

# Michigan Law Review

---

Volume 17 | Issue 8

---

1919

## Book Reviews

John B. Waite  
*University of Michigan Law School*

Edwin C. Goddard  
*University of Michigan Law School*

Edwin D. Dickinson  
*University of Michigan Law School*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://repository.law.umich.edu/mlr>



Part of the [Conflict of Laws Commons](#), [Legal Profession Commons](#), and the [Military, War, and Peace Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

John B. Waite, Edwin C. Goddard & Edwin D. Dickinson, *Book Reviews*, 17 MICH. L. REV. 715 (1919).  
Available at: <https://repository.law.umich.edu/mlr/vol17/iss8/6>

This Book Reviews is brought to you for free and open access by the Michigan Law Review at University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Michigan Law Review by an authorized editor of University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact [mlaw.repository@umich.edu](mailto:mlaw.repository@umich.edu).

## BOOK REVIEWS

---

THE LAW AS A VOCATION, by Frederick J. Allen, Assistant Director, Bureau of Vocational Guidance Division of Education, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., published by Harvard University, 1919: pp. VIII, 83.

The purpose of this book is, to quote from the preface, "to present a clear, accurate, and impartial study of the law in the hope of offering assistance to those who are attempting to choose a career or who are about to enter upon the profession. This necessitates a review of the nature of the law, present day legal conditions, personal and educational requirements, the dangers and disadvantages incident to practice, the high professional demands made upon the lawyer, the varied fields of service open to him, his probable earnings and emoluments,—in a word, all that has a distinct and important bearing upon the law as a vocation."

It is apparent that within the limits of 75 pages of text all this could at best be done in only a sketchy and superficial fashion. By "the nature of the law" the author evidently alludes not to the nature of law itself—review of which would be a considerable undertaking—but rather to some phases of the profession of law. The presentation of this, through limitation of space, does not compare in completeness and value with Julius H. Cohen's, "The Law—Business or Profession?" Neither does the discussion of dangers and disadvantages incident to practice rank in informational value with the 39 pages of Theron G. Strong's chapter on the Modern Lawyer, in his "Landmarks of a Lawyer's Lifetime". The personal and educational requirements are catalogued rather than discussed. All that is said is sound and worth while so far as it goes, but it obviously can not go very deep.

It is not impossible that the book meets a real need in the field of vocational choice—a subject with which the reviewer is but empirically acquainted,—but it could hardly be of more than suggestive value to anyone seeking to analyze the merits and disadvantages of the profession of law.

JOHN B. WAITE.

---

THE WORLD WAR AND ITS CONSEQUENCES, by William Herbert Hobbs, Professor of Geology, University of Michigan, with an Introduction by Theodore Roosevelt, New York and London, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1919; pp. XIV, 446.

Here we have a book by a professor of geology, which deals with history, politics, diplomacy and war, and all with a voice as certain as though the author were speaking on his own science. That such a book should be reviewed in a legal journal may be justified in these times by the intense interest for all of the subjects discussed, not to mention the legal flavor of the book suggested by the reference in the opening sentence of the text to "Lawyers" as "accustomed to speak of ultimate or fundamental, as opposed to

the proximate causes of an event." A geologist might not be expected to know that lawyers are more likely to speak of proximate as opposed to remote causes, and that philosophers, historians, sociologists, economists, possibly scientists generally and some other classes of students and scholars are more likely than lawyers to be concerned with ultimate or fundamental causes. However, no harm results to the book, for the author at once disclaims any even "quasi-judicial attitude of trying a case," and gets into at least a quasi-scientific field, astronomical so to speak, by attempting to show that "the assault of 1914 was as inevitable as the rising of the sun". So broadly has he covered the field of the causes and issues of the war that the reviewer can understand how Theodore Roosevelt could choose this book, if he could choose but one, to put into the hand of every man and woman in the United States at this time.

The book is the outgrowth of a course of lectures, delivered by the author before the close of the fighting, and the reviewer does not know of another book which within the same compass provides so clear, and comprehensive a view of the matters discussed. The reader will agree that it is written in no judicial spirit. There is no impartial weighing of evidence. All statements are positive and clear of all doubt on every subject touched. If the writer was ever in the attitude of a judge he has reached his conclusions and regards the evidence as having left no doubt of the justice of the sentence of condemnation he pronounces on the Kaiser and the Germany that have made this war, for which preparations had been made on a vast scale and with unbelievable thoroughness during a long period of time.

