

That remarkable series of battles which distinguished the year 1757 was treated minutely, and in the main accurately, by Carlyle. Indeed, this may be said to have been the most truly historical portion of his work. Tuttle has not deemed it necessary to his purpose to enter at great length upon the subject, but has given in clear and compact form the essential facts about the campaign. His criticisms of Frederic's military operations, however, show that he has mastered the great body of literature that has grown up about the subject. Such a labor must have been enormous, and he is reported to have declared in his later years that "the wars of Frederic would kill him," — a prophecy which, unfortunately, proved too true. The present volume only increases the regret that its gifted author did not live to write the story of Frederic's later work as an administrator, a task for which he was especially fitted and which sadly needs the work of such a hand.

ULYSSES G. WEATHERLY.

*L'Idée de l'État.* Essai critique sur l'Histoire des Théories sociales et politiques en France depuis la Révolution. Par HENRY MICHEL. (Paris : Hachette et Cie. Deuxième édition. 1896. Pp. 659.)

WITHIN the last twenty years there has arisen in France a reaction against collectivism and toward individualism. To this eddy in the current of thought such books as the volume before us and Leroy-Beaulieu's *L'État et ses Fonctions* belong. It could scarcely be otherwise than that the constantly enlarging functions of the democratic state should awaken solicitude. Michel does not indeed wish to narrow the functions of the state. His object rather is to vindicate, for the individual, rights upon which the state may not encroach and claims which it may not disregard. Modern individualists have discarded the social contract as an historical fact, but they still accept it as a rational principle governing the relation between individuals and the state.

It is from this point of view that Michel examines the movement of ideas from the middle of the eighteenth century to our own day. He passes in review the writings of political philosophers, statesmen, political economists, sociologists, — in short, all who have dealt with the state, — and in each case he asks how the particular school or writer stands toward this question. As a history of the political thought of the last hundred years, the book is admirable. No one can read it without being struck with the ample learning, the discriminating judgment, the subtlety of analysis, and the lucidity of expression displayed on every page. An introduction of a hundred pages deals with the period before the French Revolution. After characterizing briefly Voltaire, the Encyclopædists, and the physiocrats, the author takes up the individualistic movement of the century as embodied in its chief representatives, notably Rousseau. This outburst of individualism is attributed to the influence of the Cartesian philosophy and of

Christianity. But whatever may have been their origin, is not the general acceptance of individualistic ideas due to the political and economic situation? The individualistic philosophy of the eighteenth century is at bottom a protest against the absolute monarchy and the privileged orders. Discontent seizes the weapons nearest at hand. The more trenchant they are, the better they serve the purpose. Calvin's doctrine of predestination was an efficient weapon against a church that made salvation depend on sacraments.

The first two of the five books that form the body of the work deal with the reaction against individualism. In the first book an account is given of the political reaction as embodied in the writings of Saint-Martin, De Maistre, De Bonald, Ballanche, Lamennais, Haller, Bentham, Burke, Savigny, and Hegel. In the second book, devoted to the economic and social reaction, the author traces in the writings of the socialists, Saint-Simon at their head, the development of an enlarged conception of the functions of the state. Saint-Simon looks forward to the time when government, hitherto feudal, will pass into the hands of the industrial classes. Then its principal object will be "to ameliorate the lot of individuals." In another pregnant sentence Saint-Simon declares that political forms are less important than the law of property. This statement at once predicts a social revolution and indicates its character. Saint-Simon does not go so far as to deny the right of property, but he holds that the form of the right may change with the changing condition of society.

The third book treats of the individualistic movement in the nineteenth century, and in this connection the effect of the reaction even upon liberal opinion is clearly brought out. Among the political thinkers Royer-Collard, Benjamin Constant, and Lamartine receive special attention as representing respectively the political ideas of the Restoration, of the July Monarchy, and of the February Revolution. Characteristic of Michel's point of view is the remark that the doctrinaires regarded the franchise not as a right but as a function. Many of his readers will object to the implied assumption that liberal ideas and the doctrine of natural rights must be accepted or rejected together. A similar question in regard to the standard which the author applies suggests itself in connection with the account given in the same book of the views of the orthodox economists, who in their fear of socialism narrow the functions of the state. The author regrets their timidity, and sees in the rejection by recent writers of the doctrine of *laissez-faire* a return to the doctrines of the eighteenth century.

