

The AMERICAN JOURNAL *of* ECONOMICS *and* SOCIOLOGY

Published QUARTERLY under grant from the Robert Schalkenbach
Foundation in the interest of constructive synthesis in the local sciences.

VOLUME 8

APRIL, 1949

NUMBER 3

Lord Acton, A Great European

(Part I)

By FRANCIS NEILSON

HISTORY RECORDS many examples of students gathering around a teacher whose influence is so profound that in later life the young men confess that their careers have been shaped by the lectures to which they have listened. Perhaps one of the most striking instances of this was Abélard in the twelfth century. Even after he was accused of historical heresy and suffered great persecution, scores of students flocked to hear him. When he sought a solitary domain in which to build a rude cabin of wattle, suitable for a hermit, the students in Paris, learning of his retreat, went in great numbers and erected hundreds of huts about his simple abode. Such is the story of Abélard.

There were many others in medieval days to whom the young people went in throngs to hear something of the philosophy of culture. This desire to be instructed by a master was one of the most hopeful manifestations of youth. Once the student was convinced that his preceptor was a man of knowledge and ready to impart it to his hearers, the bond was forged which lasted all through life, and the attachment of pupil to master is recorded in many works left by those who were so fortunate as to be members of the group. Some of the memoirs of famous men refer to their days at college or university, when they enjoyed the hours spent at lectures given by a great teacher.

Lord Acton's Association with Döllinger

PERHAPS ONE of the most prominent of these was Lord Acton, who became Regius Professor of History at the University of Cambridge. But long before he came into direct touch with the students, he had earned for himself an exceptional reputation in the society of studious men; for his learning was encyclopedic, and culturally he was among the few outstanding Europeans whose fame was acknowledged far beyond the borders of his native land. Acton spoke several languages fluently, and frequently took a leading part in many of the profound religious and political controversies of the continent of Europe. Indeed, he was the perfect type of a European.

Born in Naples in 1834, he lived sixty-eight years full of intellectual and cultural activity in many lands. His first school was St. Mary's College, Oscott, where, in addition to Latin and Greek, he set himself the task of learning Spanish, Irish, and Chinese at the age of eleven. His masters were ripe scholars. The president of Oscott was Dr. Wiseman, afterwards the famous cardinal, and two of his instructors were J. B. Morris, a Fellow of Exeter, and Dr. Spencer Logan. Years afterwards, when Wilfred Ward was writing his *Life of Wiseman*, Acton said in a letter to him: "We used to see him [Wiseman] with Lord Shrewsbury, with O'Connell, with Father Mathew, with a Mesopotamian patriarch, with Newman, with Pugin, and we had a feeling that Oscott, next to Peking, was the centre of the world." (Quoted by F. E. Lally, "As Lord Acton Says," 1942, p. 5 footnote)

It is almost unbelievable that this young man was refused admission as an undergraduate at Cambridge University because he was a Catholic. The question then arose as to where he should go to resume his education. When this crisis presented itself, he turned to his mother, who had become the wife of Lord Granville, and she, having met Dr. Döllinger at Tegernsee, the country estate of Count Arco-Valley, her brother-in-law, suggested that her son should go to Munich.

Thus began one of the most interesting educational associations of modern days. Döllinger possessed a towering intellect. He was known wherever scholars gathered. Of him the *Dublin Review* said:

There is hardly a book, old or new, in the different nations of Europe that he has not read, or at least consulted; even the most recent publication, if it stands in the slightest relation to the object of his inquiry, is not overlooked. (Quoted by Lally, *op. cit.*, p. 7)

As things turned out, it was not unfortunate that Acton was debarred from the English universities because of his religion, for Munich in the

middle of the last century was the cultural center of middle Europe. In some respects it was like Vienna, for it was a pivot upon which those from east and west paused for a time to enjoy the marvelous development undertaken by Maximilian. The Royal Library contained more than 1,300,000 printed volumes and no less than 30,000 manuscripts. Besides, there were galleries of wonderful paintings and sculpture. The Court Opera and the Residenz-Theater were famous for the productions of opera and drama. Munich was, indeed, the perfect school for such a pupil as Acton.

However, it is curious that he has left us little in his writings about the cultural advantages of the city in which he spent some of his most impressionable years. Stranger still, we find very few references to the county in which his estate lay in England.

