

encumbrance of unexplained allusions, so frequent in monographic history. It is a book which forms a worthy part of a valuable series, and which, besides being useful to the student, will probably prove acceptable to the "general reader."

HENRY R. SPENCER.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

*Twenty Years of the Republic, 1885-1905.* By HARRY THURSTON PECK. New York, Dodd, Mead and Company, 1906.—viii, 811 pp.

The author of this book, as is well known, is a literary man rather than a technically trained historian. In preparing his work he has not endeavored to conform to scientific methods. His aim has been to give the general reader an interesting account of the period covered; he has made no effort at proportion; and he confessedly repeats stories of questionable authenticity for what they are worth. As an instance of the lack of proportion may be mentioned the fact that he devotes forty-two pages to the operations against Manila during the Spanish-American War and only twelve pages to all the rest of the conflict. Much of his space is allotted to personalities; he introduces an entire chapter, called "Memories of the Past," in which he characterizes the eminent men who died in the years 1885-86; and, in general, he has a keener eye for striking and picturesque incidents than for the merely important. The method has its advantages; and the average reader will not complain because the writer describes in detail such trivial but interesting episodes as the excesses of the representatives of the press in erecting a pavilion opposite the cottage in which President Cleveland was spending his honeymoon and from thence with field glasses watching the happy couple "so as not to lose the slightest detail which a bold-eyed curiosity could discover." On the other hand, the method is such as in some degree to justify the remark of a well known historian, that the title of the book ought to be changed to "Twenty Years of My Emotions."

Given the method used and the difficulties in obtaining trustworthy information upon so recent a period, it is, of course, inevitable that the book should contain some errors of fact and of conclusions. It would have been safer to say, on page 13, that a candidate such as Charles Francis Adams "might possibly have won" in 1872, than to say "could probably have won," for at that time Grant still had a powerful hold on the people. It is a rather strong statement to say (p. 53) that Cleveland's first cabinet was abler than any since the time of Lincoln;

for that of Hayes, including as it did such men as Schurz, Evarts, McCrary and John Sherman, was certainly as able, if not abler. A military critic would be inclined to question whether Grant won his campaign back of Vicksburg "by a close adherence to the established rules of warfare" (p. 105). Colonel Dodge says of it, in his *Birds-Eye View of Our Civil War*: "Altogether it has been a strange military manœuvre, which success will justify, failure utterly condemn." The final announcement of the election of Hayes was not made "two days" but one day before he was sworn in (p. 116); for, although the fact is not generally known, the oath was secretly administered to him at the White House on the night of March 3. The account of the cipher dispatches (pp. 117-119) is in several respects inaccurate. British Guiana was ceded to England in 1814, not in 1810 (p. 413). It is incorrect to say (p. 715) that the insurance disclosures "in essence justified" Judge Parker's charge concerning the selection of Mr. Cortelyou as head of the Republican National Committee. The "essence" of Judge Parker's charge—as the writer of this review personally heard him make it—was an insinuation that the president consciously selected Mr. Cortelyou because his knowledge of corporation

---

secrets put him in a favorable position to blackmail the trusts. That trusts made contributions to the Republican campaign fund was admitted by Mr. Roosevelt, but no disclosures, neither the insurance nor any other, have ever justified Judge Parker's insinuation. Some persons would probably be inclined to criticise the statement (p. 720) that the strife between New England abolitionists and the Southern slave owners "set back the birth of a true nationalism for three-quarters of a century." A passage on page 723 seems to imply that the "solid South" was first broken by Roosevelt in 1904, whereas both Kentucky and West Virginia were carried by McKinley in 1896. The date given (p. 738) for the socialization of the Democratic party by Mr. Bryan is evidently a typographical error. On the following page it is incorrect to speak of "Johnson's refusal to enforce the reconstruction acts"; and it is equally misleading to imply that presidential power was strengthened during his tenure of office. The date given on page 753 for the first appearance of the first two volumes of Rhodes's history—1898 instead of 1893—is doubtless another typographical error. Exception might also be taken to some of the author's portraits of statesmen. Probably most readers will be inclined to think him unduly enthusiastic over Arthur. Considering his antecedents, Arthur conducted himself very creditably; for the responsibilities of the office, as the son of a president who once removed him from office has remarked,

“sobered him”; but it may well be doubted whether he will ultimately be held to have been as much of a statesman as Hayes, who is referred to somewhat sneeringly.

Although on these and on some other matters—mostly trivial—the reader will feel an occasional impulse to rise up and disagree, there can be no question that the author has succeeded in what he has undertaken. His characters appear as living and breathing human beings; his story is told with genuine literary skill; and he has given us a reasonably accurate and extraordinarily interesting account of the period covered—an account which for some time to come is likely to be the best available, and which, in its power to convey an actual idea of the times, will probably remain superior to nine-tenths of the books written by the so-called “scientific historians,” who are so anxious not to create a wrong impression that they frequently succeed in creating no impression at all. If the scientific historians could manage to impart to their narratives some of the good qualities contained in Professor Peck’s book, there would be less truth in the familiar saying that “a novelist is one who writes about fiction in such a way as to make it seem fact, while a historian is one who writes about fact in such a way as to make it seem fiction.”

PAUL LELAND HAWORTH.

CLEVELAND, OHIO.

*The Law of Railroad Rate Regulation*, with special reference to American Legislation. By JOSEPH HENRY BEALE, Jr., and BRUCE WYMAN. Boston, Wm. J. Nagel, 1906.—lii, 1285 pp.

The regulation of railroad rates concerns many phases of trade, economics and law. But as Professors Beale and Wyman have chosen to deal only with the law of the subject, it is fair to judge their work from a lawyer’s view-point.

The first fourth of the text discusses the “fundamental principles governing railroad service.” This exposition might aid students of political economy unfamiliar with the legal aspects of railroad corporations, but is of doubtful value to practitioners. The allotted space does not permit an exhaustive treatment of these principles, which are more adequately handled in several other text-books; and the authors intrude some assertions not supported—and in some cases not supportable—by citation of authorities.

The meat of the matter is contained in books ii and iii, respectively entitled “Regulation . . . in accordance with Common Law Principles” and “Regulation . . . by Legislation.” These books form