

ditions. By way of recapitulation M. Théry places the total resources of France at 287,282,000,000 francs in 1908. This is an increase of 44,333,000,000 francs over the estimate for 1892 and represents a per capita wealth of about 7,300 francs per inhabitant. The above estimates do not include the value of the forests; or edifices belonging to the state, the departments, or the communes. Many of the statistical tables, notably those relating to private savings, education, exports, manufactures, (particularly automobiles) and the decreased consumption of alcohol, show progress along economic and social lines, but others, notably those relating to population, crop productions, particularly of cereals, the value of farm animals, and the value of landed property, can hardly be said to be encouraging.

*La Démocratie Politique et Sociale en France.* By ALFRED FOUILLEE. (Paris: Felix Alcan. 1910. Pp. 223).

In this book M. Fouillee discusses in turn the errors of individualistic democracy, the idea of country, instruction in a democracy, and social progress in France. For us the chief interest is in the first and last of these essays. It is an error to suppose, he says, that the establishment of the republican regime in France was in itself a solution of the political question. From the point of view of the sociologist the democracy is still very far from having realized its ideal. Many sociological errors have been committed, but it is wrong that they should be charged to the parliamentary regime, as is often done. The trouble is that France does not possess parliamentary regime in its true form, since the will of the majority is too often nullified by the minority. The true remedy is a system of proportional representation, which, by the way, France seems now on the point of introducing. The vices of the present democracy are: (1) that it is not organized on the true principle, that is, according to the idea of the *organisme contractuel*, and, (2) it is satisfied with being purely *political* instead of *social*. To simple political or civil justice must be added more social justice. Among the particular errors of the present democracy are the lack of permanence and stability in its institutions, too much political demagoguery, the too general existence of electoral frauds, government interference in elections, financial extravagance, the unrepresentative character of the parliament, due largely to the *scruten d'arrondissement* method of election and the lack of a system of proportional representation, the too general abstention of the voters in elections, too much

bureaucracy, too many representatives (the number should be largely reduced in the interest of more efficient parliamentary procedure) the system of voting by proxy in the chambers, legislative sterility, and the abuse of the right of interpellation. The existence of a second chamber is, he says, from the view point of philosophy and sociology, absolutely indispensable, but the senate should represent more accurately the "perpetual and collective interests of science, the arts, philosophy, morals, justice, the national defense, the national industry, the national finances, and agriculture" as the chamber of deputies represents "more particularly the wills of all individuals actually living." The existing method of electing the senate he finds objectionable, and suggests that its character could be substantially improved by choosing the senators from certain classes or bodies like the magistrature, the educational staff, the army, and certain commercial and industrial organizations. The executive, he complains, has been reduced to a position of feebleness by the encroachments of the legislature and the judiciary, and, as a consequence, is often powerless when dealing with individual violators of the law. The individualistic doctrine that the President should have the power neither to speak nor to act but merely to play a ceremonial role, he says, is false and pernicious. The result is that the chamber of deputies has become the dominant organ of the government, though a very unrepresentative body. By reason of its preponderance in the national assembly it, of course, determines the choice of the President of the Republic. France, is therefore, governed really by an oligarchy. The mode of electing the president should be changed. But neither direct election by the people nor by the councils-general, both of which methods have been suggested, is the true remedy. An intermediate method, such as election by a body composed of the members of parliament and certain other great bodies would be preferable to either. Finally, a much-needed reform is the protection of the ministers against the pressure of the senators and deputies in the matter of appointments—a practice which has become a serious evil in the administration of the government.

In his review of the social progress of France, M. Fouillée calls attention to the principal landmarks in the legislature of the third Republic in the interests of the working classes, the rise and progress of labor organizations and the general amelioration of the condition of all classes of the population. For more than thirty years, he says, the legislature has not ceased to make reforms in the interest of

laborers, women, children, the old and infirm, and the dependant classes generally. Altogether, it is a record which does honor to the Republic.

J. W. GARNER.

*Souvenirs, 1848-1878.* By C. DE FREYCINET. (Paris: Librairie Ch. Delagrave. 1912. Pp. 403).

These are the recollections of a Frenchman who has been more or less prominent in the public life of his country for the greater part of sixty years. A Senator of the Republic since its establishment, and a member of nine different ministries, four of which he was the chief, he possesses rare qualifications for narrating the political and parliamentary history of the Third Republic. Beginning his narrative with an account of the revolution of 1848, the principal events of which he witnessed while a student at the Polytechnic School at Paris and in some of which he participated in an official character, he describes in turn the reaction and the coup d'etat of 1851, the war with Germany, the work of the National Assembly (1871-1875), notably the establishment of the Republic and the framing of the constitutional laws of 1875, the presidencies of Thiers and MacMahon and the crises growing out of the system of MacMahon to govern through a ministry that lacked the confidence of the Chamber of Deputies. His portraits of some of the leaders of the time are particularly interesting. "It has been given to me, in my political career," he says, "to approach intimately four superior men, founders of the Republic, Thiers, Dufaure, Jules Grèvy and Leon Gambetta. It is difficult to compare their talents, so dissimilar. But I believe that I can say that of the four Gambetta was the best endowed. Certainly I have admired, like all my contemporaries, the universal competence of Thiers, the sober eloquence and solidity of Dufaure, the sharp and ponderous mind of Grèvy. But no one has given me the sentiment of power in the same degree as Gambetta." Concerning MacMahon, whose obstinacy Freycinet severely criticises, he says, that although figuring as the champion of reaction he possessed a fund of humor very liberal, but that he exaggerated the point of honor and did not appreciate the new conditions in which the Constitution placed him. In private conversation he was full of humor and easily accommodated himself to his surroundings, but if his presidential duties presented themselves he at once became grave, restless, brusque and imperious.