Aldenham Hall, the home of Lord Acton, stood near Bridgnorth in one of the loveliest parts of Shropshire. It was far enough removed from such towns as Kidderminster and Wolverhampton, on the edge of the Black Country, to bask in the pure air of a rich agricultural district. The Severn flowed beneath the walls of the old town, and not far away was Acton Burnell, where Edward I held the Parliament in 1283. The Acton family was on old one, and its members have always been regarded as "proud Salopians."

Perhaps no county in England is the repository of remains so expressive of the thought of Lord Acton as that of his forebears. Within a short distance of Bridgnorth, on the Severn, lie the ruins of the abbeys of Lilleshall, Buildwas, and Wenlock. Farther to the northwest, in the direction of Shrewsbury, there are the vestiges of the Roman town of Uriconium. Indeed, it may be said that this country contains the evidence of the growth of church and State since Mercian days. The old saying that Salop is a book of history that can be read by anyone who rambles about, and has the mind to learn "summat about what he sees," is near the mark. Yet, Acton left us few observations on the history of the county in which his estate lay.

It was at Aldenham Hall that he collected his famous library which was bought by Andrew Carnegie and afterwards donated by John Morley to Cambridge University. This is one of the priceless possessions gathered together by one man. He began the work of collection when he was with Döllinger at Munich. It contains nearly 60,000 volumes and most of them reveal the work of the student by the comments in the margins, to say nothing of the pages that are interleaved and covered with notes.

His stepfather, Lord Granville, wrote from Aldenham to Lord Canning: . . . His library is becoming immense. He has remodelled the old library. He has entirely filled the hall; he has furnished his own room with books, and he has bagged a bedroom for the same purpose. I can hardly open a book without finding notes or marks of his. . . . ("Life of Lord Granville," by Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice, I, 358)

It is not often that a pupil succeeds in attaining an excellence comparable to that of such a master as Döllinger. In this respect Acton is somewhat unique, for as a young man in the early thirties his learning was acknowledged by many of the leading men of that time. Of course he had opportunities that were denied to his preceptor. In Italy, Germany, France, and England, owing to his family associations, he was welcomed in the circles of society where he met those who were then famous in religious and political affairs. A list of names of the well-known people with whom he was acquainted during that period would run into the hundreds. The observations of an admirer that Acton knew everything worth knowing and everybody of importance was an exaggeration, but such a one as gives us an indication of his prestige. Moreover, he was a learned man who loved life and entered into the spirit of the sane social gatherings of the capitals with the address of a courtier and the polish of a wit. His erudition did not weigh so heavily upon him that he could not rise to the occasion and enter cheerfully into the harmless gossip of the moment. Herbert Paul, in his introductory memoir to "Lord Acton's Letters to Mary Gladstone," tells us that he was a *bon vivant*, a thorough man of the world, and that he was an excellent judge of cooking and of wine. Yet, this man who fought against ultramontaniam and the Vatican was a passionate believer in the Church.

From Döllinger Acton learned the thorough rudiments of the historical method which he pursued all through his life. In his search for truth he never hesitated to denounce what he firmly believed to be untrue in history and sinful in politicians and priests.

It is surprising now to find a revival of interest in him because his thought is so far removed from that of our religious and political schools. He was concerned with fundamentals and would have abhorred most of the nostrums that are served today as the wisdom of an age of progress culminating in the atomic bomb. It is also strange that there is a renewal of interest in his essays, for there is nothing in them that could countenance the bureaucratic recklessness and the regimentation of man which are the most noticeable features of the times in which we live. The

superficiality of political thought and the corruption which is now an everyday affair in politics would have driven Acton into solitude. The faith that he revealed in the Essays on Freedom, concerning a moral system that free men could enjoy, would have been shattered completely. We have only to turn to the Letters that he wrote to Mary Gladstone to discover the real man and understand his wide interests and the depth of his mind. Where he went, the people he met, the subjects discussed, taken together with what he was thinking, what he was reading, and the plans that he was making, particularly about his "History of Liberty," which was not written, present a rare person—one with enduring faith in man as a thinking being.

There is life in these Letters, and the student who would take up the essays should read them as a preparatory course for the understanding of their author. There is not a dull line in them, and for an exposition of intellectual honesty, they are as stimulating as any that have been published.

