Index X, 1950; Index XI, 1951; and Index XII, when issued, 1952. Owing to nonconsecutive dates of publication of the recent volumes, it should be noted that this volume fills the gap between Index VIII and Index X and that the series, which was placed on an annual basis with Index X, 1950, is now complete through 1951.

In view of the fact that this Index covers in minute detail a field not fully or adequately covered elsewhere, it would be a matter of difficulty to attempt to evaluate its great and outstanding usefulness to the research workers within the scope of its subject matter. Particularly, would such be true with regard to those who must keep up with the most recent periodical literature dealing with down-to-the-minute work on such subjects as the newer insecticides, latest approved methods for their application, or, perhaps, latest results obtained from tests of new compounds. Indeed, so rapid have been developments along some of these lines that it becomes of deep interest merely to note something of the extent to which investigation has been broadened from volume to volume in the use of new words, representing names of new compounds, new subject headings, new types of equipment, and the like. These additions to the vocabulary represent definite milestones in advancement of our knowledge and, when traced from volume to volume, are eloquent in dramatizing progress.

An average person probably would consider a reference work of this kind as exceedingly uninteresting reading. However, when approached with imagination and insight, these volumes tell a vivid, dramatic story. Dull looking as they may appear, they represent detailed documentation, item by item, of year by year advancement of an army of skilled workers in the control of insect enemies of sufficient importance that they vitally effect the geographic distribution, the food supply, the health, and the general welfare of millions of people over the world.

J. S. WADE

U.S. Department of Agriculture

The Psychiatric Interview. Harry Stack Sullivan. Helen Swick Perry and Mary Ladd Gawel, Eds. Norton, New York, 1954. xxiii + 246 pp. $4.50.

The death in 1949 of Harry Stack Sullivan prematurely ended the career of one of psychoanalysis' most brilliant and controversial figures. Since he left only one book, it is fortunate that his coworkers have put forth the effort to edit several series of his lectures and make them available in book form. This volume includes lectures given in 1944 and 1945 in which Sullivan applied his particular interest in the problems of communication to a specific consideration of the interview. Its informal style reveals his personality, his sometimes sardonic humor, and his characteristic method of teaching.

The book is a readable guide to Sullivan's concept of the theoretical nature and practical technique of the interview. He first makes it clear that an interviewer must contribute thought and direction, as well as a sympathetic ear, to carry out his responsibilities. He then outlines the objectives of the interview and emphasizes the specific maneuvers he used to accomplish these objectives.

His lucid and practical discussion should be helpful to the psychiatrist, particularly the psychiatrist in training. However, whether the material is equally helpful to ministers, educators, and workers in industry, as recommended by the author, is open to some question, unless they have an unusually extensive psychiatric background.

Sullivan's book demonstrates that psychoanalysis today is by no means limited to Freudian theory. He was a leader in the challenge to those who tended to look on Freud as a final authority, and he contributed materially to the scientific advance of psychoanalysis and to the prevention of its stagnation. The taste of Sullivan's dynamic thinking included in *The Psychiatric Interview* should stimulate the reader to further exploration of his interpersonal theory of psychiatry.

C. KNIGHT ALDRICH

Department of Psychiatry and Neurology, University of Minnesota

How to Understand Propaganda. Alfred McClung Lee. Rinehart, New York, 1952 (reissue, 1954). xii + 281 pp. $3.

It is encouraging to hear again, even if indirectly, from the Institute for Propaganda Analysis, which voluntarily ceased its work at the start of World War II. Alfred McClung Lee served for a period as executive director of that important organization and has had a long, unbroken interest in propaganda. This book is a reorganization and popular interpretation of Lee's writings in learned journals during a period of two decades. It should be viewed, therefore, as a popularization rather than as a work pushing forward the frontiers of thought and research in this field.

The early pioneer work of the Institute for Propaganda Analysis was concerned principally with large-scale national propagandas. Indeed it was this very emphasis that led to the dilemma of loyalty created by our own entrance into war—a dilemma which the Institute patriotically resolved by ceasing its work. *How to Understand Propaganda* is directed more at domestic forces, commercial advertising, vicious brands of super-patriotism, and other compulsions that place us under what the author calls "the growing pall of orthodoxy." He seeks to reinforce the objectives of liberal education by helping man free himself from the glue of mass opinion and conformity that has been slowly poured over him. He reflects the same concern for individuality that occupied much of the energy of Thoreau and Mill and, in our own time, of Ortega y Gasset in his *Revolt of the Masses* and David Riesman in *The Lonely Crowd.*

Lee's analysis, however, lacks the clarity and incisiveness of these other works. It is true that his warnings about the development of mass man are put

in a modern context, but the dangers are ancient, and the real solution is as ancient as the dangers. It is questionable whether a new dimension of analysis or a new insight is contributed by the present work. It would be difficult, for example, to improve on Mill's admonition:

> Precisely because tyranny of opinion is such as to make eccentricity a reproach, it is desirable, in order to break through that tyranny, that people should be eccentric. . . . That so few dare to be eccentric marks the chief danger of the time. [Mill, *On Liberty*, chapter entitled "Of individuality."]