In the fourth book the author makes a study of writers who, like Comte, Spencer, and the scientific socialists, apply the method of science to the study of political phenomena. A trait common to these different systems is the disappearance of the opposition between the individual and the state. But such a reconciliation our author thinks can be effected only at the cost of the individual. He brings out clearly the fact that here there are two great systems face to face, the one teaching the reign of law in history as well as in science and the solidarity of successive generations, the other

attributing all progress to individual initiative considered as standing outside of and acting upon the course of events. The antithesis between these two systems is sharply brought out in the doctrines of M. Renouvier, which the author examines in the course of his fifth book, in which present tendencies are considered. According to this writer, the idea of nationality, which has played such a large rôle in the history of the present century, is misleading. The state is made up of groups separated by race, language, and religion, whose union consequently is not natural but voluntary. In like manner the impersonation of society as though it were a real being with rights and duties is without warrant; for rights and duties belong, and indeed can belong, only to individuals. In like manner the idea of progress has been misunderstood. There is no law of progress which governs society in its entirety, but only facts of progress. Progress then is due to the initiative of individuals or of voluntary associations, which break away from the dominion of custom and whose acts are not mechanical but the result of reflection.

In a closing chapter, in which the author sums up his work and brings forward his own views, there occurs a sentence which defines his position. Referring to the charge that the doctrine of natural rights is a menace to society, he remarks that the recognition of rational or natural rights can be dangerous only where against all justice their recognition is refused to the citizens. This statement at once raises the question of the origin of law. It has been the great service of the historical school to point out the connection between the laws of a community and its social and economic condition. But while law is the legal embodiment of the life of a community, it is also the expression of its will, no matter in what form that will may be formulated. But law does not, even under the most favorable circumstances, change as readily as do social and economic conditions, and hence discontent and the demand for change. But it is evident that the changes that are demanded must have the same relation to new conditions as do the existing laws to conditions that are becoming obsolete. Hence the ideals of reformers must have the same relativity as the conditions out of which they spring.

Some writers have carried the organic theory of the state so far as to overlook the fact that society is made up of individuals, and exists for their benefit. Against such views the doctrines of the individualists are a natural reaction. But reaction here, as elsewhere, goes to the other extreme. Individuals exist only in relation, and hence the social bond is as much a part of the natural order as is individual existence itself. To attempt to construct the state out of individuals, on the basis of contract, is to deny that the general has as much validity and necessity as the particular. It is to attempt to do artificially what nature has already done. Men make the state, but they can no more do otherwise than they can belie other natural instincts. Moreover, the form, which in any country or age they give to it, must be the result of national character. To divorce conduct from motive is to degrade history to annals.

Rights, to have any value, must be concrete, not mere vague abstractions. The right to live, upon which the author insists, is valueless unless supplemented by a poor-law. Even the most convinced individualist would scarcely claim that the conditions and rate of relief, varying as they do in different systems, come under the category of natural rights. If natural rights are so vague that they must receive their contents from positive law, they clearly have little value as a means of defending the individual against the omnipotence of the state. Fortunately, more efficient protection is found in the national conscience, which prevents the misuse of national power.

To dissent from the opinion of an author is by no means to disparage his book. Had M. Michel not been himself an individualist, his history of the individualistic movement since the eighteenth century would have been less appreciative and sympathetic. As it is, he has given us a most admirable account of the development of opinion, bringing out the salient points of conflicting views with such lucidity as to compel the reader to take a position. If that position is adverse to his cause, it is not the author's fault.

RICHARD HUDSON.

*History of the Post-Office Packet Service, between the years 1793-1815.* Compiled from records, chiefly official. By ARTHUR H. NORWAY. (London and New York: Macmillan and Co. 1895. Pp. ix, 312.)

CONTRIBUTIONS to the history of traffic are neither numerous nor always thorough in workmanship. Postal histories seem entitled to special attention, considering that they deal with the quintessence of traffic, and derive their information, in the main, from official records. Even in our day postal affairs and passenger traffic are not wholly separated, the fast trains and the principal ocean steamers being generally engaged in the mail service, without the profits of which many of them would not be maintained. Postal histories, then, have general value or interest, and it is pleasant to add that after the good beginning made by Joyce we have valuable contributions to English postal history from Hyde, Baines, and now Norway. Joyce undertook to give the postal history of England from the earliest time to the era of Rowland Hill; Hyde told the story of the seventeenth century; Baines offered modern reminiscences; and Norway gives details on the English mail-packet service from 1793 to 1815. In England a packet means a mail-boat, in the United States a passenger-boat.

The subject chosen by Norway is interesting and difficult. The period was one of war and extraordinary confusion, England being engaged in her struggle for maritime supremacy and a certain preponderance in the affairs of Europe. The struggle was highly successful, and Norway tells of the part played by the packets. Down to 1815 these packets were armed, in theory for defence, in practice for attack when occasion offered. Inci-