

State, county, and municipal government all come under the author's scrutiny. None escapes unscathed, and properly so. Utah's governmental structure has certainly not kept pace with the economic and social changes of the past half-century. Improvements, halting and tentative, have been made on occasion, and are recognized by Professor Durham. The antiquarian nature of much of the present machinery assures that most of the emphasis is on reform. Professor Durham has no revolutionary suggestions and no panaceas. His recommendations are largely those advocated by students and scholars for a quarter of a century or more, and particularly those which have demonstrated their effectiveness in specific trial runs in certain parts of the country.

This reviewer was particularly pleased by the emphasis given to the legislature. The author recognized grave weaknesses in the present legislature, both in theory and practice. The biennial sixty-day session was sharply rebuked. Two questions were posed, "Do we really believe in representative government? Or do we render lip service to the idea, then force the legislature to delegate power to the chief executive to function as 'representative of all the people?'" These are penetrating questions. Unfortunately affirmative answers are being all too frequently given to the second question, and the assumption is made that this is a sufficient answer to both.

Among other points and suggestions the author makes, one could comment favorably on the frequent insistence upon the expansion of the merit system. It has become almost a cliché to say that the administrative branch of state government must be manned by more efficient and intelligent personnel, and that expansion of the merit program would contribute favorably to this desideratum. Hackneyed as the idea is, it needs reiteration time and time again.

Professor Durham's first section on the background of political science may not have wide interest; but, beginning on page 13, he belabors, flays, and prescribes with admirable perspicacity and unfailing common sense and good humor.

M. R. MERRILL.

Utah State Agricultural College.

The Growth of the American Republic. By SAMUEL ELIOT MORISON and HENRY STEELE COMMAGER. (New York: Oxford University Press. Fourth Edition. 1950. Vol. I, pp. xvi, 825; Vol. II, pp. xvii, 974. \$11.00.)

The third edition of *The Growth of the American Republic*, which appeared in 1942, covered the period from the origin of man in America to the entry of the United States into World War II. The fourth edition

of this two-volume work describes that conflict and carries the story to the presidential election of 1948, with a final chapter summarizing the responsibilities of the United States as a world power. Several pages of statistical tables have been appended to volume I. Statistical tables and bibliographies in volume II have been brought up to date. As in earlier editions, the authors have adopted a broad interpretation of the term history, embracing (to use their own words) "the whole of a people's activity: economic and social, literary and spiritual, as well as political and military." *The Growth of the American Republic* continues to be one of the best-balanced and most readable college textbooks in its field.

In their preface, Professors Morison and Commager state that the text has been revised to correct errors, and "the bibliographies have been completely reworked." With all admiration for the extensive bibliographies, this reviewer is nevertheless impelled to offer certain criticisms.

In connection with the citation of the *Statistical Abstract of the United States* (Vol. I, p. 742), why is there no mention of the well-nigh indispensable *Historical Statistics of the United States 1789-1945*, published by the Government in 1949, which reflects economic, social, and political aspects of the nation's development? An appendix to the *Statistical Abstract of the United States 1949* covers the period 1946-1948, from which point annual editions will keep these historical statistics up to date.

In the references to collections of treaties (Vol. I, p. 743), David Hunter Miller, *Treaties and Other International Acts of the United States of America*, should be included. The eight completed volumes form a valuable source of information on American foreign policy from 1776 to 1863; nor ought the lengthy bibliographical note in volume I of that work be overlooked. So, too, Green H. Hackworth, *Digest of International Law*, should be cited as supplementing Moore's *Digest* (Vol. I, p. 743).

As a partial offset to the bewailed paucity of books on military history (Vol. I, p. 746), there is here suggested Emory Upton, *The Military Policy of the United States*, covering the period 1775-1862; Frederic R. Huidekoper, *The Military Unpreparedness of the United States*, carrying the story to 1915; and William A. Ganoe, *The History of the United States Army* (rev. ed., 1942). An appendix to the latter volume supplies a selected bibliography and much historical information on army officer personnel.

The bibliographies list some books published as late as 1950, but do not include Samuel F. Bemis, *John Quincy Adams and the Foundations of American Foreign Policy* (1949), and James Hart, *The American Presidency 1789* (1948), two outstanding recent publications. Perhaps George A. Lipsky, *John Quincy Adams, His Theory and Ideas* (1950), appeared too late for inclusion.

Concerning Dean C. Worcester's *Philippines, Past and Present* (Vol. II, p. 863), it would have been better to have cited the 1930 edition, revised by J. R. Hayden, with four additional chapters, and to have followed this with Hayden's *The Philippines, A Study in National Development* (1942).

Finally, why was not the citation (Vol. I, p. 745) to H. S. Commager, *Documents of American History* (1492-1940), changed to refer to the fifth edition, 1949, which is cited throughout volume II?

University of Michigan.

EVERETT S. BROWN.

The Federal Government and Education. By HOLLIS P. ALLEN. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. 1950. Pp. xvii, 333. \$4.00.)

The reports of the various "task forces" of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government generally have been overwhelmingly praised or strongly condemned. Professor Allen's book, "The original and complete study of education for the Hoover Commission Task Force on Public Education," will probably be no exception; but, in the opinion of this reviewer, there is much to commend and considerably less to criticize.

The tone of the report is set in the preface, where we learn that "the chapters which follow . . . will take the point of view that organizational decisions as they concern education can be made properly only in the light of good educational and public policy." (p. xi.) When it is stated that "because organization and procedure are inseparable from policy and objective, we believe it essential that the scope of this report include consideration of policy, both as now developed, and as it should be developed" (p. 7, italics supplied), some of the emphases throughout the book become more clearly understood. It has been pointed out before that the Commission was instructed to make recommendations concerning organization, structure, and procedure, and *not* policy; that was to remain in its traditionally proper place, namely the Congress. Once it is established that the author conceives a major share of his task to be one of establishing policy, many later statements become more logical. For example, when discussing a Federal educational agency, the query "How can such an agency be set up to give maximum assurance against bureaucratic federal control of education?" is a revealing key to his point of view. The possibility of "bureaucracy" on the state or local level of government is not mentioned.

When one has become reconciled to Dr. Allen's fear of Uncle Sam, his book becomes not only more understandable but more appreciated. The brief but concise historical presentation of the educational activities