On Political Conditions

WE MIGHT NOW TURN to the works and learn from this many-sided man what he thought about the political conditions of his day. This should be of great interest to the student because the opinions expressed therein are those of one who was intimately associated with the leading politicians of Europe and America. He abominated the time-serving demagogue who battens upon the taxpayer, and he abhorred historians who refused to record facts that were unfavorable to the State and its ministers. When he reviewed Phillimore's "History of England," he said:

It is certainly most desirable that something should be written that would abate the conceit and self-satisfaction with which we Englishmen contemplate ourselves. Many of the qualities we prize most highly in theory are those which appear least visibly in our history. No Christian annals are so sanguinary as ours. . . . (Lally, *op. cit.*, p. 53 footnote)

It is well for us to remember such pronouncements and to understand that it was not Acton alone who recognized this fact; similar statements had been made by John Bright and Richard Cobden. However, the English skin at that time was not so easily scratched as it is today.

No one had a better appreciation than Acton of the utility of government and the extent of its powers. In a few lines he put this in a nutshell:

The true distinction between despotism and constitutional government does not lie in the limitation of power but in the existence of means for making power accountable for its behaviour. (Lally, *op. cit.*, p. 149)

And so keen was his sense of the purpose and aim of political liberty that he did not cease to keep this in view and repeat it many times in his essays:

Liberty is not a means to a higher political end. It is itself the highest political end. It is not for the sake of a good political administration that it is required, but for security in pursuit of the objects of civil society and private life. (Lally, *op. cit.*, p. 148)

And how true is the following:

. . . Liberty deteriorates unless it has to struggle for its own existence; and struggle it must, inevitably, and recurrently; for *the passion for power over others can never cease to threaten mankind*. . . . (Lally, *op. cit.*, p. 153)

This seems like an echo of the warnings of our Founding Fathers. Alas, they have fallen upon deaf ears! There is no struggle today to conserve that which was the dominant desire of the Revolutionists.

No one during his period realized so well as he the clear intentions of the men who made this country a Republic.

. . . It was from America that the plain ideas that men ought to mind their own business, and that the nation is responsible to Heaven for the acts of the State, ideas long locked in the breast of solitary thinkers and hidden away in Latin folios, burst forth like a conqueror upon the world they were destined to transform under the title of the Rights of Man. ("Letters to Mary Gladstone," pp. 66-7)

Who, in politics today, minds his own business? And it might be asked: Who likes the cost of interfering with the business of others? But politics, as viewed by Acton, was something far higher than the practice we have become used to since we departed from the custom of letting the people themselves settle their own troubles. Of course, it should be remembered that Acton lived in the days of what was called "splendid isolation." He would have been called a Nazi if he had lived in our day and gave voice to his opinions. Still, he was in the true line of descent from the British Whigs. He wrote to Mary Gladstone, saying: "I know I am much more favourable to the great Whig connection, to the tradition of Locke and Somers, Adam Smith and Burke and Macaulay, than Mr. Gladstone would like." ("Letters," p. 212)

And this was written in opposition to his suspicion of early impressions and of doctrines unaccounted for. He would have agreed, no doubt, with George Savile (Marquis of Halifax) who said, "Religion is the foundation of government; without it man is an abandoned creature, one of the worst beasts Nature hath produced."

On Democracy

ACTON'S FAITH in true democracy remained steadfast, and his belief in its future seems to us today strange and out of place. But at that time many of the great thinkers of Europe, in France and in Germany, imagined that education would not tend to deprive men of their religious ideas, for it was thought that the spread of knowledge would enlighten men and help them to rise to better things. He wrote to Mary Gladstone:

The generation you consult will be more democratic and better instructed than our own; for the progress of democracy, though not constant, is certain, and the progress of knowledge is both constant and certain. It will be more severe in literary judgments, and more generous in political. . . . ("Letters," pp. 141-2)

Surely such a hope as this must remind us how far we have departed from the aim of many men who lived before the great wars that began in this century. Such a statement made about seventy years ago marks the amazing changes that have wrought havoc with the hopes of those who placed their faith in education as an instrument of enlightenment. Still, we may be living in one of the inconstant periods when democracy is in need of new rims for its wheels and has been shunted down a siding for repairs. The prospect of getting it on to the main line again is not a hopeful one, for knowledge of its usefulness is disclaimed by those who have abused it and imagine a bureaucracy is better suited to an ignorant electorate.

