

ethical ideas as to the end of the law. The last of these, he observed, is made up to a large extent of an idealized picture of the legal and political institutions of pioneer America. In the conferences Dean Pound stressed the steps which are under way to adapt judicial organization and administration so as to function more effectively in modern industrial and urban communities. He also gave considerable attention to the rule-making power of the courts, the selection of judges, and improvements in methods of instruction in law schools. He commended as forward steps the judicial council of California and the recent bar organization act.

The interest shown in this year's Institute, both by those connected with the University of California summer session in Los Angeles and by the general public, was exceptionally encouraging. Dr. C. G. Haines, chairman of the committee in charge, has announced that plans are under way for a third Institute during the summer of 1928.

ORDEAN ROCKEY.

*University of California at Los Angeles.*

**The Institute of Politics at Williamstown.** Between July 28 and August 25, the seventh session of the Institute of Politics was held at Williamstown. Said the executive secretary, Professor McLaren, at the beginning of the session: "New problems arising in the world, or problems of long standing entering upon new phases, present difficulties that require discussion. We have come to recognize that the United States has entered upon a new phase in its relations with the other members of the family of nations. Our power to produce goods and the consequent necessity to sell them almost equals that of all the rest of the world. This recent development has brought us face to face with a many-sided problem and if we are to solve it successfully we must take stock of our situation." This the Institute attempted to do through eight round-table conferences, of which five bore directly upon American interests and policies, supplemented by three lecture courses and five special addresses. The practice of holding general conferences, which has prevailed at previous sessions, was somewhat modified. Instead of considering certain special topics in general conference, each round-table leader held two general conferences for all members of the Institute, in which he summarized the most important features of his round-table.

Another novelty was the study of Latin America from a new angle. Hitherto this subject has been considered under the able leadership of the head of the Pan American Union. But this year Professor William R.

Shepherd, of Columbia University, discussed "Foreign Interests and National Self-Determination in Latin America." He felt free to emphasize the hegemony of the United States in the western hemisphere, the enormous elasticity of the Monroe Doctrine, the artificiality of Pan-Americanism in its most successful aspects and its political failure, and the conflict between realities and theories which lies at the root of most of the difficulties between the United States and Latin America. He pointed out on what grounds the United States is called imperialistic. In most cases, however, American policy was regarded as more or less inevitable, although specific actions might be condemned as needlessly brusque. The facts, theories, and legal uncertainties of the Mexican question were considered in detail, and arbitration of matters in dispute was endorsed. It was felt that better understanding with Latin America might result from the creation of an inter-American commission of inquiry and conciliation and the establishment, on the Williamstown model, of an institute of inter-American relations. Dr. Moisés Sáenz explained in a lecture the "Educational Policy of the Mexican Government."

Discussion of American relations with Europe was confined to a study of international debts in retrospect and prospect, conducted by Dr. Joseph S. Davis, of the Food Research Institute, Stanford University. Not only were the usual facts and arguments pro and con considered, but also the financial and economic lessons of the reparations question, and the development of American investments abroad with their implications. It was urged that the formulation of some definite policies involving foreign investments was something much to be desired. The course of lectures on the financial and economic policy of Germany since the war, by Dr. Peter P. Reinhold, sometime minister of finance for Saxony and for the German Republic, served to supplement the consideration of the debt question.

Although the relation of that question to the difficulties of American agriculture was considered, it was not regarded as bearing very largely upon the farmers' problems. Mr. Henry A. Wallace, of Des Moines, editor of *Wallace's Farmer*, took up the subject of "An American Agricultural Policy." To what extent America should be industrialized; what percentage of the population should remain agricultural; to what share of the national income the farmer is entitled; how far large-scale organization is practicable in agriculture—these matters were all considered without developing any consensus of opinion. Dangers of a food shortage, increasing the cost of living and thereby creating proletarian

discontent and unrest, were held up as possible if no relief for the farmers is devised. The creation of an agricultural board and an agricultural council to consider agricultural problems and to formulate far-sighted policies was urged. The government was criticized for favoring business and industry while neglecting agriculture. The homestead law was declared obsolete, and further reclamation projects were condemned. The principles of the McNary-Haugen bill were explained and apparently approved, while the provisions of the so-called administration bill, published in the newspapers during the Institute, were criticized. A lecture on the modern aspect of the land problem in Denmark was delivered by Dr. Jakob E. Lange, of Odense.

