

*Register* appears to have been drawn upon to any considerable extent, Yet the press probably played a more conspicuous and more important part in this campaign than ever before under the able leadership of Blair, Kendall and Green.

There are other omissions and apparent inaccuracies of minor importance; but, on the whole, the monograph is highly praiseworthy, and a real contribution to what has long been needed, namely, a series of intensive studies of presidential campaigns.

P. ORMAN RAY.

*Northwestern University.*

*Four Famous New Yorkers: The Political Careers of Cleveland, Platt, Hill and Roosevelt.* By DE ALVA STANWOOD ALEXANDER. (New York: Henry Holt and Company. 1923. Pp. xvii, 488.)

This book is rather what the subtitle suggests, a political history of the state of New York, 1882-1905, than a series of biographical essays. The political careers of Cleveland and Roosevelt are discussed only in so far as they touch upon New York politics, and the book, ending abruptly with the year 1905, leaves out the latter half of Roosevelt's career in New York politics. The selection of "four famous New Yorkers" from this period must necessarily be arbitrary. The exclusion of Richard Croker from the list may be defended on the ground that he never held an important elective office as did Cleveland, Platt, Hill and Roosevelt; but there were times when Croker wielded more political power than either Platt or Hill. Benjamin B. Odell was also a "famous" figure in New York politics. In fact, it was easy for any successful New York politician to become "famous" in the period which Mr. Alexander treats, because the failure of a major party to carry New York State in a presidential election then meant the loss of the presidency to that party.

Mr. Alexander has given an interesting and accurate account of the conventions and campaigns which brought Cleveland and Roosevelt to the front in national politics. Since Mr. Alexander was a United States district attorney during Harrison's administration and Cleveland's second term, and since he was a member of Congress from 1897 to 1910, he is able to write about many of these events from first-hand knowledge.

In his preface the author states that the volume is presented as a history of "the personal forces or types of public men who controlled two great political parties in the state of New York." Like the first three volumes of *The Political History of the State of New York*, this volume is written in the old style, narrowly "political." There were certain "personal forces" of political importance in the state which he does not even mention. The names of prominent business men like J. P. Morgan and Thomas F. Ryan are omitted from this book, although it is undeniable that Ryan, the utility magnate, was an exceedingly significant figure in the Democratic National Convention which nominated Alton B. Parker for president. Mr. Alexander's narrative keeps so close to the chronological order of events that it has no place for important evidence which came to light after 1905. The legislative life-insurance investigation of 1905-6, the Allds senatorial case of 1910, and the corrupt-practices investigation of 1910-11 all threw some light upon the inner workings of New York politics of the late nineties, but Mr. Alexander makes no reference to any of the inquiries.

By and large, the author is impartial in his treatment of the two major parties, but his personal party preferences are not entirely concealed. He dwells upon the departures from the merit system that occurred during Cleveland's administration, but he says nothing about those which occurred during McKinley's first administration. He refers to the gerrymander of the state by the Democrats in 1891, but he does not mention the gerrymander which the Republicans wrote into Constitution of 1894. Even more disappointing than the author's Republicanism is his failure to appreciate the significance of the third-party movements. In describing the New York mayoralty campaign of 1886, he says (page 81): "as the canvass progressed, the most dangerous and disorderly elements, the enemies of public order, adopted George as especially their own." These "elements," the wage-earning groups, were not usually "dangerous" when they kept within the traditional two-party system. Mr. Alexander refers to the national platform of the Democratic party in 1896 as the "crazy Populist platform." This platform contained among other things such "crazy" suggestions as an income tax amendment, stricter control of trusts and pools, and the enlargement of the powers of the interstate commerce commission.

The value of this book lies in its vivid descriptions of national and state party conventions and in its wealth of political anecdotes. This

material might be used in a scientific analysis of political groupings in the state. It is to be regretted that Mr. Alexander has not attempted to interpret the events about which he has written in the light of recent advances that have been made in the social sciences.

HAROLD F. GOSNELL.

*University of Chicago.*

*Lords Lieutenants in the Sixteenth Century: A Study in Tudor Local Administration.* By GLADYS SCOTT THOMSON. (London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1923. Pp. x, 182.)

The King's lieutenants of whom Miss Thomson writes were not the important and stately heads of the military and civil administrations of the counties which they grew to be in post-Elizabethan times. They were not "great, selfish, pampered aristocrats" as Charles Greville called the lord lieutenant of his time. Nor was their function mere "decorative inutility" as it became from Cardwell's Army Act of 1871 which took away their military powers until Haldane's Army Act of 1907 restored them. The lord lieutenancy at its origin under the Tudors was the tentative creation of an administrative link between the crown and the counties.

In the Tudor period local administration was not formalized. The crown's use of loyal and influential noblemen and gentlemen as justices of the peace with increasingly varied duties is well known. In like manner the crown came to use an occasional more important and more influential subject as its agent, first in raising and commanding the military levies, and then for a variety of civil duties as well. The lord lieutenant occupied a position midway between the council and the justice.

During the whole Tudor period, however, as Miss Thomson shows, the lord lieutenancy was in a way experimental. For a time in certain counties the new official would be given the military duties of the commissions of array and the sheriff. Again no lieutenant would be chosen, and the duties would revert to commissions. In a bureaucracy, which the Tudor administration tended to become, the lord lieutenancy would have had a distinct place and function. But since the government of the Tudors was based upon personal loyalty, and was a bureaucracy of good-will, the crown dared not risk the revival of the quasi-independent position of the great nobles which had caused some of the troubles of the preceding century. The crown created the position