

some of the public offices to which Negroes were elected or appointed before and after the "Great Migration." The author believes that it was logical for Negroes to stay in the Republican column because of that party's efforts in their behalf. He attributes the defection from the Republicans to: (1) "their tendency to forsake or ignore Negroes in the South"; (2) the failure of that party to keep its campaign pledges; (3) the effective overtures which Democrats made to "a great number of energetic and intelligent Negroes" who had migrated to the North since 1915. This shift in party allegiance, plus a slight tendency of a few Negroes to vote "independent of party labels," is what Professor Tatum seems to regard as "the changed political thought of the Negro" between 1915 and 1940.

It is quite disappointing to find no discussion of the "Negro's attitude toward communism" (except for two sentences on page 184) or toward the other liberal or reactionary politico-economic philosophies which have competed with the traditional political groups for electoral support in the United States since 1930.

Other things which mar the volume are: mistakes in spelling (pp. 10, 62, 77, 170, and in the bibliography), unsupported generalizations (pp. 77, 80, and 159), inconsistent statements (pp. 72 and 111), and inaccurate reporting (pp. 35, 36, 103, 158, 159, and in the bibliography).

Finally, in this reviewer's opinion, the one contribution which the present study makes is that of pointing up the need for a scholarly investigation of Negro political ideas in America from 1619 to 1952.

J. ERROLL MILLER

Lincoln University of Missouri

KNAUFF, ELLEN RAPHAEL. *The Ellen Knauff Story*. Introduction by Arthur Garfield Hays. Pp. xix, 242, 21. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1952. \$3.50.

Ellen Knauff dedicates her book, a detailed chronology of her three-year battle to gain admission to the United States after being branded a "poor security risk" and excluded without a hearing, to "the United States of America and her amaz-

ing people." Her report is a tribute not only to her own faith in the American principles of justice and fairness, but to the "amazing people" who, once informed of the facts in Mrs. Knauff's case, rallied to her defense and by that most mysterious of group processes—public opinion—forced the Immigration Service to recognize its error, reverse itself, and permit Mrs. Knauff's entry to this country.

Widely publicized, this case of a German war-bride was fought by Mrs. Knauff's indefatigable attorneys, Gunther Jacobson and Albert Feingold, the *New York Post*, the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, the American Civil Liberties Union, and Congressmen Walter and Roosevelt because they believe that the democratic idea of due process—a fair hearing—must be continually defended, even in the face of small-minded and arbitrary thinking in a government agency.

Behind the many legal jousts and infighting between the executive and legislative branches of the government in this case is the theme which symbolizes the moral struggle that the free world is now waging against Communist totalitarianism: that a democratic government can provide a system of fair procedures in which respect for the individual is paramount and in which opportunity is given to disprove charges, and that only through full and impartial hearings can the truth be established. While security safeguards in a time of international tension are understandable, Mrs. Knauff's story points up what abuses can occur when these procedures operate without corresponding concern for individual rights.

The struggle to establish the principle of a full and fair hearing goes beyond Mrs. Knauff's tribulation. The State Department's Passport Division denies passports to American citizens for travel abroad if, in its opinion, such travel would not be in the "best interests of the United States." No specified reasons are given. No opportunity is given the citizen to answer openly whatever evidence the Passport Division may have, or to disprove the charges. All this indicates how far the pendulum can swing toward the side of security and away from liberty when fear, even when

understandably grounded, dominates governmental action. The American Civil Liberties Union has recently initiated a test case challenging the constitutional right of the State Department to deny a passport without a hearing, and it is hoped that the Supreme Court will decide the issue soon.

Throughout Mrs. Knauff's book, despite the disappointments, the delays in the legal process, the pettiness of bureaucracy, runs a strong note of optimism and faith in the democratic process. She writes: "I do not wish anybody to be falsely accused. It is a bitter and frightening experience. Yet—if it were possible without the agony, I almost wish every human being could go through a similar experience, a similar, personal method of realizing what's important in this world—as I did on Ellis Island.

"Only when my own human rights and my own freedom were endangered did I realize the importance of freedom. Only when I experienced the deep, natural devotion of other people to justice did I myself become a passionate believer in freedom and justice—and in people. . . .

"For the people of America despise tyrants, be they of the great or the petty variety, and they are fortunate to have inherited a system of protection which makes every little man master in his house and in his country.

"The people of America saw to it that their elected representatives picked up my fight against arbitrary decrees of the frightened. And in turn, an official of the highest tribunal of the land brought the weight of his office to bear in my favor, in order to protect the authority vested by the people in their elected representatives.

"And finally, the Government itself, faced with an aroused public opinion and a relentlessly probing Congress, showed enough fortitude to admit it was not omniscient and could make mistakes."

As long as these forces are free to express themselves, and are willing to take up the cudgels—even for the single individual—when an injustice is committed, our brand of democracy will win out.

PATRICK MURPHY MALIN

American Civil Liberties Union
New York City

ECONOMICS AND INDUSTRY

GALBRAITH, JOHN KENNETH. *American Capitalism: The Concept of Countervailing Power*. Pp. xv, 217. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1952. \$3.00.

Dr. Galbraith presents here, with characteristic sweep and verve, a number of interesting and challenging ideas concerning American economic and political life. The first half of the book is devoted to a careful criticism of some of the economic notions prevailing about 1935, especially in their more naïve business and academic forms. Chamberlin's discovery (1931) that economic life seldom conforms to "pure" competition is elaborated, and there is a brief popular summary of Keynes's attack upon "Say's law" that supply creates its own demand.

In the middle of the book, after a somewhat ambivalent but predominantly neo-Veblenite excursion into the "Unseemly Economics of Opulence," Dr. Galbraith develops his very interesting politico-economic concept of "countervailing power" (Chapters IX and X) and applies it to a number of different problems ending with inflation.

The first and last parts of the work are curiously dated in economic analysis with a very spotty coverage of postwar literature and ideas. There are also a number of inaccuracies. Students of economic history will be troubled, for example, to learn (p. 67) that "until 1930 a *really* serious depression was not part of the experience of Americans." Schumpeter's three cycle schema, the panic of 1837, and the fifteen years of "dull times" that followed the panic of 1873 have all alike been passed by. Dr. Galbraith also repeats (p. 75) the usual mistaken charge against Lord Keynes that he considered the rate of interest always and exclusively a purely monetary phenomenon. In addition the recent work of such sincere Keynesians as Professor Lloyd Metzler regarding wages and the "wealth effect" is entirely overlooked. There is nothing in the text to tell the reader that today it is generally conceded by most Keynesians including Samuelson, Klein, and Metzler that the