

These are two major differences. The clincher, however, is that Lincoln believed in abiding by the *Dred Scott decision* (as distinguished from the "political" *dicta* in the opinion) until it might be overruled, and said further that those who thought that the Court's "political rule" was actually a judicial holding were duty bound to implement it by legislative action. This is a far cry from interposition and nullification. It is the opposite of Douglas's "Freeport heresy." And it is very different, too, from the position of most southern school boards today, a position permitted and even tacitly made respectable by the Supreme Court. For what have we in the South right now, but the "Freeport heresy" in modern guise? The responsible governing bodies disregard the *Brown* decision. They refuse to take the steps needed to implement it. Thus they deprive it of effect, and flout the Constitution—just as Douglas suggested that anti-slavery territorial legislatures could render nugatory the *Dred Scott* decision a hundred years ago. Lincoln denounced the "Freeport heresy": "There can be nothing in the words [in an oath of office] 'support the constitution,' if you may run counter to it by refusing support to any right established under the constitution."²² Today countless schools boards are "refusing support" to an established right—the right to unsegregated education. If they read "Created Equal?" (the question mark seems designed to make the title acceptable) they might then decide, with all deliberate speed, which spirit they really would wish to invoke today—Lincoln or Douglas? The answer, it seems to me, can only be Douglas.

THOMAS H. ELIOT†

CITADEL, MARKET AND ALTAR. By Spencer Heath. Baltimore: The Science of Society Foundation, 1957. Pp. xix, 259. \$6.00.

This is an unusual book. An engineer has tried to develop a framework for analyzing society. The reviewer does not find the result very fruitful. This, of course, may be due to the shortcomings of the book or the inability of the reviewer to fully grasp its significance.

The author's attempt to create an "authentic science of society, founded on the same measurements and analyses, with the same methods of observation and formulation as the natural sciences"¹ and to use an analysis that "describes the societal structure as it operates and exists, in terms of its mass, motion and duration content, and

22. Reply at Jonesboro, September 15, 1858, p. 219.

† Charles Nagel Professor of Political Science and Constitutional Law, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri.

1. Pp. 7-8.

thus in its actual and fundamental reality"² may be related to some of the technocratic writing of two and three decades ago; or perhaps it merely represents carrying to an extreme the mechanistic view of the social universe underlying much of the early classical writing in economics.

Similarly, we find loud echoes of Henry George. Mr. Heath asserts "the progressive reduction of taxation and rapid enhancement of ground rent [which would accrue to the government] . . . must surely transform government from the predacious character in which it finally destroys the society it assumes to serve, into a vast agency of veritable public service."³ This reflects a Ricardian-Georgian economic analysis accepted by few economists today. It also reflects the author's view regarding the role of government. An atomistic society based on the right of free contract—and the abolition of taxation—which would "realize, in effect, although not in method, the socialist ideal"⁴ represents Mr. Heath's ideal. While the paucity of footnotes in this book is surely a minor matter, it may reflect the author's unfamiliarity with the vast literature dealing with the problems he discusses. The reader would, of course, look in vain in a theoretical work of this sort for a great deal of empirical evidence. In a brief review like this it is impossible to go into the details of the analysis but the above gives the reader a flavor of the writing and the scope of the problems the author tries to discuss.

This reviewer would be the first to agree that at times an outsider looking at a problem (in this case the engineer looking at societal organization) can make a basic and lasting contribution which the insiders have failed to make because of a form of myopia. It is for this reason that this reviewer had looked forward to reading this book. Unfortunately his expectations were disappointed.

HENRY H. SCHLOSS†

2. P. 7.

3. P. 172.

4. P. 184.

† Assistant Professor of Economics, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri.