Turning to the Far East, a round-table directed by Professor Ralston Hayden, of the University of Michigan, considered "The Philippine Islands: Their Political Status." In general, the Coolidge policies were endorsed and the administration of Governor-General Wood was lauded. On the other hand, the necessity of removing the political uncertainty which now hinders the economic development of the islands was frankly recognized. Commissioner Guevara suggested the appointment of an American-Filipino commission to investigate the whole question and suggest a solution that would satisfy both parties. Such a body could consider world aspects of the subject as well as local ones, and might be able to lift the question out of politics, both in the United States and in the islands. This would seem to hold out hopes for that American-Filipino cooperation which is essential to progress.

Professor Harold S. Quigley, of the University of Minnesota, directed a conference on "The Chinese Situation." While a sympathetic presentation of Chinese nationalism in both its political and cultural aspects was given, the tremendous difficulties to progress in China were considered and the unsuitability of Western democratic institutions to Chinese conditions was admitted. Although the nationalists at present seem to be facing insurmountable difficulties, it was emphasized that the foreign powers should let China alone and stop trying to "pick winners" among the Chinese factions. Mr. Thomas F. Millard gave vigorous warning against large-scale intervention by all the foreign powers to restore order and rescue the Chinese people, and criticized the American minister at Peking for failing to understand or to approve the policy of the present administration in Washington. Suggestion was made favoring some form of gradual abolition of extraterritoriality, or, if abolition is impossible, the creation of a bilateral system of reciprocal extraterritoriality. Professor Stanley K. Hornbeck

reported on the session of the Institute of Pacific Relations which met at Honolulu, formulating as the two great outstanding facts in the Pacific that "China needs a government" and "Japan needs foodstuffs and raw materials." It was urged that new negotiation for treaty revision be promptly undertaken.

The present problems of the British Commonwealth of Nations since the war were analyzed in a conference led by Professor Herbert Heaton, of Queens University. In considerable measure, this was a discussion of the Imperial Conference of 1926 and its attempt to define the status of the British dominions in their relations to Great Britain and to each other. Any attempt to explain the British Empire raises more questions than it answers, and this was no exception. Unfortunately, no opportunity offered for considering India and the crown colonies. Supplementary in some respects to these discussions was the course of lectures on British foreign policy since the war, by Sir Arthur Willert, of the British Foreign Office. These traced the broad outlines of that policy in all their simplicity, with the exception of those matters then being discussed by the Arms Conference at Geneva.

Certain outstanding features of present-day Europe were described in the conference on "Dictatorship versus Democracy in Europe" under the leadership of Professor Henry R. Spencer, of Ohio State University. The reasons for the existing régimes in Russia, Italy, Spain, Hungary, and elsewhere, were presented in detail, and the beneficial results in each case were described, but considerable doubt as to the stability of such governments was expressed. It was felt that their foundations are unsteady. On the other hand, due consideration was given to our changing views as to the purpose of government. If popular government, instead of being merely a means for protecting the individual against royal tyranny, is to become an efficient agent for social betterment, it must learn how to utilize the expert and vigorous leader, and must free itself from "parliamentarism." Certain phases of this subject were also taken up in a lecture on the basis of political party life in Europe, by Dr. Robert Michels, of the universities of Basle and Turin.

Other aspects of European affairs were considered in lectures of which the most important were those of Count Carlo Sforza, sometime Italian minister for foreign affairs, on "Diplomatic Europe since the Treaty of Versailles." In these he discussed Franco-German relations, Polish-German relations, the succession states, Turkey and the Allied Powers, the Baltic states, and the post-war policies of the Vatican, illustrating many of his points from his personal experiences. In general, he defended

the peace settlement, and his whole outlook on the future was optimistic. A similarly hopeful note was struck by the head of the Serbian Orthodox Church, Bishop Nicholai, of Ochrida, who lectured on "The New Balkans—New Spiritual and Political Values," and on "The Narrow Path to Peace."

Following the precedent set a few years ago of having one conference of a legal character, Dr. Pierre Le Paulle, the representative in the United States of the National Association of French Barristers, conducted a round-table on the main contrasts between Anglo-Saxon and Continental systems of law. He set forth the advantages of code law over judge-made law and of European methods of examining witnesses and taking appeals over American practices, and pointed out the weaknesses of the jury system.

RICHARD A. NEWHALL.

*Williams College.*