright and Larson ask for still more studies before the full, complex structure of western populism can be put into clear historical perspective. Now that populist scholarship is back on track let us hope that their call is answered soon by correspondingly thorough investigations of Idaho, Utah and Arizona.

WILLIAM W. PHILLIPS

*Arizona State University*

*Political Theory and Practice.* By BERNARD CRICK. (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1973. Pp. xii, 244. \$12.00.)

The title of Bernard Crick's most recent book will be less misleading if it is immediately pointed out that, rather than being a systematic exercise on the relationship of political theory and practice, the book is a collection of essays by the author written over the last ten years for which the title is the closest thing to a unifying theme. The style is variously academic and journalistic and the topics range from a formal typology of political systems to a discussion of Enoch Powell's racism, though the volume is not quite as much of a potpourri as this may suggest.

Out of this varied collection, it is possible to extract certain dominant themes: a plea for the natural affinity of freedom and politics, made in the context of a critique of Isaiah Berlin's essay on freedom and somewhat akin to Hannah Arendt's position; a sharpened and refined conception of toleration which distinguishes it from total social acceptance or assimilation; the view that an increase in democratic politics requires more careful attention to the problems of open and honest political communication rather than to the more conventional issue of participation (a principle Crick applies to student dissent); the charge that the liberal/empiricist tradition fails effectively to appraise the role of ideas in politics (used as an explanation of why British intellectuals and journalists failed to grasp the significance of the rise of Hitler before it was too late); and a call for the introduction of the study of politics in the secondary schools in some manner other than the sterile and formalistic study of the British constitution. In addition, Crick presents a three-fold categorization of political systems (Autocratic, Republican and Totalitarian), a "thinking-out-loud" piece on violence, and a chapter on the classical issue of tyrannicide.

The binding theme of all of this is supposed to be the relationship of theory and practice, about which Crick might be said to take the "love-hate" view—that is, we should equally avoid a rigid isolation of these activities as well as such an intimate mixing of them that their independent function and significance disappears. The introductory title piece on this question will not necessarily satisfy the reader about where the middle ground is. If the remainder of the book is taken as an example of Crick's position, then we may say that his view is essentially classical and perhaps best rendered by Pericles' famous characterization of his fellow Athenians: "For we have a peculiar power of thinking before we act and of acting too, whereas other men are courageous from ignorance but hesitate upon reflection."

The question of ideology is also important to these selections, but is not adequately explored. Crick is a self-proclaimed socialist (many will not be convinced through a reading of this book) who sounds provocatively conservative at times. There is consistency here to the extent that the conservative and the socialist may share sympathy for the peculiar features of "public life" in contrast to the anti-political sentiments of liberalism. Nonetheless the reader will probably be left with a desire to know more about Crick's ideological posture.

Some of the weaknesses of the book might be expected in a collection of this sort. The more topical pieces may seem dated, particularly the chapter on student protest in the British universities. Of greater consequence is the inability of this type of book to explore issues in greater depth and follow through on initial observations. The best parts of the book make us wish for more systematic treatment. It would be interesting, for example, to know Crick's view of William James' pragmatism considering how similar their opinions seem to be on the matter of theory and practice; however, the author mentions American pragmatism only once in passing. It should be added, however, that not all the weaknesses are a result of the genre; the more theoretical pieces, such as the chapter on toleration, offer useful insight but lack analytical rigor and clarity.

The political theorist will find little new ground broken and will be frustrated by the halting, tentative quality of these essays, but beyond this narrow audience the rewards may be greater, for these writings engage in refreshing critiques of conventional wisdom (mainly liberal wisdom) about politics and are written in a literate and civilized style of political discourse, which is very refreshing in its own right.

WILLIAM J. MEYER

*The University of Michigan—Flint*

*The New Zealand Bureaucrat.* By THOMAS B. SMITH. (Wellington: Cheshire Publishing Pty, Ltd., 1974. Pp. 162. \$NZ 9.95.)

This book is an appropriate response to the call for political scientists to get out of their easy chairs and into the field to test their notions about how government works. It is also a response to those who call for single system studies to provide evidence on which to base hypotheses that in turn can ideally generate in-