

THE PRESIDENT'S CABINET

JOHN A. FAIRLIE

University of Illinois

The recent publication, within a few months of each other, of two independent works on the President's cabinet¹ serves to call attention to an important political institution in this country, which has hitherto failed to receive adequate recognition. Mr. Bryce has stated that, in the government of the United States, there is "no such thing as a cabinet in the English sense of the term;" and the larger part of his short chapter discusses what the President's cabinet is not rather than what it is. But if the cabinet in the United States is not the same thing as the British cabinet, it is a significant factor in the operation of the government deserving more consideration than it has received.

Mr. Learned disclaims any attempt at a complete history of the cabinet; and, as indicated in the sub-title, presents a series of studies on the origin and formation of the cabinet—its anatomy rather than its functions. But in tracing the development of the composition of the cabinet, approximately half of the text is devoted to chapters on the origin and formation of the executive departments, whose heads have been added to the cabinet as first organized. A second series of studies on cabinet practices and personnel is expected to follow.

Miss Hinsdale's volume, on the other hand, undertakes a more comprehensive account of the cabinet, traced mainly in connection with the several Presidents; and forming what might be styled more accurately a history of cabinets. The opening and

¹ Henry Barrett Learned, *The President's Cabinet. Studies in the Origin, Formation and Structure of an American Institution*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1912, xii, 471 pp.

Mary L. Hinsdale, *A History of the President's Cabinet*. University of Michigan Historical Studies, vol. 1, Ann Arbor, Mich., George Wahr, 1911, ix, 355 pp.

concluding chapters discuss various aspects of the cabinet as an institution.

The different scope and character of the two works may be indicated by noting that, in lists of about 250 bibliographical references given by each author, there are less than 70 in common. The two volumes thus by no means duplicate, but rather in the main supplement each other, in adding to our information about the cabinet. Nor do both works exhaust the subject. There is room for much further investigation in the actual working of the cabinet and its influence in the government.

Both volumes show the results of extended investigation in the sources, including not only official publications such as the records of the constitutional convention of 1787, congressional debates and reports, but also the diaries, memoirs and writings of public men. At the same time there are important points of difference in the use of some classes of material. Within the narrower field, Mr. Learned's studies have been more intensive, especially in the use of newspapers and the unearthing of forgotten pamphlets and other fugitive sources. At the same time, he seems to avoid the use of standard histories, biographies and other secondary authorities. Miss Hinsdale has made good use of some manuscript sources.

While the two works naturally discuss many matters in common, the method of treatment is so different that precise comparison can seldom be made. It is of interest, however, to observe that on the two points discussed by both, each writer has something to add to what the other has noted. In reference to the early meetings of the cabinet officers, Miss Hinsdale quotes from Jefferson's writings about several consultations not mentioned by Mr. Learned. On the other hand, Mr. Learned has not only traced the use of the term cabinet much more exhaustively; but calls attention to its use in congress several years earlier than the first instance noted by Miss Hinsdale.

Based largely on these volumes, it is proposed to present here a summary of the origin and history of the cabinet as an institution, and some features in its organization.

While the President's cabinet cannot be considered as a deliberate creation consciously imitated from that of Great Britain, or of any other country, the analogy which led to the use of the same term warrants some reference to the British institution. Developing from the English privy council, which had reached its greatest power under the Lancastrian and Tudor monarchs, there can be traced from the middle of the sixteenth century an informal committee or interior council; and the term cabinet in its political sense can be traced from the writings of Francis Bacon. During the eighteenth century the composition of the cabinet and its relations to Parliament became more definite, and that its active place in the British government was well known in America at the formation of the Constitution of the United States is shown by a statement of James Iredell of North Carolina in 1788:

"Notwithstanding their important constitutional council, everybody knows that the whole movements of their government, where a council is consulted at all, are directed by their cabinet council, composed entirely of the principal officers of the great departments."

The framers of the Constitution were also familiar with executive councils in their colonial governments; and these had been continued in many of the early state governments. In pre-revolutionary days the governor's council often included some administrative officials.

