service rivalry, and Presidential ineptitude are not remedied simply by larger appropriations.

Although he is sharply critical of American foreign policy since World War II and calls for a radical transvaluation of our whole value system, Spanier's account of American performance on the new world stage is anything but a record of failure. To be sure, he repeats the usual *post hoc* arguments about our political innocence in pulling back from Eastern Europe, in leaving Germany divided and Berlin an island in a communist sea, and in demobilizing our vast army before a political settlement had been reached, as well as about the other "blunders" that a "realistic" diplomacy of force might have avoided. But all this is what FDR used to describe as an "iffy" argument. Could we in fact have done anything to "free" Eastern Europe, including Germany and Berlin, without continuing the war—this time against our quondam ally, the Soviet Union? Did the demobilization of our Army in fact create a power vacuum in Central Europe, and if it did, what difference did it make? The Russians, by and large, did not in fact advance significantly beyond the lines they held at war's end. Was not Russia so weakened by the destruction of her economy and the loss of manpower that, while she could hold what she had, she was in no position to do more?

Foreign Policy Record

I would not argue that American foreign policy since World War II has been an unblemished record of success. Nor would I defend the diplomacy of "Brinkmanship," "Massive Retaliation," or "Liberation" rather than "Containment." But the Japanese treaty, the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, and even the Korean War, to mention but a few items in the record, represent achievements of no mean proportions in defense of our national interest. To be sure, these and other policies have not been unmixed with liberal notions about "peace," "generosity," and "friendship," but neither are they the policies of a nation suffering from an excessive fear of power.

In addition to our failure to understand and to play the game of power politics, Spanier chides us for failure to understand "the anti-colonial revolutions of the underdeveloped nations." The real issue here, he says, is "whether the United States can supply the new nations with the capital funds and with a social message that can compete with the appeal of Communism." It would seem that our liberal tradition and our own revolutionary heritage should stand us in good stead as we confront the "revolution of rising expectations and national independence" that is sweeping through Asia, Africa, and the Middle East. But this, too, will call for a tough appraisal of the extent to which the democratic values and democratic institutions of a "People of Plenty" are exportable to "People of Poverty and Illiteracy," with little or no experience in either politics or administration. The wrong answer to this question may well be the Achilles heel of American foreign policy in the 1960's.

Spanier's analysis and his argument as to what must be done pose a challenge to every literate American. Must we abandon the liberal and humane values which have been our heritage to achieve security against communist infiltration, subversion, and conquest? Must we, in a word, lose our souls to save our skins? I think not.

PETER H. ODEGARD
Department of Political Science, University of California, Berkeley

Trends in the American Economy in the Nineteenth Century. A report of the National Bureau of Economic Research. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1960. xi + 780 pp. $15.

This book fills a major need in the field of United States and Canadian economic history. The result of a joint effort by the National Bureau of Economic Research and the Economic History Association, the volume contains the most comprehensive and careful measurements yet made of the quantitative aspects of economic growth in Canada and the United States since 1790. Eighteen monographs, with critical commentaries, present new or improved statistical series covering the main trends in output growth, prices, income by sectors, factor payments, investment, and the balance of payments. These series tie in with contemporary series in national income, prices, wages, and so forth; hence, the volume makes possible reasonably accurate historical comparisons, in some cases for the first time.

THEODORE GEIGER
National Planning Association, Washington, D.C.

A Manual of Common Beetles of Eastern North America. Elizabeth S. Dillon and Lawrence S. Dillon. Row, Peterson, Evanston, Ill., 1961. 844 pp. Illus. $9.25.

This manual is the first of its kind on the largest group of animals, the Coleoptera. To be sure, there are manuals for general beetle collectors, but they are either too incomplete for reasonable accuracy or too bulky and technical for easy use. The Dillons' book strikes a happy medium. Keys identify some 1200 common beetles found in eastern North America. There are illustrations galore (544 of body parts) and 85 plates (four in color) of 1177 habitus drawings of species. If the user keeps in mind the fact that not all known species are included, he should find this book very useful, for never before has it been made so easy to identify beetles in the area concerned.

The introduction is a short discourse on the anatomy of beetles, collecting and preserving, and larvae. A chapter on ecology gives short accounts of the many environmental situations in which beetles are found; this chapter should suggest places for beginners to collect specimens. A key allows determination of 64 families and contains illustrations of body parts that might cause trouble for the user. The major part of the book, 85 percent, is concerned with each family and its species. Each family is briefly discussed; then keys to species are given. For convenience the many illustrations of difficult characteristics are placed very near the couplet concerned. Each species is described, and the habitus of each is illustrated on a plate. Finally, there is a glossary, a list of important technical articles, a list of faunal lists, and an index.

There is not much to criticize, but one serious fault is the use of many incorrect generic and specific names. These errors are unfortunate, and could easily have been avoided by consulting current catalogs or revisions. Some of the illustrations of body parts could be confusing: a line just inside the border indicates either a sulcus (Fig. 211) or convexity (Fig. 108). I have not made a search for errors, but one mistake in the key to families could cause some trouble: on page 39, couplet 18, Trogidae actually has closed mesocoxal cavities, whereas Scarabaeidae has open cavities (the figures referred to are correctly labeled).

It is my hope that this book will be shown to every undergraduate biology