

the President to formulate political theories to justify such a treatment of the rebellious states as they desired, furnishes one of the most curious illustrations of the adaptation of political theory to specific practical ends. The author shows with great skill how the theory of "forfeited state rights" was evolved as a compromise out of the various conflicting theories then advanced.

In the chapter on "Are the States Equal Under the Constitution?" a chapter which is but indirectly connected with the main topic of the work, Professor Dunning shows the wide differences in the treatment of territories upon their admission into the union and the nature of the restrictions upon state legislation which Congress has assumed to be within its constitutional powers. The broad interpretation of the power of Congress to admit states into the union has practically resulted in giving to the national government a control of some of the leading questions of state policy. The conclusion of the author is that "at no time since the formation of the present constitution have all the states of the union been in the enjoyment of equal powers under the laws of Congress."

Throughout the work, dealing as it does with some of the most complex and delicate problems of government, the author gives evidence of a political judgment and of an ability to weigh the merits and defects of political measures which few modern writers have equalled, and none excelled. The best evidence of this is to be found in his clear grasp of the situation that confronted the executive and legislative between 1863 and 1870. We are not burdened with long jeremiads on the "wounding of the constitution" or the "tyranny of popular majorities." The author clearly shows that the interests of the country were best served by the assumption of authority by the executive and legislative. Had the judiciary become involved in the struggle the process of reconstruction would have extended over a longer period and would have been attended with far greater evils.

If the present volume is an indication of the kind of work we are to expect of Professor Dunning, it is to be hoped that he will expand the fragmentary essay on "American Political Philosophy" with which he closes the book, approaching the subject in the same scientific spirit.

L. S. ROWE.

The Science of Political Economy. BY HENRY GEORGE. Pp. xxxix, 545. Price, \$2.50. New York: Doubleday & McClure Co., 1898.

There are few real admirers of Henry George to whom the publication of this book will bring anything but keen regret. Under the

[419]

most favorable conditions, it may be doubted whether the author of "Progress and Poverty" could have accomplished his avowed purpose of restating the principles of political economy in constructive rather than in controversial form. The propagandist turned text-book writer is an unpromising transition, of which the resultant is ordinarily more attractive in style than enduring in content. If to pre-eminent unfitness for judicial statement be added the special circumstances of unfinished composition and posthumous publication, the product can only be complete failure.

Despite its bulk, Mr. George's "Science of Political Economy" is practically a fragment. The announcement of the publisher that the work "was intended by Henry George to be the crowning achievement of his life," and the statement of the editor (Mr. Henry George, Jr.,) that it was "in its main essentials completed," are simply irreconcilable. Neglecting positive lacunæ, both those noted by the editor and those unmarked but manifest in any careful reading of the text, and omitting the typographical expansion of author's memoranda into formal chapters of one, two or three pages in length, the incompleteness of the book is evident in the distribution of its contents. Book I, "The Meaning of Political Economy," extends over 104 pages; Book II, "The Nature of Wealth," requires 200 pages, but Book IV, "The Distribution of Wealth," covers only 46 pages. In Book III, "The Production of Wealth," three successive chapters treating of Land, Labor and Capital, respectively, require in the aggregate five pages, something less than one-half of the space given in the same book to a single chapter treating "Of Space and Time."

The features of the work are a discussion, pretentious rather than novel, of general philosophical principles; a vigorous résumé of the development of economic science from the physiocrats to "the most recent purveyors of economic nonsense in Anglo-German jargon;" a fundamental distinction between so-called "value in production" and "value in obligation;" emphatic insistence upon a natural law of distribution, and a clear statement of the primary functions of money. Throughout the book there is nothing essential which Mr. George had not already said, and little which he had not said better. The style, lightened here and there by characteristic flashes, is on the whole less fluent and vigorous than that of "Progress and Poverty," while its force is marred throughout by a bitter though comprehensible attack upon academic economists and their teachings. The book appears in luxurious form, and contains an admirable portrait of Mr. George taken shortly before his tragic end.

[420]

The time is not remote—it has perhaps come—for a detailed criticism and a general estimate of Henry George as an economist; not of the powerful agitator, nor of the great-hearted reformer, but of the acute critic and the virile thinker. But the immediate occasion for this should be something other than posthumous fragments, which even the most appreciative reader leaves, assenting to the application of McCulloch's dictum upon Robert Hamilton's "Progress of Society:" it "might without injury to his fame or the public interests have been allowed to continue in manuscript."

J. H. HOLLANDER.

Johns Hopkins University.

Unforeseen Tendencies of Democracy. By EDWIN L. GODKIN. Pp. 272. Price, \$2.00. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1898.

Mr. Godkin's critical observations on politics, so familiar to readers of the *Nation*, occasionally lead to interesting and important conclusions respecting American political institutions in general. In the volume of essays before us he touches upon some aspects of these institutions which are at present exciting attention both in Europe and America. The first essay treats of equality, and in it the author desires to show that our ideas of equality have materially changed. In both the American and French revolutions "equality" signified the absence of exemptions and peculiar privileges, the equal liability of all men to burdens imposed by the state. This conception of equality interfered in no way with leadership as exercised by able and distinguished men; in fact one of the striking features of our early American history is seen in the deference paid to certain leaders of public opinion. At present this deference no longer exists. Our idea of "equality" has come to include equal political sagacity so that all men are held to be eligible to our highest offices and gifted with political insight. "The disregard of special fitness, combined with unwillingness to admit that there is anything special about any man . . . constitutes the great defect of modern democracy." According to the prevailing notion of "equality," says the author, experience and peculiar ability count for nothing. In an essay on the nominating system the author deals plainly with his subject. Our present method of nomination is, he declares, the "great canker of American institutions." The absence of the more intelligent and honest class of voters from the primaries is due first, to the great and increasing importance and variety of private affairs demanding close attention, and second, to the merely preliminary character of the primaries.

[421]