A more definite basis for the American cabinet is found in the executive offices established by the congress of the confederation, in 1781; although these did not constitute a collective council. The organization and titles of these offices show both British and French influence. Secretary at war comes from the time of Charles II; and superintendent of finance was the title of the chief finance official in France. The establishment of single headed departments followed the French rather than the British practice of the time.

Contemporaneous with the organization of these executive officials (in 1781) came anonymous suggestions that they should consult together as an advisory council. Two years later Pelatiah Webster more definitely proposed an executive council of state,

to be composed of the ministers of state, certain judicial officers and three others added by congress, one from each geographical group of states. While these proposals had no immediate result, they serve to indicate the origin of the idea of some such body.

In the convention of 1787 several plans for a constitutional executive council were presented. The Randolph resolutions proposed a council of revision, including some of the national judiciary; and Mason recommended a council of appointment, to be composed of six members selected by the house of representatives. These suggestions resembled similar councils provided in the constitution of New York. Pinckney's draft proposed that the President should "have a right to advise with the different departments as his council;" and Madison approved a council which should have a right to advise the executive but not to control his authority. In August, Ellsworth suggested a council composed of the president of the senate, the chief justice and the ministers of foreign and domestic affairs, of war, of finance and of marine. Two days later Gouverneur Morris, seconded by Pinckney, introduced resolutions proposing an advisory council of state, to be composed of the chief justice of the supreme court and the secretaries of the executive departments. This plan was referred to the committee of detail, which reported a slightly modified plan for a privy council, to include the president of the senate and the speaker of the house, as well as the chief justice and the department secretaries. In this form, the plan, with other undecided proposals, was referred to the committee of states; and here the plan for a constitutional council was abandoned.

As the outcome of these various proposals may be noted several clauses in the Constitution as adopted. In place of the suggested council of revision, the President was given the qualified power of disapproving measures passed by congress. In place of the council of appointment, the advice and consent of the senate was made necessary for appointments. And of the other plans for an advisory council the barest suggestion remained in the clause providing that the President "may require the opinion, in writing,

of the principal officer in each of the executive departments, upon any subject relating to the duties of their respective offices."

While the Constitution thus made no definite provision for an executive council, other than the senate, several members of the convention recognized that the President would be likely to advise and consult with the heads of the executive departments; and at least two members foresaw the possibility of a voluntary council of these executive officials. Pinckney considered such an institution essential; while Mason looked on it as dangerous.

There were, indeed, three possible centers about which an active executive council might have developed. If the powers of the senate to advise and consent to appointments and treaties had been exercised by means of previous and oral consultation, the senate might well have become even more powerful than it has been in the control over the national government. But the opposition of the senate itself to Washington's efforts in this direction prevented this line of evolution. In the second place, if the senate had exercised its power of confirming appointments so as to control the selection of the heads of departments; and these officials had been encouraged to attend and to address the houses and had worked in coöperation with congress, a cabinet system more nearly resembling the British might have resulted. But the senate did not assert a control over the major appointments; and the house declined to permit the department heads to appear before it. These circumstances tended to keep the President and senate apart; and to bring the secretaries into closer relations with the President.

In the summer of 1789 congress passed the series of acts organizing the departments of state, war and treasury, and the office of attorney-general. In these acts the principal officers were not placed on the same footing. The state and war establishments were styled executive departments; and the secretaries of these departments were placed under the direction of the President. The finance establishment was called the department of the treasury, with a significant omission of the word executive, and of all reference to Presidential direction; while the secretary was to report to the legislature "in person or in writing." The

attorney-general had no department; and his office was established incidentally by the act organizing the United States courts.

