

With Fabian socialism the author has far more sympathy, although upon the main issue a sharp difference appears.

The presupposition of this doctrine [that of the Fabians] is in favor of state industry. I would take precisely the opposite ground. Let us retain the immense advantages of individual initiative with the accompanying results of maximum enterprise and inventiveness, wherever such initiative is not erected into an abuse of society. Let us resort to state agency only when, and so far as, this is rendered necessary by the power and disposition on the part of individuals and private corporations to maltreat the public at large.

It is denied further that this would lead to the same practical results as the Fabian program, it being implied rather that experience will show very questionable results from too wide an activity on the part of the state.

JOHN GRAHAM BROOKS.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

*Gouverneur Morris.* By THEODORE ROOSEVELT. [American Statesmen Series.] Boston and New York, Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1893. — x, 370 pp.

That *Gouverneur Morris* stands in only the second rank of American statesmen, is freely conceded by Mr. Roosevelt. But it is a sound judgment that has assigned a sketch of Morris to a place in this series. His position in the politics of our earliest national life can be made to throw much light on the period in which he lived, and therefore is historically important. This position is very fairly set forth in the present work.

It is unfortunate, however, that the positive, dogmatic element in Morris's character awakens the corresponding chord in his biographer. In the first half of the book, where the career of his subject does not lend itself readily to the requirements of a fascinating narrative, Mr. Roosevelt seems to feel the necessity of compensating for the deficiency. The result is a series of interjected reflections in which chauvinistic patriotism is rather more conspicuous than relevancy. The series begins (pp. 4-7) with a vigorous denunciation of England's treatment of her American subjects. The Americans "warred victoriously for the right"; and the British were like the Catholics in the sixteenth century, and the Stewarts in the seventeenth, and the Confederate slave-holders in the nineteenth. Mr. Roosevelt's perfect acquaintance with the ultimate standard of "right" and "wrong," and the easy confidence with which he deals out

judgments on questions that occur, are the striking features of his writing here as elsewhere. So we find on page 29 that the "loyalists of 1776 were wrong . . . beyond question"; but naturally, not so frightfully wrong as the rebels in 1861. On pages 49-52 we see the absurdity of attributing the success of the Revolution to foreign aid. "It was on our own strength that we had to rely." We had our weaknesses, but in spite of them we were a great people; only it will not do to think that we had then anything like the magnificent qualities we displayed during the Civil War and have now. "But if the Americans of the Revolution were not perfect, how their faults dwindle when we stand them side by side with their European compeers!" The English were bad enough, in all conscience.

As for the other European powers, the faults of our leaders sink out of sight when matched against the ferocious frivolity of the French noblesse, or the ignoble, sordid, bloody baseness of those swinish German kinglets who let out their subjects to do hired murder, and fattened on the blood and sweat of the wretched beings under them, until the whirlwind of the French Revolution swept their carcasses from off the world they cumbered. [Pages 82-83.]

The force of this passage is marred only by the uncertainty in which the reader is left as to whose carcasses are referred to.

On pages 131-132 the author explains "the one great reason for our having succeeded as no other people ever has." The reason itself is not so important as the comfort to be found in the assurance that we *have* so succeeded, and in the knowledge as to just the volume and page where we may read in concise form how it happened. On pages 136-138, the great superiority of our constitutional convention to that of France is duly set forth. So the constitution produced "was not only the best possible one for America at that time, but it was also . . . *probably* the best that any nation has ever had." The word I have italicized is the only indication in the book of a faltering judgment on any point.

Not even in denouncing dogmatism does Mr. Roosevelt cease to be dogmatic. "It is simply idle folly to talk of suffrage as being an 'inborn' or 'natural' right" (page 149). But the people who talk that way merely put forward "nature" to take the responsibility for what is really their personal private conviction. Mr. Roosevelt prefers to express his convictions as absolute truth, without the authority of nature. Perhaps it is not so much in the distinction as in the resemblance between him and the natural rights people that the "idle folly" is to be found.

The latter half of this work, particularly the part dealing with Morris's European experiences, is interesting mainly for the view given of social conditions in the better classes at the outbreak of the French Revolution. In these chapters the author has less occasion for patriotic digressions. The opportunity recurs, however, in connection with the War of 1812 and Morris's Federalistic sympathies. Here the old fervor breaks out again; the French and English are berated in swelling terms, and scathing censure falls upon the New England separatists of the Hartford Convention.

Mr. Roosevelt has a clear head and a good historic sense. There seems to be a profound conviction of duty back of the style of writing which he adopts. He appears to feel that the nation is in peril if the good old-fashioned "stump-speech" patriotism is allowed to die out. Admirers of his ability would be gratified if he would embody in a book for boys all the matter of this sort that he deems necessary, and would give to adults the benefit of a different vehicle for his historical learning.

WM. A. DUNNING.

*London and the Kingdom*: A History derived mainly from the Archives at Guildhall. By REGINALD R. SHARPE. Printed by order of the Corporation under the direction of the Literary Committee. London, Longmans, 1894. — Two vols., xv, 566 ; xi, 650 pp.

The City of London is the only municipal corporation of England that has displayed much activity or interest in the investigation of its history and in the publication of its ancient records, though a few of the other boroughs (notably Nottingham) have recently bestirred themselves to make their muniments better known to the public. The City of London has not, however, always displayed wisdom in planning the work to be performed and in selecting the editors or authors to accomplish it. On the whole, Mr. Riley did good work, and the registers and records edited by Dr. Sharpe have given much satisfaction. Any one who has had intercourse with Dr. Sharpe in the dingy record room of the Guildhall knows that he has a knowledge of the records in his charge and a scholarly enthusiasm which go far to qualify him for the successful achievement of any historical work which the corporation of London may entrust to him. It is doubtful, however, whether the literary committee of the corporation have made the best use of their resources in directing his energies to the production of the book before us. London stands forth so prominently in the political annals of England that every historian of the king-