

special duty to perfect the rules of international law and the machinery for its administration.

JOSEF L. KUNZ

University of Toledo

WYNNER, EDITH. *World Federal Government. Why? What? How? In Maximum Terms.* Pp. 84. Afton, New York: Fedonat Press, 1954. \$2.00.

"A dangerous affliction of the Western world is its addiction to minimum proposals" (p. 31). This is an overpriced tract—and tracts should never be overpriced—for world government "in maximum terms." It is well written, but always one must ask, is it designed to be effective beyond the converted? This reviewer wonders just how relevant is the subtitle: "Proposals for United Nations Charter Revision."

After stating that "success requires a far greater tactical flexibility than the bulk of the federalist movement has yet shown" (p. 71), the author proposes that the world constitutional convention provides the tactical flexibility in the struggle for world government. It is therefore no surprise that she states, "currently there is a dangerous tendency to put all the world government eggs into the basket of United Nations revisions, a tactic providing little in the way of public education on world government."

Pages 42-46 carry a summary maximum proposal—enough to scare off the lukewarm. But is it good strategy for the author to introduce this by saying it "contains sufficient excess baggage to permit some of it to be abandoned during the bargaining process" (with whom?) without specifying what she considers "excess baggage"?

RICHARD H. HEINDEL

University of Buffalo

*UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT  
AND HISTORY*

HARRIS, LOUIS. *Is There a Republican Majority?* Pp. xvii, 231. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954. \$3.50.

The public opinion polls first became widely known in this country at the time of the 1936 presidential election. In that year, and in each election year since, the private polling organizations have published pre-election forecasts of the electoral decisions, based on samples of voters interviewed during the campaign period. For the most part, the reports of these polls have been confined to newspaper releases with the inevitable strictures regarding brevity and simplicity which such publication entails. The contribution to social science from these polls has not been great.

Now, however, one of the major polling organizations (Elmo Roper) has prepared a detailed statement of its data regarding the 1952 election. This volume, written by Mr. Louis Harris of the Roper staff, is concerned with an explanation of the factors which led to the Eisenhower victory. It is a book which students of political behavior will welcome and we may hope that additional monographs of this kind will be forthcoming from the polling agencies.

Mr. Harris has based the greater part of his analysis on the major demographic divisions which make up the electorate. He shows the candidate preferences of men and women, urban and suburban, white collar and union labor, Irish and German, Catholic and Jew, and a number of the other social aggregates which are customarily thought to have political significance. He identifies, partly on the basis of his polling data and partly on supposition, the issues which he believes moved these different groups. He describes certain changes which the Roper polls found in the attitudes of these groups as the campaign progressed.

These data are obviously of great interest. They bear on questions of great importance to scholars and practitioners alike. The answers they give puzzle this reviewer a great deal, however, since in many cases they flatly contradict comparable data gathered by him and his Survey Research Center associates at the time of the 1952 election. Consider these three findings in the Harris study: (1) Women swung more sharply to Eisenhower than did men. (2) Negroes voted in greater numbers in 1952 than in 1948. (3) Young voters gave

Stevenson a majority of their votes. None of these conclusions is supported by the Survey Research Center data and numerous other discrepancies appear which go far beyond sampling error.

The explanation of these differences is not altogether obvious. The two surveys used different methods of sampling; they also defined voters differently. It would require a very detailed analysis to determine why the discrepancies in the findings of the two surveys occurred. In the absence of such an analysis this reviewer advises all readers of survey reports to examine with a sharp eye the methodologies on which the data are based.

ANGUS CAMPBELL

University of Michigan

CONNALLY, TOM. *My Name Is Tom Connally*. As told to Alfred Steinberg. Pp. viii, 376. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1954. \$5.00.

Tom Connally of Texas cut his eyeteeth on politics. He grew up in a household where it was served, as table talk, at every meal. He first ran for office, and was elected, at 25. He quit running, and being elected, at 75. He served in Congress for thirty-six years, twenty-four of them in the Senate. He was Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee while this country fought its greatest war, while the United Nations was born, and while the cold war with Russia culminated in the hot war in Korea.

Now Tom Connally, at 77, has written an autobiography in the "as told to so-and-so" style made popular by the mass circulation magazines. It is a detailed account of Connally's life and of the great events in which he was a participant. It is replete with anecdotes that tend principally to emphasize the prowess of Connally as a political protagonist, but it adds little to what has already been published about those with whom he came in contact and the destinies they shaped.

There is a compelling charm in Connally's recollections of his Texas boyhood, of his strong-willed mother and his kindly, well-to-do farmer father who loved the old South and who doted on politics for its own sake.

There is much of self-revelation in Connally's estimates of the men with whom he worked and fought, estimates composed almost always more of derogation than of praise, even in the case of the two presidents, Roosevelt and Truman, to whose support he devoted the most important part of his political life.

His sharpest attack was directed against the late Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, whom he regarded as a Johnny-come-lately convert from the ranks of isolationism and whose popular acclaim he frankly resented.

His highest praise was reserved for Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov whom he found "an attractive man" and "one of the ablest diplomats I have ever known." This admiration betokened no softness toward Communism on Connally's part. It was just that he recognized in Molotov a man whose toughness of fibre matched his own.

It is regrettable that, despite the plentitude of anecdotes, the book does not convey adequately the essential flavor of Connally as a Senator, the dignity with which he wore the overlong white hair, black coat, and string tie that would have made most men look like caricatures of Senators; the mercilessness of his invective in debate; the terror he struck in those with less facile and embittered tongues. Perhaps there is no way to convey in print the contempt he could manifest when he referred to an antagonist as "the VERY distinguished Senator" and at the same time gestured with his hand, palm down, to indicate a man who stood only knee high.

Even so, none who reads the book will doubt that Connally is a man who rejoices in giving as good as he gets, and then some.

It is, on the whole, an enjoyable though not particularly informative book.

ROBERT ROTH

*Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*

PRITCHETT, C. HERMAN. *Civil Liberties and the Vinson Court*. Pp. xi, 297. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954. \$5.00.

The book surveys the seven years of the Vinson Court, particularly from the point of view of civil liberties. Not only that, but the opinions of the judges are ana-