Washington early called on the principal officers for written opinions, as authorized in the Constitution. But the practice of regular oral consultations and the development of a collegiate council developed gradually and apparently without any deliberate plan. During the first two years of his administration, Washington consulted irregularly and informally with a small group, including Madison, the leader of the house of representatives, Chief Justice Jay and Vice-President Adams, as well as the department heads after they were established. With the substitution of Madison for the speaker of the house, this group corresponded to the privy council proposed in the constitutional convention; and if the later cabinets had included the same officials there may have well developed a more cordial spirit of coöperation between the three main divisions of the government than has existed. The advice of the chief justice it may be noted, was analogous to the older English practice, where Lord Mansfield had been a member of the 'efficient cabinet' to the close of the Grenville ministry in 1766;² and where the Lord Chancellor is to the present time a member of the cabinet.

In April, 1791, we have a definite record of a meeting more closely resembling the later cabinet. Setting out for a journey to the south, Washington wrote to the three secretaries that if important business arose during his absence, they should hold consultations thereon. He also stated that he should wish the vice-president to be consulted, if he had not left the seat of government; but neither the chief justice nor the attorney-general were mentioned. A meeting was held on April 11, at which the vice-president, the three secretaries and the attorney-general were present.

Such meetings, however, were for some time to come held only at irregular intervals. Jefferson refers vaguely to "one of our meetings" in November, 1791, and to "one of our consultations" in December of the same year. Apparently the practice was no

² Anson, *Law and Custom of the Constitution*, pt. ii, 2d ed., p. 166.

longer uncommon. But written opinions and advice continued to be requested. More definitely Jefferson notes on March 9, 1792: "a consultation at ———, present H. K. and J." Again on March 31, he records: "a meeting at the P's, present Th. J., A. H., H. K. and E. R.,—which appears to be the first specific record of a meeting of the President with all of the principal executive officers, and without the presence of the vice-president, chief justice or any member of congress.

Jefferson mentions other meetings in April, October and December, 1792, to consider a request for information from a committee of the house, and matters connected with treaties. In 1793 the meetings of the President and the executive officers became more frequent, and formal summonses appear. One meeting was held February 25, two others to discuss the second inauguration and on April 19 a notable session, which agreed on a policy of neutrality in relation to European affairs. The European crisis led to many consultations—at one period they were held "almost every day." They continued through the summer; and after an interruption during the President's vacation at Mount Vernon, were renewed in November.

During the summer of 1793, President Washington asked for the advice of the justices of the supreme court on a formidable list of questions bearing on the international situation. There were precedents for such a request in both English and colonial practice; and provision for such judicial opinions existed (and still exist) in several of the State constitutions. But the justices of the supreme court declined to answer the questions. This attitude of the judiciary, following the failure of the efforts at oral consultations with the senate and the house, may well have strengthened the tendency towards more frequent consultations between the President and the principal officers, and aided in the development of the extra-legal collegiate council.

Not only was the practice of consultative meetings thus well established by 1793, but the term cabinet was early employed to designate the collective body. It had been used by Pinckney as early as 1787 in suggesting the need for such an advisory council; but the earlier gatherings are more vaguely referred to as

meetings or consultations; and Washington does not appear to have used the term. In May, 1793, Jefferson referred to "our council" and "our conclave." But in June, Madison wrote of "the discussions of the cabinet;" and before long Jefferson and Randolph also make use of the same term. A year later Senator Rufus King of New York mentioned "the cabinet." In congress, the council was referred to as early as 1798; the term cabinet was used in debate in 1802; and the institution was the subject of a caustic debate in 1806. In 1803 Chief Justice Marshall used the term in the well known case of *Marbury vs. Madison*. In 1809, Judge Augustus B. Woodward, in a pamphlet on the Executive Government of the United States discusses the cabinet as an established and recognized factor in the government. In 1813, Josiah Quincy made a savage attack in congress on the cabinet as an instrument of despotism. Clearly both the institution and the term had come to be firmly established and well understood by those acquainted with the working of the government. Even foreign writers on the United States speak of the cabinet soon after this time.