Most readers might be expected to doubt some of the alleged facts, and many of the theories advanced to account for those facts, had Germany not furnished so many undoubted proofs which condemn her out of her own mouth. Professor Hobbs is careful throughout to give references to books and documents on which he bases his statements, and here he is like the lawyer who cites cases to uphold his every point. While some will question many of his inferences and explanations of acts and events, evidence seems abundant and clear to support the huge array of damning facts he presents against Germany. The book, especially in Chapter VIII, almost arouses admiration for this Germany because of her marvelous efficiency, military, educational, industrial, economic, every thing but moral and diplomatic. One might have expected to find Germany's diplomatic weakness more fully stated. It seems to have been her Achilles' heel. With two or three exceptions the author is unusually frank in mentioning by name those whose acts he discusses, be they public or private citizens, living or dead.

He renders a needed service in reinforcing the earnest plea to the Nation of General Leonard Wood by showing how inefficient have been the armies of our country in past wars whenever our untrained men were matched against trained soldiers, and how undeserved are the heroics of the school histories. This was shown notably in the War of the Revolution, in that of 1812, and in the opening months of the Civil War. This has been due to no lack of courage and ability of the men of the Nation, but to their lack of military training. When our armies had been trained they proved them-

selves worthy the steel of any foe. America should learn a lesson from this, and it should be taught in our schools. Let our children know the facts. Some Americans would not want their children to get their ideas of President Wilson and his administration from this book. Even those who agree with the author will admit that the discussion is partisan. It should be added that it is evidently honest and sincere, and the partisanship is not due to political party feeling but to patriotic fervor.

In speaking of the strength of Germany as depending on her resources in coal, iron, and potash, it is fortunate for the reader that the author is a geologist. His remarks on the future of Mesopotamia are the more interesting and valuable for the same reason.

EDWIN C. GODDARD.

---

FEDERAL MILITARY PENSIONS IN THE UNITED STATES. By William H. Glasson, Professor of Political Economy and Social Science, Trinity College, North Carolina. Edited by David Kinley. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Division of Economics and History. New York. Oxford University Press, 1918; pp. xiv, 305.

Professor Glasson's original monograph on the pension system, entitled *HISTORY OF MILITARY PENSION LEGISLATION IN THE UNITED STATES*, appeared in the Columbia University Studies in Political Science in 1900. The present volume is the result, as the author tells us, of "A fresh and better rounded investigation of the federal military pension system of the United States from the beginning." It offers an accurate and well-balanced account of the development of the system from the period of English and colonial origins, when the first English statute "for relief of Souldiours" was enacted, to the entry of the United States into the great war, at which time a radically different system was adopted. The author's generalizations are carefully formulated and abundantly supported. As Professor Kinley remarks in his editorial preface, the account is both heartening and depressing, heartening because of the generous provision which has been made for those who have risked their lives in the country's service, and depressing because of the political corruption and moral degeneration which are revealed in the system's operation. In several respects Professor Glasson's study should be of particular interest to lawyers. It illuminates some of the more obvious defects in our legislative methods. It exposes incidentally certain activities of the parasitic claim agent or "soldier's friend" which a profession jealous of its good repute must welcome every opportunity to condemn. It presents in reasonable compass a reliable summary of national legislative activity in relation to a topic of the first importance. The book contains many valuable statistical tables, a brief bibliographical note, and an excellent index. An analysis of the War Insurance Law of October 6, 1917, is included as an appendix.

E. D. DICKINSON.

THE CONFLICT OF LAWS RELATING TO BILLS AND NOTES. By Ernest G. Lorenzen, Professor of Law in Yale University. New Haven, Yale University Press; London, Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press; 1919; pp. 337.

An anonymous pamphlet of the year 1645 warns against the election of lawyers to the House of Commons because, among other objections, "The knowledge of the Common Law, doth no way conduce to the making of a States-man: It is a confined and topical kind of Learning, calculated only for the Meridian of Westminster Hall, and reacheth no further then Dover. Transplant a Common Lawyer to Calice, and his head is no more useful there then a Sun-Dyall in a grave." Mr. Lorenzen's head, however, contains knowledge of use in Calice and in every other part of the civilized world, if one may judge from this book—although he does not mention the law of China. He has taken as his text the Uniform Law relating to bills and notes, approved by the representatives of more than a score of nations at the Hague Conference in 1912. This, in its particulars, he compares with the law, on the same topic, of the various countries of the world, especially that phase of it relating to the conflict of laws. This does not necessitate statement of all the law of any country regarding negotiable instruments, and the author has not attempted to offer to the international financier, or his lawyer, a compendium of foreign law upon the subject. He assumes, moreover, a considerable technical knowledge on the part of his readers, and his style, while direct and concise, is somewhat elliptic, so that those parts of the book which are not merely expository are rather tough reading. With this realization, that the book is for the student rather than for the casual practitioner, it is of a value quite commensurate with all of Mr. Lorenzen's writings.

JOHN B. WAITE.