Acton would not have lifted his hand to save a shred of what we now call democracy. His thought was so far removed from that of the illiterate mob that they would not have known the figure of democracy that he respected. In all probability, she would have been stoned by our so-called democrats.

Gladstone's definition—"trust in the people, tempered by prudence"—appealed to Acton, and that was the Liberal understanding of the term during his lifetime.

In reviewing Sir Erskine May's "Democracy in Europe," he wrote: "Democracy, like monarchy, is salutary within limits and fatal in excess; . . . it is the truest friend of freedom or its most unrelenting foe." ("Essays on Freedom and Power," Boston, 1948, p. 130)

A democracy that countenances graft, dole, and regimentation, could not have been imagined by the Liberals of the middle of the last century. And as for one sanctioning military ascendancy in the government by imposing upon men the rule of drill and drum, it could not have been

thought of, for it was the Liberal creed at the time to live in peace with one's neighbors. Yet, Acton often seems to be conscious of the political pitfalls set for the unwary: "A true Liberal," he says, "as distinguished from a Democrat, keeps this peril always before him." ("Letters," p. 194) And he was convinced that "there is no error so monstrous that it fails to find defenders among the ablest men." ("Letters," p. 195)

In recent articles and reviews on Acton and his work, the following well-known declaration has been quoted—"Power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely." Snipped from its context, it loses its force and seems rather bald although the statement is emphatic. In the controversy that arose over Acton's article in the *English Historical Review* on the "History of the Papacy," Mandell Creighton, the editor of the volumes, took issue with the writer, and in one of the most powerful letters that Acton ever wrote, he defended his position. Strange to say, this defense of the position which Acton took has not been revealed, but it is to be found among his letters to Bishop Creighton and has been reproduced in part in the Appendix to the "Historical Essays and Studies," published in 1907. Every word he wrote to Creighton is worth remembering, for in this generation drawing to a close, we have had, unhappily, so many examples of the power which tends to corrupt that the words of Acton are as timely now as they were when the article was written in 1887. There is room only to quote the following excerpt:

. . . I cannot accept your canon that we are to judge Pope and King unlike other men, with a favourable presumption that they did no wrong. If there is any presumption it is the other way, against the holders of power, increasing as the power increases. Historic responsibility has to make up for the want of legal responsibility. Power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely. Great men are almost always bad men, even when they exercise influence and not authority, still more when you superadd the tendency or the certainty of corruption by authority. There is no worse heresy than that the office sanctifies the holder of it. That is the point at which the negation of Catholicism and the negation of Liberalism meet and keep high festival, and the end learns to justify the means. You would hang a man of no position like Ravailac; but if what one hears is true, then Elizabeth asked the gaoler to murder Mary, and William III ordered his Scots minister to extirpate a clan. Here are the greatest names coupled with the greatest crimes; you would spare those criminals, for some mysterious reason. I would hang them higher than Haman, for reasons of quite obvious justice, still more, still higher for the sake of historical science. ("Historical Essays and Studies," Appendix, pp. 504-5)

Here is a text which should be hung on the portals of our schools:

"The law of liberty tends to abolish the reign of race over race, of faith over faith, of class over class." ("Letters," p. 196) We ought to take the following to heart at this time, for many an honest man might write it today in connection with the scandals reported on the front pages of our journals:

. . . We deal only with responsibility for public acts. But with these we must deal freely. We have to keep the national conscience straight and true, and if we shrink from doing this because we dare not cast obloquy on class or party or institution, then we become accomplices in wrong-doing, and very possibly in crime. ("Letters," p. 198)

Acton's Influence on Gladstone

HOW JOHN MORLEY, when he wrote the "Life of Gladstone," could miss the importance of Acton's association with Gladstone is difficult to explain. Matthew Arnold said: "Gladstone influences all around him, but Acton: it is Acton who influences Gladstone."