Nevertheless the official recognition of the cabinet did not come until later. Jackson was the first President to use it in his annual message to congress in 1829. Tyler and most of the later Presidents also used it at rare intervals. It appears to have received legislative recognition for the first time in a house resolution in 1867. The first use of the term in the statutes was in an appropriation act of February 26, 1907, in connection with an increase in the salaries of the principal executive officers. These instances of legislative recognition of the cabinet do not, however, in any way undertake to regulate its organization; and the existence of the cabinet remains purely a matter of custom.

While the cabinet may be considered to have been definitely established by 1793, the frequency and regularity of its meetings was by no means placed on a permanent basis by that time. The almost daily sessions of the summer of that year were due to the critical situation in foreign affairs; and this practice does not seem to have been continued. Miss Hinsdale states that up to the

Civil War, each President had his own practice; but no data are presented for most of the administrations. Jackson held no cabinet meetings for the first two years of his administration; but that such meetings had become customary is shown by the congressional protest against their absence. Van Buren held a cabinet meeting within two days of his inauguration. Polk held more frequent and more regular consultations than any of his predecessors, apparently beginning the practice of two meetings a week, which were then held on Tuesdays and Saturdays. In Lincoln's administration, there are traces of the Tuesday-Friday rule; but this was not closely followed, and the republican senators complained that the President did not adequately consult the cabinet. Johnson held semi-weekly sessions regularly; and this practice appears to have been followed by the later Presidents, except for such times as the President is not in Washington.

When the cabinet, both as an institution and as a name, assumed definite form at the beginning of Washington's second term, it was composed of the President, the three secretaries of state, treasury and war and the attorney-general. With the participation of the attorney-general in the consultations, the chief justice disappeared from these meetings; and after the meeting of April, 1791, at which Adams was present while Washington was absent, there is no record of the vice-president attending the cabinet councils. When Jefferson became vice-president in 1791 his conception of the office as confined to legislative functions precluded his attendance at executive consultations, even had it been proposed. From time to time suggestions have been made that the vice-president should be called to the cabinet meetings; but while at times consulted, as have been members of both branches of congress, he has not been considered as a member of the cabinet.

The four executive officers were by no means on the same footing; and it was many years before it could be said that the cabinet was composed of the heads of the executive departments. As first organized, two of the departments were styled executive; but the Treasury was apparently designed to stand in closer relations to congress. The attorney-general had no department

under his supervision; his salary was much lower than the department secretaries; and he was not expected to give his whole time to the public service.

On the establishment of the department of the navy in 1798, the secretary of the navy was added to the list of cabinet members; and with this addition the membership of the cabinet remained unchanged for thirty years. During this period, however, the importance of the office of attorney-general decidedly increased, notably during the incumbency of William Wirt (1817-1829).

President Jackson's administration marks some important developments in the structure of the cabinet and the relations of the members to the President. The admission of the postmaster-general to the list of cabinet members in 1829 has usually been considered as a recognition of the political significance of the office, in connection with the introduction of political appointments. But it was also a recognition of the increased administrative importance of the postal service. This had been already indicated four years before when the phrase "Post Office Department" appeared in the statutes, in place of the former term "Establishment;" and also by the advance of the salary of the postmaster-general in 1827 to an equality with the four secretaries in the cabinet.

Jackson's well known assertion of authority over the secretary of the treasury in the removal of the bank deposits was significant in relation to the cabinet, in marking the termination of the view that this officer was independent of the President; and thus served to make the cabinet a more coherent body.

With the creation of the department of the interior in 1849, and the admission of the secretary of the interior to the cabinet, the President's council may be said to have reached a stage of maturity. The group of now seven executive officers acting individually and collectively as the recognized, though extra-legal, body of advisers to the President remained unchanged in structure for the next forty years; and from this time the practice of regular cabinet meetings seems to have been well established.

During this period, legislative changes of some importance were made which placed the members of the cabinet and the depart-

ments of which they were the heads on an equality in certain respects. In 1853 the salaries of the principal executive officers were increased, and all of the members of the cabinet given the same amount—\$8000 a year. The increase was especially significant in the case of the attorney-general, who had hitherto occupied an inferior position to the other members of the cabinet; while it has also been accepted as indicating that the attorney-general should no longer accept private practice while in office.

