was the philosophes, a literary group that placed social and political problems in the very forefront of man's intellectual life. The philosophes may be considered as the pioneers of the "intelligentsia".

Much of the book covers well-known ground, but does so from the vantage point of the twentieth century. Mr. Martin takes great pains to show that the eighteenth-century intellectual movement was not all of one pattern. As the Enlightenment progressed it became more enlightened concerning the welfare of the masses in the new schemes for a better order. The moderate Voltaire and the cautious Montesquieu of the first half of the century were followed in the second half by the more progressive Rousseau and Condorcet and by the socialist school of writers. In his analysis of the ideas of the philosophes the author takes into account the various influences that helped to formulate their views. But he makes only fragmentary references to America, which exercised considerable influence on French liberal thought, especially after 1776.

In general Mr. Martin analyzes the ideas of the philosophes in a spirit of sympathetic detachment. But his sympathies grow warmer when he turns his attention to the more radical of the philosophes. Rousseau he considers the most creative thinker of the eighteenth century. As the originator of the doctrine of popular sovereignty Rousseau, in the view of Mr. Martin, popularized the democratic idea that political authority "was legitimate only when founded on rational consent." However, his statement that Jeffersonian democracy was "directly inspired by Rousseau" (p. 218) is misleading. Locke, not Rousseau, was Jefferson's inspiration. Condorcet is aptly characterized as "a somewhat advanced twentieth-century liberal" (p. 293) because of his radical views concerning social reform and popular education. Considerable space is devoted to the views of Mably and Morelly, whose socialism, in the view of the author, was primarily a Puritan attack on idleness and luxury, and only incidentally on the economic system.

Mr. Martin's book succeeds in giving the reader a clear view of what was permanent and what was transitory in eighteenth-century libertarianism. It is a contribution much needed at the present time.

J. Salwyn Schapiro

New York, N. Y.

Henry George. By Charles Albro Barker. New York, Oxford University Press, 1955.—xvii, 696 pp. $9.50.

Publication of this satisfying book is an event. Henry George has waited for a biographer at once scholarly and sympathetic. His career has been set forth several times with filial fidelity and apostles' apprecia-

tion. His movement, as distinguished from the man, has had more searching treatment, both in antecedent thought and in practical application. Now Professor Barker gives us a comprehensive study, balanced, original in much new material, and illuminating in all its parts.

The author, through patient years, has explored every quarter. He himself transferred from West coast to East, pursuing his inquiry. He has incorporated particularly the first careful examination of George's early newspaper work for the evidence of his developing ideas. Such a thorough review serves to rob George's story of certain of the surprises which are remembered from briefer accounts. He had no sudden conversion to his faith, as on the road to Damascus. Instead, his thought grew, in the beginning tentatively, under many promptings, personal, local, national, political and economic. We have the proof of an alert mind and courageous spirit receiving impressions which he had the wit and purpose to focus to a point. Every experience in his varied and hard school was linked to every other.

Of course, there was the quality of genius which may not be documented, of moral fervor and exaltation of written and spoken word more readily admired than explained. In his eager acknowledgment of these virtues, Professor Barker does not surrender informed appraisal. In picturing Henry George this is a feat; for, as philosopher and propagandist, George raised up either devotees or detractors. The time of appearance of this full-scale biography has helped. Associates of the great reformer are still on the scene to vivify the perspective of more than half a century since his death. In the interval the socialist movement, partly supplementing, more largely supplanting, George's doctrine, has achieved new definition, and presents unmistakable contrast.

Was *Progress and Poverty* a cry of alarm that free land was—prematurely through monopolization—disappearing? Was the analysis inspired principally by the depression following 1873? How far was Henry George himself a single-taxer? Did Woodrow Wilson assist a late rally of Georgists? What has been the extent of fiscal reform attributable to George's teachings? If George was mistaken in his specific, just how was that? These and many more questions are discussed with knowledge and point. As always in such a volume, the list of sources (in this case grouped and annotated) is a diary of the author's industry and legwork. The reader who wants to take off for explorations of his own will find springboards.

It so happens that a new edition of *Progress and Poverty* has appeared at the same time with Barker's biography, seventy-five years after its original publication and discouraging reception. How explain the persistent popularity of a treatise at first dubbed forbidding and distorted?

Barker gives many reasons in economic history in this and other countries. He justly values the persuasiveness and charm of the language. But principally he dwells on the moral force of the reformer. No economic remedy is universal and permanent, but the intelligent intention to benefit society has its immortality. As we recede from Henry George's day his merit, in this sense, increases. In the end he gave his life, deliberately, for his principles. This record of his career is not a rehearsal of a past epoch, but a pertinent chapter in an unending and noble effort to fit institutions to ideals.

It may not be out of place to venture that such a portrayal of a social prophet is best executed by the historian. The philosophy, as such, may be acquired. The economics and politics may be grasped without difficulty. But all must be woven on the broad loom which the historian commands. It will be a long while before another will find profit in returning to the assignment which this author has so amply discharged.

BROADUS MITCHELL

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY

The Theory of the Mixed Constitution in Antiquity: A Critical Analysis of Polybius' Political Ideas. By KURT VON FRITZ. New York, Columbia University Press, 1954.—xii, 490 pp. $7.50.

The theory of the mixed constitution, as it was formulated by the Greek historian Polybius (200–120? B.C.), has in recent years increasingly attracted the attention of historians interested in its impact on modern constitutional thought. This influence was so great, particularly in England, that a history of this classical theory in the modern world will eventually have to be written. The starting point has been provided by Kurt von Fritz, Professor of Greek and Latin in Columbia University, in the book under review. Just as the celebrated description of Rome's mixed constitution occupies a central place in Polybius' *History*, it similarly supplies the main theme of this volume, in which Von Fritz has tested the historical validity of Polybius' constitutional analysis against the findings of modern scholarship.

In his *History*, covering essentially the years from 200 B.C. to 146 B.C., Polybius set out to explain why the Roman republic was able to rise after the disaster of Cannae to mastery of the known world. He found his explanation in the stability of Rome's mixed constitution by which political power was divided equally among consuls (the monarchic element), senate (the aristocratic element), and assemblies (the democratic