

vitality important events in their proper places, is one of the aspects of his work which shows how superficial his treatment often is. Dr. Schwill's work fills a gap, but we still await the book which in a scholarly, interesting and suggestive manner shall present to preparatory and college students the progress of European history from the Renaissance to the present.

Professor Judson's "Europe in the Nineteenth Century" is not new, for it was published originally in 1894, and as no attempt has been made to bring it up to date and only here and there has an event been added to show that any revision has taken place, one wonders why the present reprint bears the date 1898. Nothing is said of Italy after 1871; no event of French history after 1886, except the election of the presidents, is mentioned; nothing is said of German history since the retirement of Bismarck. A page is devoted to English history since 1894 and another to that of Russia, but the treatment is inadequate in both instances, and in the latter case is vitiated by the statement that under Nicolas II. no material change of policy has been undertaken. Such important events as the establishment of a fifth electoral class in Austria (Cis-Lithania) and the recognition of Prince Ferdinand of Bulgaria are passed by entirely. In truth, Professor Judson's little book is not history at all. It is a kind of political view of certain aspects of nineteenth century history, containing many interesting comments, but often marred by newspaper judgments and hasty conclusions.

CHARLES M. ANDREWS.

Bryn Mawr College.

The Rise and Growth of American Politics. By HENRY JONES FORD. Pp. viii, 409. Price, \$1.50. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1898.

"The cardinal principle of American politics is that party organization is the sole efficient means of administrative union between the executive and legislative branches of the government, and whatever tends to maintain and perfect that union makes for orderly politics and constitutional progress." This sentence is an admirable summary of the conclusions reached by Mr. Ford in his study into one side of the unwritten constitution of the United States. The framers of the government attempted the impossible when they sought to found a progressive government upon a system of checks and balances. That ideal would have resulted in confusion and inefficiency. From the first a leader with the force of the government behind him was necessary if any progress was to be made, and in the absence of any

constitutional method of obtaining unity of action, the extra-constitutional means of party organization was forced into service.

Hamilton and Jefferson became the leaders of their respective parties, and each one while in office used the official machinery for the realization of party programs. With the patronage which the president has at his disposal and the unlimited field from which he may draw his official advisers, the American executive has the possibility of being the most effective party leader in the world, and if Mr. Ford's ideal shall be realized, the voters of the United States will through him control the policy of the nation. Precedents have shown, however, that when the president is not the leader of his party more than half his power is gone. Adams wrecked his administration because the Federalist leader in the person of Hamilton was not taken into the executive department. The power of Jefferson and Jackson came from the fact that the party leader was president, and a well-organized system of discipline kept the house of representatives behind the president. The voters elected both, both stood for the same principles and the two administrations were successful.

The period of senate supremacy was abnormal. The questions at issue from 1840 to 1860 were sectional not national, and while these were the important issues, leadership in national politics drifted into the hands of a body constitutionally unfit for the position, and occupying it only because North and South could there meet on equal terms. Opportunism and delay were the highest aim of American politics, and the senate was the only body where such a policy could live.

With the disappearance of sectional issues the conflict came between the two departments of government dependent upon popular support, and then the question of leadership was determined by party. Lincoln led the house for he led his party. Johnson could not do so, because he had not party support. Upon all conflicts between president and house of representatives Mr. Ford looks with regret, for in them he sees a waste of energy. How can we again secure that co-operation of the two popular forces which was found under Washington, Jefferson, Jackson and Lincoln, and which resulted in the broad outlines of legislation being determined by well-trained heads of departments, while the immediate representatives of the people determined the details?

A strengthened and improved party organization, in the author's opinion, is the only true solution. Party organization has prevented the wheels of government being blocked in the past, and the same force is able to increase the efficiency of the government in the future. The president and the majority in the house of representatives elected

at the same time should be in party accord, and the force of party organization should compel them to act in harmony. Against these two powers the senate would be impotent except in its constitutional function of an advisory body. Hold the president and his party responsible to the platform upon which they were elected, giving to the executive the political leadership which, as the representative of the popular will he has a right to demand, and a presidential democracy will result, a type of the future governments of the world. In this government two features will be prominent, an executive, responsible to party and to people, formulating the general outlines of legislative policy and a congress regulating the details of the measures proposed and furnishing a check upon presidential action because of its more frequent election. This government in the author's opinion is superior to a parliamentary democracy, in that the prime minister as well as his followers will be directly responsible to the people and can be checked by them if necessary at the expiration of two years. Not parliamentary government based on a system of classes but presidential government supported by popular representation is the ideal which Mr. Ford sees in our perfected system, and it is in realizing this ideal that he sees the political mission of the United States.

C. H. LINCOLN.

Philadelphia.

The Referendum in Switzerland. By SIMON DEPLOIGE. Pp. 322. Price, 7s. 6d. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1898.

"*Le Referendum en Suisse*" was originally issued in Brussels in 1892, and now appears in English under the auspices of the London School of Economics, whose series embraces a considerable number of very useful books. M. Deploige's work is a thorough and complete account of the referendum and the initiative, those two interesting Swiss institutions which have lately claimed so much attention from political students, at least in centres of investigation west of Germany. In countries where the representative system is itself not yet very secure in its seat, the public mind is indifferent to the worth of an institution which goes to such radical lengths on the way toward unchecked democracy.

The agitation of the referendum when the constitution of Belgium was revised is responsible for this investigation by a Belgian jurist. He has carefully traced the history of the referendum's development in Switzerland and adds not a little to our knowledge concerning the origin of democratic forms in the Alpine cantons. With the purpose of obtaining practical knowledge of his subject, he visited Switzerland and interviewed many men of many minds.

[251]