In the revised statutes of 1873 several changes appeared in the terminology of the executive organization. The department of the treasury and the post office department were for the first time styled "executive departments;" and the office of the attorney-general was now organized into the department of justice. The latter change marked an important increase in the staff; and also brought the legal advisers of the other departments (except those of war and the navy) into official relations with each other and with the attorney-general. From this date it can be said that the President's cabinet consists of the heads of the executive departments.

The act of 1886 regulating the succession to the Presidency, in case of the removal, death, resignation or inability of the President and vice-president, constituted a legislative recognition of the importance of the cabinet officers, and also emphasized the distinction in rank between the several officials, on the basis of the seniority of the offices. Under this law, in case of vacancy in both the offices of President and vice-president, the succession to the Presidency falls in order to the secretary of state, secretary of the treasury, secretary of war, attorney-general, postmaster-general, secretary of the navy, and secretary of the interior.

In the last twenty-five years, two additional executive departments have been established; and their secretaries have been automatically accepted as members of the President's cabinet. In 1889 the former department of agriculture was organized as an executive department, with the secretary of agriculture at its head. In 1903 the department of commerce and labor was established, taking over a number of bureaus previously established and creating several new bureaus, all placed under the

general supervision of the secretary of commerce and labor. These additions serve to complete the membership of the cabinet as it exists to-day. With no formal act, either of congress or of the President, establishing its existence or regulating its organization, it is clearly established by custom that the heads of the nine executive departments form an advisory council, which is regularly and frequently consulted by the President.

Analyzing the customs and practices that have been followed in the composition of cabinets, we may first note that the number of members is less than in most other countries. This may be explained in part by the federal system of government, under which some important branches of public administration are left to the states and are not provided for in the national government. Thus there is no United States official corresponding to the minister of the interior or home secretary, or the minister of education in European countries. In other cases important services are organized as subordinate bureaus, which in other countries are placed in the charge of an officer of cabinet rank. Thus the place of a minister of public works and colonial minister are performed, to some extent, by the secretary of war. Another factor is the absence of any cabinet positions with little or no administrative functions, such as the first lord of the treasury or president of the council in the British cabinet.

The smaller cabinet is a more effective body and less likely to form into groups. But it may be questioned whether the addition of some of the congressional leaders to the regular cabinet consultations would not increase the coöperation between the executive and legislative branches of the government and add to the effectiveness of the government as a whole.

Limited to the heads of executive departments who are excluded from congress, the President's cabinet is sharply differentiated from the cabinets of countries under the parliamentary system, such as Great Britain, France and Italy, where the cabinet members are also members of parliament. Moreover the exclusion of members from congress is carried further than in Germany, where the ministers appear and address the representative branch of the legislature, although not members of that body.

The formal separation of the executive and legislative branches perhaps, in part at least, serves to explain the failure of the senate or congress to exert active control over the President's appointments to cabinet positions. Except in the case of President Johnson, the senate has confirmed the President's nominations, even when politically opposed to each other, as in President Cleveland's first term. Even more clearly, the appointments do not require either the formal or informal approval of the house of representatives, and are in no way affected by the political complexion of that body.

Nevertheless certain customs and traditions have developed which serve to regulate the President's choice of his advisers. Elected as the candidate of a political party, the Presidents have selected the members of their cabinet, with few exceptions, from their own party. Before distinct parties had emerged, Washington attempted to unite representatives of opposing political views, by appointing both Hamilton and Jefferson. But with the retirement of Randolph in 1795, the cabinet became distinctly Federalist. With the accession of Jefferson, there was a complete change to the Republicans; and since then the rule of party agreement in the cabinet has been regularly followed.