Lee's first suggestion for combating the effects of propaganda is that "we must give up certainty." For, he states, "in a world in which all is relative to all else and in which all is constantly changing, there is no certainty, no valid absolute or dogma." Some of the staunchest defenders of freedom in our day would not agree with this assumption. Certainly, for example, responsible British conservatives in the tradition of Burke would be the first to believe in certain absolutes concerning the dignity of man and the existence of natural law; yet they would also be the first to defend individuality and eccentricity within the circle of these absolutes. All of which is simply saying that the maintenance of individuality does not really depend upon the denial of certainty "in all things" but rather upon the questioning of certainty in most things. There will be sharp disagreement about this first assumption of liberty. But at least Lee has reminded us of the need for asserting independence and thinking for ourselves. This should help us to escape the pall of uniformity that he decries.

RALPH BRAIBANTI
Department of Political Science, Duke University

Atlas of Men. A guide for somatotyping the adult male at all ages. William H. Sheldon. Harper, New York, 1954. xvi + 357 pp. Illus. $10.

This *Atlas of Men,* by William H. Sheldon and two listed collaborators, is the fourth book to appear in the inevitably controversial "Constitutional Psychology" Series. For the record, it is outsize and handsomely printed. It provides 1:30 body-build photographs of 1175 men selected from a master file of 46,000, and age-height-weight norms for each of the 88 known somatotypes. In addition, there is a prose accompaniment: verbal and graphic sketches of birds, insects, and mammals (both living and extinct); observations on diverse topics; an estimate of the probable somatotype of Abraham Lincoln (1½–6–3); and some commentary on Babe Ruth's lower legs.

Age-weight-height norms for each somatotype represent an interesting and potentially useful contribution. So, too, is the evidence that for most somatotypes, gross weight decreases by the late fifties, suggesting possibly differential survival *within each somatotype.* However, statistically sophisticated workers may object that 46,000 cases (two-thirds of them from college campuses) are too few for 88 somatotypes, 15 stature groups, and 8 to 10 age groups, or 13,200 categories in all! Thus, while the information for the 7–1–1, incidence 1 per 10,000, is based on only 4 or 5 men, there are 75 weight-for-age-and-height norms given for this rare somatotype! Sheldon explains that "in the cases of somatotypes of extreme rarity the weight data are derived *mainly* by interpolation" (p. 31), which is a most unpretentious way of describing the methods used in computing the "norms."

As readers of the previous volumes know, the three-number system may be augmented by more verbal descriptions. A 4–5–1 can be called an endomorphic mesomorph or a Northwesterner (referring to its position on the somatotype triangle). In this *Atlas,* Sheldon, responding to no popular demand whatsoever, likens each of the 88 somatotypes to a different bird, insect, or mammal—1–1–7's are "wasps," 1–7–2's are "eagles," 3–2–5's are "railbirds," 3–5–4's are "racehorses," and 6–2–1's are "seals" or "platypuses." Impartially, the animals, as well as the men, come in for description and portrayal but in the form of miniature line cuts and not in the expected three views.

In certain respects Sheldon has moderated, or mellowed. Neither sociologists nor razor blade manufacturers will find personal affront in the *Atlas.* In considering the idea of specific organ weaknesses, cross-cutting somatotypical lines, Sheldon comes closer to Julius Bauer. He adheres more closely to contemporary thinking by suggesting that morbidity (and probably) mortality might be reduced if most somatotypes were trained down to 10 percent below their norm-for-somatotype weights. (In the case of the 7–3–1 this still leaves about 200 lb of fat.)

Yet these concessions do not entirely remove the impression of increasing isolationism. Rarely are other studies utilizing the somatotype approach mentioned, even when conducted by C. W. Dupertuis, who is listed on the title page as a collaborator. Hooton's modification of the Sheldon system is ignored, even though extensively applied to Army separatees. Tanner's work in England, extensive work in Scandinavia, several studies from South Africa, in fact the factor analyses of Burt, Howells, and others, even the work of Morris—none achieve acknowledgment. Kraus (who somatotyped Japanese) is never mentioned by name, nor is Gallagher, Bodell, or Seltzer. And the whole question of why there should be correlations between physique and disease, normal or psychotic behavior, or anything is avoided or dealt with mechanistically, when there is increasing evidence that body form and biochemical function are not unrelated dimensions and when Sheldon stresses the desirability of reasonable (but unspecified) biochemical tests.

Because Sheldon's writings always elicit a strikingly bimodal response with individuals on the tails loudest in their praise or condemnation, it is hardly possible to review the *Atlas* in the conventional way. If you are for Sheldon or at least interested in descriptive somatotyping you will find in the *Atlas* multiple ex-