fullest recognition inasmuch as it cultivates a field which has been lying quite fallow. In the first volume the author investigates in general the rise of house-industry, which in many provinces of Austria still continues to-day to be the only form of industrial employment. He shows how the local house-industry, which had sprung up here and there, could develop to a considerable degree only through the appearance of mediators between work and its market. We have even to-day in Austria a double form of house-industry—one which sells its commodities only by peddling, the peddlers being recruited from the families of the producers; and a house-industry whose commodities reach the market through strange agents, through merchants, and finally, through the *entrepreneur* ("Verleger"). Only this last method of sale enables the house-industry to thrive greatly.

In the second volume the author treats a subject that might also awaken a keen interest in America; he gives us, namely, a detailed account of the origin and development of the Viennese pearl button industry, which, till recently, as is well known, exported its products in large quantities to America and whose stability latterly has received a severe blow through a customs regulation of the United States. The author gives us a description of how the raw material is procured (shell fisheries), how this was worked up in the Orient and how the same process began in Austria at the commencement of the last century. Then he portrays the condition of the master workman in the shell-turning industry, and the transition of this handicraft into a house-industry. This last form was more advantageous to the *entrepreneur* and was encouraged by him in his capacity of "contractor." Only through these "contractors" was it possible for the pearl buttons of Vienna to become one of the most important export articles sent from Austria to America. Because of the great importance of this branch of industry for Vienna, the author goes into a detailed account of the *social* status of the masters as well as of the journeymen and workmen in this trade.

We hope that the author may soon gratify us with the account of other branches of Austrian industry, and so enrich the history of the *work* of the Austrian people by further valuable contributions.

LUDWIG GUMFLOWICZ.

(Translated by ELLEN C. SEMPLE.)

Municipal Government in Great Britain. By ALBERT SHAW. Pp. 375. Price, \$2.00. New York: Century Company, 1895.

A number of recent publications on municipal government and institutions seem to show that the literature of this subject is entering upon

[973]

a new stage of development. For a long time our main source of information was a series of disconnected essays and magazine articles critical, rather than descriptive, in character. Directed, as a rule, against specific abuses they lack the breadth of more general treatment. Not that we have as yet emerged from this stage. There are indications, however, that the period of careful and detailed description and analysis has been reached. Even here, it is true, it has been the legal rather than the economic aspects of city government that have received attention. Such questions as the relation of the State to the municipality ; the legal powers of the latter ; its rights and liabilities have received careful scientific treatment at the hands of a number of distinguished jurists.

On the other hand, we have but very few attempts to treat with any degree of completeness the economic problems that confront our cities ; especially the great centres of population. The relation of the activities of the municipality to the question of social progress still awaits the attention of the economist. In theories of social prosperity this element must occupy an increasingly important position. Comparatively small changes in municipal policy ; a very slight increase in the concerted action of the community often means a new standard of wants and with it of comforts to large classes of the population. Condemnation proceedings against the worst slum districts, careful building regulations, a strict enforcement of sanitary requirements, etc., involve but little effort when compared with the change that would be effected in the daily life of our urban population. No treatment with the economic side of municipal activity will accomplish its purpose unless it fully illustrates this fact. It is because Dr. Shaw's book does this that it will be of permanent value to all who are interested in the manifold problems of social progress. In thus meeting the full requirements at a first attempt, in a field of work hitherto unoccupied, Dr. Shaw has done a great service to those who are to follow him in work of a similar character. Perhaps the greatest merit of the book is a rare ability in so grouping facts as to give them their deepest interest and most suggestive influence. This is especially true in the chapters dealing with individual cities, such as London, Glasgow, Birmingham and Manchester. Without any conscious attempt to contrast the English with the American development the author's skillful presentation calls forth, almost involuntarily, a contrast with the method of dealing with similar problems in the larger American cities. Dr. Shaw has clearly demonstrated the possibility of giving a concise and yet fairly complete description of the activities of a municipality in such a way as to interest the average reader. To do this, however, he has been

compelled to restrict the descriptions to necessary facts, giving but few details as to the development of policy in various municipal departments, a method which would have been clearly impossible within the comparatively short space of one volume.

The present condition of municipal government in England, as described by the author, presents many curious and interesting comparisons with our own conditions. The English municipalities, in their form of administration, do not depend upon any system of "checks" and "balances," such as we have thought necessary to incorporate into our form of city government. In matters of local government, they have not taken their inspiration from the form of central government; clearly recognizing that the peculiar nature of the problems to be solved by the municipalities made it impossible, and if possible, undesirable, to hamper the action of the community by means of a bicameral system and an executive veto. We are made to feel that positive action is the great desideratum where the character of the work is purely economic and administrative; however desirable a system of checks may be in political action. In other words, the distrust of representative institutions has not found its expression in the form of municipal government in England, as it has in the United States. There, the town council is looked upon as representative of the body of citizens or burgesses, and to this popular body complete control over local affairs is given. As a result, we find local powers concentrated in the town council, with the detailed administrative control in the hands of committees of the local legislature.