With the shifting of party lines there have been some apparent exceptions to this rule; and in a few cases individual exceptions explained by personal factors. Monroe's cabinet contained members who before and afterwards belonged to different parties. Tyler's isolated position led to some curious anomalies in his cabinet. Lincoln appointed some former Democrats and Whigs; but all definitely attached themselves to the Republican party. In more recent times, Cleveland appointed as secretary of state Walter Q. Gresham, who had been a member of Arthur's cabinet, and considered as a republican candidate for the Presidency; but he had supported Cleveland in the campaign. Presidents Roosevelt and Taft each appointed a democrat, in both cases as secretary of war; but neither had been prominent in national politics.

The party complexion of the cabinet naturally involves a complete change in its membership when there is a party change in the Presidency. But the principle of rotation has been applied

even where the new President is of the same party as his predecessor. In the earlier years it was customary for a new President to continue at least some of the members of the former cabinet, if of the same party. But, when Vice-Presidents Tyler and Fillmore succeeded to the Presidency the factional divisions in the Whig party were so marked that the cabinets were soon recast; and when Buchanan succeeded Pierce in 1857 he made a complete change in the cabinet. The same practice was followed under Grant, Hayes, Garfield and Arthur; while Cleveland in his second term reappointed none of those in his first cabinet. When Vice-President Roosevelt became President, he continued McKinley's cabinet for a time, and some of the members remained until after Roosevelt's election as President. President Taft retained two members of Roosevelt's cabinet.

Notwithstanding the tendency to complete changes in the cabinets, there have been a considerable list of those who have served under two or more Presidents. Among these may be noted Albert Gallatin (secretary of the treasury for thirteen years under Jefferson and Madison), W. H. Crawford, Wm. Wirt, Richard Rush, John C. Calhoun, Daniel Webster, Thomas Ewing, J. J. Crittenden, Levi Woodbury, Lewis Cass, Amos Kendall, J. G. Mason and W. L. Marcy. Since the Civil War, John Sherman served in the cabinets of Hayes and McKinley; J. G. Blaine and Wm. Windom were in the cabinets of Garfield and Benjamin Harrison; John Hay, Elihu Root, and E. A. Hitchcock from McKinley's cabinet served for two years and more under President Roosevelt; while P. C. Knox and James Wilson have been in the cabinets of three Presidents, McKinley, Roosevelt and Taft—Mr. Wilson holding the record for sixteen years continuous service in one cabinet position.

Some of the reappointments have involved promotions to the offices, which are considered to rank higher and to be more important. Thus Calhoun, Cass and Marcy were each secretary of war and later secretary of state; and W. G. Gresham and John Sherman were each secretary of the treasury and later secretary of state. There have also been a number of transfers or promotions from one department to another under the same President—

notably under Roosevelt, in the cases of George B. Cortelyou, W. H. Moody and C. J. Bonaparte. There have further been a number of instances of promotions within the department; but some of these have been simply to fill a temporary vacancy, and there has been little tendency for the cabinet posts to be reached, as in Germany, as the culmination of a career in the administrative service of the national government.

At the same time a large majority of the cabinet members have had some experience in public affairs. About one-half have been former members of congress; and the treasury department has a number of conspicuous cases where committee service prepared the way for a cabinet post,—notably in the cases of Gallatin, Sherman and Carlisle. The diplomatic service has also served as a source of cabinet appointments, as in the cases of John Quincy Adams and John Hay. A number of former state governors appear on the list of cabinet members,—including W. L. Marcy, W. H. Seward, S. P. Chase, D. R. Francis and L. M. Shaw.

A considerable number of cabinet appointments have been based largely on political considerations. A good share of these include selections that also fall in some of the classes already noted; but in some instances services during the election campaign are the most obvious explanation for appearance of some members in the cabinet list. This has been most evident in the case of postmaster-general, in such appointments as Amos Kendall, John Wanamaker and H. C. Payne. The more recent instances of Postmaster-General Cortelyou and Hitchcock have involved previous experience in the public service as well as campaign management.

