and Father Charles Coughlin launch what in Lukacs's view were the only real threats to President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Today we have the "Republicans, who are more nationalist than socialist, and the Democrats, who are more socialist than nationalist—whence the rise of the former and the decline of the latter during the last forty-odd years."

The future, Lukacs thinks, will be different. As "the welfare state is a universal reality now, the conflicts and the compounds of nationalism and socialism have lost much of their meaning." And nationalism all over the world has been devolving into ethnic tribalism. "Given the changing ethnic composition of the American people . . . American nationalism, too, may devolve into tribal struggles of a peculiarly American kind."

Free the Courts!

"Judicial Gridlock: The Case for Abolishing Diversity Legislation" by Frank M. Coffin, in *The Brookings Review* (Winter 1992), 1775 Mass. Ave. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Over the past three decades, the burden on the federal court system has grown enormously. The caseload has tripled in federal district courts and increased tenfold in the courts of appeals. And there is no end in sight, notes Senior U.S. Circuit Judge Coffin, given the "unceasing flow of federal statutes and entitlements, resulting in inexorably increasing federal litigation." How can the serious strain on the courts be reduced? One way would be to expand yet again the 837-member federal judiciary. Coffin urges a different solution: Get rid of an anachronism called "diversity jurisdiction."

Thanks to the Federal Judiciary Act of 1789, out-of-state parties involved today in state civil cases (in which the amount at issue is at least $50,000) have recourse to the federal courts if they fear the state judge will be biased in favor of their home-state opponents. The need for such protection from local passions "has long since disappeared," Coffin says, yet that "diversity jurisdiction" provision survives.

Since the early 1970s, diversity cases have accounted for one-fourth of the district courts' civil docket, one-fifth of their total criminal and civil docket, and almost one-seventh of the appeals courts' total docket. The amount of judicial time and effort consumed is even greater. In fiscal 1990, diversity cases accounted for 40 percent of all trials, jury and nonjury.

In 1990, the Federal Courts Study Committee, which consisted of members of Congress, federal and state judges, and lawyers, recommended abolition of diversity jurisdiction, shifting the cases back to state courts. Many state and federal judges concur, but there is one notable group of dissenters: lawyers who do not want to give up the option of transferring cases to a federal court when that seems advantageous. If diversity jurisdiction is to be laid to rest, Coffin notes, "it will be because of support from beyond the borders of the legal community."

FOREIGN POLICY & DEFENSE

Waiting for Mr. X

"The Case for Pragmatism" by William G. Hyland, in *Foreign Affairs* (special annual "America and the World" issue, 1991–92), 58 East 68th St., New York, N.Y. 10021.

The end of the Cold War has been a bonanza for the punditocracy. Opportunities to spin new theories about the proper U.S. role in the world abound. Should America