certain points too vigorous. The general view that physically similar individuals behave alike he has answered—as he puts it, to his own satisfaction and to the “frenzied disapproval” of others—by a study of the correlation between types of criminal offence and different physical characteristics. The original data are not discussed in the book under review, but, neglecting altogether for the moment the question of the possible correlation between crime and social and economic status, one may be permitted to make the general observation that, since conventions of ‘crime’ differ between different peoples and at different times, the correlation suggested by Prof. Hooton might not hold in a social environment different from the one in which he studied it.

Furthermore, while a definition of constitutional types is broadly possible, and in general referable to certain psychological distinctions—a relation which even the non-scientific man has for centuries recognized—the detailed classification of physical types which Prof. Hooton accepts presents too many anatomical shortcomings (many of which he himself points out) to justify wide generalization.

A further difficulty is that Prof. Hooton often gives the appearance of confusing the question of racial differences with that of the correlation in a mixed population of different patterns of behaviour with specific physical types. Both problems are immensely important, but they are largely distinct—even though they may overlap. Racial types cannot be created *a priori* by the anthropologist—notwithstanding Prof. Hooton’s assertion that in classifying men on the basis of physical resemblance he would be prepared to put siblings, if necessary, in different racial groups.

The anthropologist’s responsibility is to define the physical and psychological characteristics of declared racial groups the individuals of which are linked in blood-ties—and to do this not only in the isolated pockets of humanity where a correlation may be found between racial type and behaviour, but also in regions where a declared racial type has spread into an environment in which specific patterns of behaviour, and even specific physical characteristics, no longer remain immediately obvious. Isolation—either physical or psychological—and conversely the opposite of isolation, may be far more potent determinants of social behaviour than racial physical characters. Until the relative strength of the two factors has been decided by the most rigorously controlled observation, wide generalizations such as “human evil is not a product of human institutions but of human beings” will continue to be dangerously double-edged.

So, too, it is perhaps premature to follow Prof. Hooton in his far-reaching eugenic predictions about the possible effect of family limitation on the physical and social character of future populations. If indeed we knew enough about human biology to produce the ‘better’ men to whom he looks forward, why limit their number as he would have us do? Why not fill the world with them? The manner in which these particular views are put forward suggests, however, that some of them are Prof. Hooton’s demonstrations of kite-flying, while others are Aunt Sallies, which he occasionally knocks down before the reader has a chance to get at them.

The total effect which Prof. Hooton has produced is a readable, stimulating and amusing book which demonstrates the scope of the conclusions that could be reached with fuller knowledge.

S. ZUCKERMAN.

AGRICULTURE ON A NATIONAL SCALE

Agriculture’s Challenge to the Nation

By Arthur Smith. Pp. x+236. (London and Toronto: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1942.) 8s. 6d. net.

ONE of the hopeful features of our national life to-day is the widespread interest now being taken in our agriculture. Rarely have so many policies been propounded or books issued, which clearly the public is prepared to buy. There is a growing tendency to expect the State to take a larger and larger part in the business, though how far this would survive in actual practice would remain to be seen.

In the present book Mr. Smith goes further than most of his predecessors, and almost makes the farmer and the farm worker into salaried officials; at least the risks are to be more heavily shouldered by the State and the returns both to farmers and workers are to be increased.

The author sets out to bring into use some forty-seven million acres in the United Kingdom, sixteen million being arable and thirty-one million grass. This is, of course, considerably more land than is in agricultural use at present, and the scheme necessitates a good deal of reclamation and development of rough grazings and deer forests. The main arable crops would be oats, of which there would be four million acres, half for human consumption and half for poultry and other livestock; next would come wheat and lucerne in the dry areas; and then enough sugar beet to provide our pre-war sugar allowance and sufficient barley to give a “reasonable drink allowance”. Haymaking would be replaced by ensilage and grass drying. Beef production would be eliminated as too costly in feeding-stuffs, but as milk production is to be increased it is not at all clear what use is to be made of the bull calves inseparable from that activity. For you cannot have milk until the cow has produced a calf, and she has to go on producing a calf annually if her milk yield is to continue. Approximately half her calves are males useful only for conversion into beef. Sheep, pigs and cattle would be pastured on the hill lands, the cattle being used for butter production.

Prices would be such that the men workers would receive a minimum wage of 60s. a week for forty-eight hours and the women and youths would receive 48s. There would be processing factories in the villages at which other members of the family could work. A family might as a whole be drawing £15 weekly. The farmer would be paid according to the area of land he occupied. He would live free of rent, rates and taxes on the land he farmed. He would receive free of charge all implements and machinery, seeds, fertilizers, stock, etc., necessary to his farming, and in addition a salary of £4 per acre on the first fifty acres, £3 per acre on the next 150 acres, £2 per acre on the next 150, and £1 per acre on all acres above 350. In return, the produce would belong to the nation.

There is little doubt that farmers in Great Britain would be interested in a scheme of this sort which goes far beyond their most sanguine hopes. But the crux of the problem is this: Would the nation? Until some big national pronouncement is forthcoming, policy-making remains uncertain.

E. J. RUSSELL.