I do not know of anyone who studied the Grand Old Man so closely and so deeply as Acton did. This should be clear to those who will read that extraordinary letter to Mary Gladstone, dated Cannes, December 14, 1880, in which Acton devotes many pages to her father's gifts. In this illuminating communication there are many passages that should be preserved because they are of historical value. There is space to mention only one or two. Referring to Gladstone's "science of statemanship," Acton says:

The decisive test of his greatness will be the gap he will leave. Among those who come after him there will be none who understand that the men who pay wages ought not to be the political masters of those who earn them, (because laws should be adapted to those who have the heaviest stake in the country, for whom misgovernment means not mortified pride or stinted luxury, but want and pain, and degradation and risk to their own lives and to their children's souls), and who yet can understand and feel sympathy for institutions that incorporate tradition and prolong the reign of the dead. . . . ("Letters," p. 147)

It might be said that the gap was felt before he died. For he was the one man, had he not retired, who could have opposed the South African policy of Chamberlain and Rhodes with a chance of success. Another passage from this letter should be recorded, for what it states is very well worth deep consideration at this time:

. . . We know that the doctrine of equality leads by steps not only logical, but almost mechanical, to sacrifice the principle of liberty to the principle of quantity; that, being unable to abdicate responsibility and

power, it attacks genuine representation, and, as there is no limit where there is no control, invades, sooner or later, both property and religion. . . . ("Letters," p. 146)

In discussing the propositions of Adam Smith concerning the contracts between labor and capital, Acton declares:

. . . If there is a free contract, in open market, between capital and labour, it cannot be right that one of the two contracting parties should have the making of the laws, the management of the conditions, the keeping of the peace, the administration of justice, the distribution of taxes, the control of expenditure, in its own hands exclusively. It is unjust that all these securities, all these advantages, should be on the same side. It is monstrous that they should be all on the side that has least urgent need of them, that has least to lose. . . . ("Letters," pp. 194-5)

This from a nobleman and a landlord is refreshing and reminds one of the notions held by Francis Place, the pioneer who was responsible for the reform of labor conditions more than a generation before Acton wrote. In a letter dated February 7, 1824, Place said: "Leave workmen and their employers as much as possible at liberty to make their own bargains in their own way."

On History and Historians

AND NOW we must turn to some of Acton's thoughts on history and historians. It should be remembered that at that time in England there were such outstanding jurists as Sir Henry Maine, Sir Frederick Pollock, and Frederick William Maitland—eminent historians who have left indispensable works. Maitland was recognized as one of the most learned men at the University of Cambridge. In referring to Acton's erudition he said:

If we recall the giants of a past time, their wondrous memories, their encyclopædic knowledge, we must remember also how much that Lord Acton knew was for them practically unknowable. ("Letters," p. 85)

Maitland also tells us how Acton toiled "in the archives hunting the little fact that makes the difference." Early in his life Acton realized that "no part of modern history has been so searched and sifted as to be without urgent need of new and deeper inquiry, and the touch of a fresh mind." And he was convinced that "all understanding of history depends on one's understanding the forces that make it, of which religious forces are the most active and the most definite."

He was conscious, too, that ideas play a more important part in historical crises than many writers imagine. On this point he says, "the great object, in trying to understand history, political, religious, literary or scientific, is to get behind men and to grasp ideas."

I do not know where we should look for a finer exposition of the true approach to history than that which is contained in the "Inaugural Lecture on the Study of History," delivered at Cambridge, in June, 1895. The reader of this masterly address should remember that it was given more than fifty years ago, when there was a sense of liberty in the universities which permitted full freedom of thought and speech. The vast scope of his erudition was devoted to the preparation of the lecture, and I am glad it has been incorporated in "Essays on Freedom and Power," by Lord Acton, issued by The Beacon Press (1948). In the 1906 edition of "Lectures on Modern History," there is an Appendix of notes covering twenty-three pages of small print and dealing with 105 items. It will come as a shock to the specialist who treats exclusively of a dynasty, or a political upheaval, or the character of a statesman to learn how Acton approached his problem:

You have often heard it said that Modern History is a subject to which neither beginning nor end can be assigned. No beginning, because the dense web of the fortunes of man is woven without a void; because, in society as in nature, the structure is continuous, and we can trace things back uninterruptedly, until we dimly descry the Declaration of Independence in the forests of Germany. No end, because, on the same principle, history made and history making are scientifically inseparable and separately unmeaning. ("Lect. on Mod. Hist.," p. 1)

Those who have taken snippets of history in some of the courses prescribed in our schools may be surprised to learn from this lecture that the present can only be understood by those who have a knowledge of the past. Acton says, "If the past has been an obstacle and a burden, knowledge of the past is the safest and surest emancipation." There are so many surprises in this address for our students that many will wonder why they have not been introduced to it before this. Here is one: "No intellectual exercise can be more invigorating than to watch the working of the mind of Napoleon, the most entirely known as well as the ablest of historic men."