The tendency of municipal government in this country is in exactly the opposite direction. The history of American cities during the last twenty years might well be called the history of the decline and fall of the town council. In none of our large cities at the present time does the city council exercise anything like the powers it enjoyed twenty years ago. At first, stripped of its appointive powers; then, of its more important financial functions; and, finally, of the power of confirmation of mayoralty appointments,—it has come to be a mere shadow of its former self. This is the case in New York and Brooklyn; it is the tendency of all changes in Philadelphia; and will, no doubt, receive acceptance in Boston in a very short time. The idea of concentrating power in the hands of one man, namely, an elective mayor, has never found acceptance in any of the European cities. While the momentary needs of the hour may have dictated this step to most of our cities, yet we ought consciously to face the fact that it is leading us farther and farther from the earlier democratic ideals, and that it is closing the way to an improvement in the character of our

city councils. It is true that in the system we have adopted, the office of mayor will appeal to the ambition of some of the better elements in our communities ; but it is equally true that the office of councilman will be definitely relegated to the mercies of the obscure, if not undesirable elements of the population. The contrast, then, between the English and American cities, is as great as one can readily imagine. The fact of the complete failure of the attempt to govern our cities on something of the same plan, merely proves that a form of government which requires the co-operation, and the active co-operation, of a large number of citizens, becomes unworkable as soon as the character of the men who are drawn into the administration, falls below a certain point.

Dr. Shaw gives an inspiring picture of the municipal, or perhaps more exactly described, the social activities of Glasgow, Manchester and Birmingham. The far-sighted policy in planning a system of drainage and water-supply, adequate to the needs of a growing population, stands in direct contrast with the experience of some American cities in expending large sums upon poor sources of supply, and in constructing a drainage system on a patch-work plan, rather than in accordance with a complete organic scheme. When Manchester determines to go to Wales for a water-supply ; when Birmingham contemplates the same thing, it is with the idea of creating a supply which will meet any possible need for generations to come.

No less characteristic of this far-seeing policy is the demolition of entire sections of the city in order to give air, light and health to the poorest and most degraded portions of the community, and thus to raise the tone of social morality throughout the city. While the expenditure for these purposes has been very large in both Glasgow and Birmingham, especially when we consider the fact that the entire work was done within a very few years, yet the return to the community will be hundred, if not thousand-fold in the saving of human energy and in the lessening of human suffering. But even from a purely financial standpoint these expenditures represent by no means unprofitable investments.

Dr. Shaw's treatment of the government of London is one of the most satisfactory in the book. In perhaps no other city in the world has there existed so complete a chaos of authorities. The discussion of the relation of these authorities to one another is a model of clearness and precision of exposition. The work of the London County Council and the magnitude of the problems with which London's great aggregation of population is confronted, receive careful treatment ; the possibilities and limitations being clearly recognized.

On the whole, this book which is to be followed by another dealing

[976]

with continental cities, gives us a most inspiring picture of the possibilities of an intense municipal life, as we find it in the English cities. Without undue praise of English institutions, or disparagement of those of our own country, it is evident that Dr. Shaw fully realizes the fact that the government of municipalities is dependent upon the men who take an active part in the work, and that the system which brings the government in closest contact with the people is, in the long run, the safest and most permanent basis of development. The book contains so much of interest to the economist and sociologist, as well as to the student of local institutions, that these brief references to various portions of the book, give but a very faint idea of the value and interest of the material which has thus been placed before the American public in most attractive and readable form,

L. S. ROWE.

University of Pennsylvania.

Roger Williams, the Pioneer of Religious Liberty. By OSCAR S. STRAUS. Pp. 257. Price, \$1.25. New York: Century Company, 1894.

The resolution to be impartial does not always avail in dealing with men who have been much loved or much hated, for the heart finds arguments which often escape the critical eyes of the judgment. It seems that Mr. Straus has not escaped some of the subtle influences produced by his admiration for the noble battle of his hero against the ecclesiastical system of Massachusetts. This appears in the preface where Roger Williams is set in the same rank with Luther and Cromwell; it hardly seems necessary to argue that the relation of Williams to "The Establishment of Religious Liberty" is not fairly indicated by suggesting it be the same as that of Luther to the Reformation, and that of Cromwell to the Puritan Revolution. This defect appears most prominently perhaps in the great controversy between Williams and the Massachusetts authorities. In general it may be said that nowhere does Roger Williams fall under the authors' criticism and nowhere do the authorities come in for praise. Perhaps the latter do not deserve much commendation for anything said or done, but it is hardly conceivable that Williams committed no errors of either heart or mind. Very few writers upon this controversy leave out the political influences operating upon the General Court in trying and sentencing Williams, and while some New England writers may have placed too much emphasis upon them, in order to relieve the Puritans of the charge of religious persecution, yet one can hardly justify the author in ignoring the probable effect of Williams' teaching and acts upon England, as a cause of his treatment. Again, the

[977]