Another factor with a political bearing has been the geographical distribution of the cabinet members from different parts of the country. From the beginning of the government, it has been considered advisable to have some member from each of the geographical groups of states. But until the time of President Jackson the appointment of two members from the same state was not infrequent, though no state received two of the more important posts. With the development of the country, the newer sections of the country have also been represented; and

the selection of two members from the same state has been unusual until recent years. During the long period of Republican rule, the recognition of the southern states has been exceptional; while a larger number of members have come from the middle-west, and in two instances there has been a member from the Pacific coast. From the time of President Cleveland, there have been a number of instances of two members from the same state; and for a time there were three members of Roosevelt's cabinet from New York.

In the aggregate the largest number of cabinet positions have gone to New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Virginia, and Ohio, each of which has had 20 or more appointments; while among the other large and populous states, Illinois has had only 7, Missouri 6 and Texas none. New York has had the largest number of secretaries of state and war and postmasters-general; Pennsylvania leads in the number of attorneys-general; and Massachusetts has most often furnished the secretary of the navy. New York and Pennsylvania have each supplied 7 secretaries of the treasury; but since 1860 this post has been held largely by the States of the middle-west.

Within the limits set by these considerations, each President has a considerable range for personal preferences; and on the whole has probably a wider field of choice than a prime minister in Great Britain, who is limited to the parliamentary leaders of his party. Some Presidents have clearly made some purely personal selections, entirely apart from any of the political factors and in recent years this tendency has distinctly increased. Jackson's personal appointment of Major Eaton led to serious friction. Grant's cabinet appointments were largely influenced by personal factors. Fillmore, Harrison, Cleveland and McKinley each called into their cabinets their law partners. Roosevelt made several distinctly personal appointments, especially in the later years of his administration.

Another recent tendency in the appointment of cabinet officers has been a marked increase in the number of members selected primarily for their administrative ability. This is to be seen in some of the cases of promotions; but some of the most striking

instances have been of men whose skill has been previously shown in the legal and business field rather than in the public service. Such appointments as Lyman J. Gage, Elihu Root and Oscar S. Strauss were distinctly of this type; while a large proportion of President's Taft selections have been of the same class.

These tendencies in the make up of the cabinet are related to the increasing influence of the President in the operation of the national government. They serve also to emphasize the distinction between the President's cabinet in this country alike from the British cabinet of parliamentary leaders and from the German ministry of bureaucratic administrators. To what extent a cabinet of this sort can effectively direct and harmonize the complicated mechanism of the national administration and can formulate and secure the legislation to carry out constructive policies calls for further studies of the working of the cabinets in the past, in their relations to the administrative services to the President and to congress, and also for a more thorough analysis of the forces that affect public affairs in this country at the present time than has yet been made. But these problems are beyond the scope of the present paper, and must be left for the future.

EXPERT ADMINISTRATORS IN POPULAR GOVERNMENT

A. LAWRENCE LOWELL

President of Harvard University

Presidents, governors and mayors certainly cannot be experts in all the matters with which they are called upon to deal, nor, as a rule, are they thoroughly expert in any of them; and in fact this is generally true of officers elected to administer public affairs. We cannot, therefore, avoid the question whether they do, or do not, need expert assistance if the government is to be efficiently conducted. The problem is not new, for the world struggled with it two thousand years ago. The fate of institutions has sometimes turned upon it, and so may the great experiment we are trying today—that of the permanence of democracy on a large scale. Americans pay little heed to the lessons taught by the painful experience of other lands, and Charles Sumner expressed a common sentiment when he remarked sarcastically his thankfulness that they knew no history in Washington. Our people have an horizon so limited, a knowledge of the past so small, a self-confidence so sublime, a conviction that they are altogether better than their fathers so profound, that they hardly realize the difficulty of their task. We assume unconsciously, as a witty writer has put it, that human reason began about thirty years ago; and yet a candid study of history shows that the essential qualities of human nature have not changed radically; that men have little more capacity or force of character than at other favored epochs. Some improvement in standards has, no doubt, taken place, and certainly the bounds of human sympathy have widened vastly; but there has been no such transformation as to justify a confidence that the men of the present day can accomplish easily and without sacrifice what to earlier generations was unattainable.