When, on fuller knowledge, we re-examine the histories of many of our political and religious heroes we find them lacking in the virtues claimed for them by their biographers, and Acton pointed this out in his review of "Tocqueville's Souvenirs":

We cannot form a judgment until we know the worst of the cause to be tried. From the time when the biographical element becomes distinct, for the last five hundred years, there is this constant result, that fewer characters bear the searchlight; and it may generally be affirmed of ruling and leading spirits that, the better we know them, the worse they appear. (Lally, *op. cit.*, p. 213)

What is the real purpose of research that should guide the investigator when he begins to examine the records of the past? Acton in a letter to Mary Gladstone gives us a hint of how we should proceed:

. . . What we want to know is why the old world that had lasted so long went to ruin, how the doctrine of equality sprang into omnipotence, how it changed the principles of administration, justice, international law, taxation, representation, property, and religion. . . . ("Letters," p. 100)

Modern History has had a long beginning, and if we are to understand how we have reached the present stage, it is necessary to review, as Acton did, the amazing changes that shook the world after the discovery of America. For him, Modern History began about the close of the fifteenth century:

. . . When Columbus subverted the notions of the world, and reversed the conditions of production, wealth, and power; Machiavelli released Government from the restraint of law; Erasmus diverted the current of ancient learning from profane into Christian channels; Luther broke the chain of authority and tradition at the strongest link; and Copernicus erected an invincible power that set for ever the mark of progress upon the time that was to come. ("Letters," p. 78)

Dr. Henry Jackson who knew Acton said, "History, as he conceived it, included in its scope all forms of human activity; so that scholars, whom others would describe as theologians or jurists were in his eyes great departmental historians."

In the postscript of a letter to Bishop Creighton he gave

ADVICE TO PERSONS ABOUT TO WRITE HISTORY—DON'T

In the Moral Sciences Prejudice is Dishonesty.

A Historian has to fight against temptations special to his mode of life, temptations from Country, Class, Church, College, Party, Authority of talents, solicitation of friends.

The most respectable of these influences are the most dangerous.

The historian who neglects to root them out is exactly like a juror who votes according to his personal likes or dislikes.

In judging men and things Ethics go before Dogma, Politics or Nationality. The Ethics of History cannot be denominational. . . . ("Hist. Essays & Studies," Appendix, p. 505)

The list of subjects treated in the first two volumes of the "Essays" covers nearly all the most important epochs and crises in the history of Europe and America. It is impossible to put a just estimate upon the erudition of Acton, but a student of history will be well repaid to take the essays edited by Dr. J. N. Figgis and Professor R. V. Laurence (both lecturers at Cambridge) and give them deep consideration, if he has the

slightest desire to appreciate the invaluable work to which Acton devoted his career. Moreover, an interested reader will find excitement in the new interpretation and in the vast number of emendations of old notions which appear on nearly every other page. A thorough reading of the contents of the three volumes will go far toward making an informed man of one who undertakes the task. It is amazing to find students and instructors wasting time on ephemeral studies when they might be delving into such mines of information as can be found in Acton's works.

A second article to follow will present Acton as a historical and literary critic par excellence.

New York

The Outlook for Dependency

WELFARE COMMISSIONER Raymond M. Hilliard of New York City, in helping to launch a public solicitation by a private welfare agency, said: "By far the greater part of our public assistance program is a child of the Great Depression of the Nineteen Thirties. A quantitative measure of the change could be made by comparing 1946, a year of great prosperity, with 1928, the last full year of high prosperity before the 'bust' of 1929. Such a comparison was made in one city, not New York. Five times the number of people were found to be receiving thirty-three times as much money from combined public and private assistance in 1946 than was the case in 1928. I would like to believe that in another twenty years, public assistance, as we know it today, would be only a memory, to be replaced by better organization of our social and economic life. . . . We now know that unless we 'attack dependency at its source,' the public assistance loads will continue to rise inordinately and unnecessarily."

Every economist and economic journalist would like to believe, with New York's sociologist, that a more rational organization of our social and economic life was in prospect in the next two decades. But hardly anywhere in the world do we see portents of this, and certainly not in capitalist America or socialist Russia, the rival leaders of our time. From the Great Depression we learned only to temporize with social and economic problems.

W. L.