

tute's special interest. Professor Quincy Wright, executive secretary, secured three foreign speakers and three American lecturers for this year's meetings. Count Michimasa Soyeshima of Tokyo, until recently a member of the House of Peers, and an authority on Japanese diplomacy, lectured on the domestic and foreign problems of Japan. Dr. P. W. Kuo, president of Southeastern University at Nanking, China, and Mr. H. G. W. Woodhead, C. B. E., editor of the *Peking and Tientsin Times* and of the *China Year Book*, presented alternative views of China's internal unrest and her relations with other powers. Mr. Julian Arnold, American commercial attaché at Peking, lectured on "China's Economic Resources," and Mr. H. K. Norton, author of *The Far Eastern Republic of Siberia*, dealt with the topic, "The Russians in the Far East." These lectures will be published during the winter by the University of Chicago Press. They were delivered in Mandel Hall in the afternoons and attracted large audiences.

Special courses on Far Eastern politics were given by Professors Harold S. Quigley, of the University of Minnesota, and Frederic A. Ogg, of the University of Wisconsin. The latter delivered the convocation address at the close of the summer quarter on the subject "New Tests of Representative Government."

Henry Jones Ford, *emeritus* professor of politics, in Princeton University, died at Blue Ridge Summit, Pennsylvania, August 29, after an extended illness. He had just turned his seventy-fifth year, being born in Baltimore, August 25, 1851. His teaching career was the second in which he rose to prominence, and was preceded by his career as journalist.

Graduating from Baltimore City College at the age of seventeen, he became an editorial writer for the *Baltimore American* four years later. Subsequently he held in succession the following editorial posts: City Editor of the *Baltimore Sun*; managing editor of the *Baltimore American* (1875-1879); editorial writer for the *New York Sun* (1879-1883); editorial writer for the *Baltimore Sun* (1883-1885); managing editor of the *Pittsburgh Commercial Gazette* (1885-1895); managing editor of the *Pittsburgh Chronicle Telegraph* (1895-1901); editor of the *Pittsburgh Gazette* (1901-1905).

Of the volumes on political history and government which later brought him his chief reputation, the first was published through the Macmillan Company in 1898. This was *The Rise and Growth of American Politics*, which was the fruit of reading and reflection "out of hours"

through many years. Issuing from an unacademic course, its importance was not recognized at first, but when appreciation dawned it waxed rapidly. In 1906 Mr. Ford was invited to lecture on political science in Johns Hopkins University, and two years later was offered a professorship in politics at Princeton University by President Woodrow Wilson. His association with Mr. Wilson also brought him, in 1912, the post of commissioner of banking and insurance; and a year later, after Mr. Wilson had become president, a confidential mission to Philippines, in the performance of which he is understood to have rendered a report on governmental conditions in those islands, though this has never been published. From the same source he received in 1920 an *ad interim* designation as a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission; but owing to the *impasse* which had developed between the President and the Senate the appointment was not confirmed.

During the same period Professor Ford was constantly employing his pen. Besides a great number of articles, he published the following volumes: *The Cost of our National Government* (1909); *The Scotch-Irish in America* (1915); *The Natural History of the State* (1915); *Woodrow Wilson, the Man and his Work*—primarily a campaign biography (1916); *Washington and his Colleagues* (1918); and *The Cleveland Era* (1919)—the last two of these volumes appearing in the *Chronicles of America Series*; *Alexander Hamilton* (1921); and *Representative Government* (1922).

As an editor Professor Ford had come to appreciate the great importance of the problem of control of public expenditure, and his interest in this subject led him naturally to an investigation of the broader and more fundamental problem of the proper relation of executive and legislature in a constitutional government. On this point his creed was the one confirmed by the entire course of English constitutional history, that the business of governing is executive and the rôle of the legislature that solely of criticism and control. All the chief faults of government in the United States he traced to a common rootage in a false interpretation of democracy whereby, in the language of fable, the donkey has been encouraged to put his feet in the stirrup. Although Professor Ford found his ideal of governmental structure most nearly realized in the British cabinet system as depicted at the height of its development by Bagehot, yet as early as 1898 he had detected signs of its impaired efficiency which have since become manifest to even casual observation. The strongly entrenched

office of President he therefore deemed a much securer basis for a democratic government dominated by the principle of efficient public service, could the historical tradition illustrated in the British system but be recovered for our own people.

Although he was reared in the *laissez faire* traditions of the Democratic party, and indeed remained a voting member of that party to the end of his life, Professor Ford was in essential outlook a thoroughgoing Hamiltonian—one who, moreover, had read and pondered his Darwin. He held that the best approach to the problems with which our closely articulated society confronts the modern student of government was that afforded by the notion of society as an organism. Nor does he anywhere in his writings manifest much interest in problems of constitutional limitation. The sole limit to the serviceability of government is that set by its efficiency.

Among Professor Ford's volumes two stand preëminent, the first and the last. *The Rise and Growth of American Politics* was a pioneer work in the history of party politics in the United States and performed the distinctive service of setting forth for the first time the reciprocal reaction of party organization and governmental structure upon one another in this country. The work is also remarkable for its prophetic anticipation of the rôle for which the presidency was soon to be recast by Roosevelt and Wilson. That both these men were influenced by this volume in which interpretative insight finds expression in some extremely good writing, seems altogether likely. The recent *Representative Government* brings John Stuart Mill's famous essay down to date. For readiness of pertinent illustration and power of sustained analysis it would be hard to match.

But upon all of Professor Ford's writings will be discovered the stamp of a philosophic and ruminative mind, nourished on the historical tradition of its science, and operating upon a wide range of materials, the harvesting of omnivorous reading. Ford had, moreover, a freshness of style, a heritage from the editorial sanctum but purged of editorial diffuseness, which enabled him to convey to his readers his own warm interest in his subject, first-hand and unimpaired. Stylistic skill supplies the place of personal presence in his pages to a rare degree. The same qualities were of course brought to his teaching. Students and colleagues alike found him a constant source of stimulative ideas and a conversationalist of rare charm.

Professor Ford was president of the American Political Science Asso-

ciation in 1918 and 1919, and was subsequently president of the Catholic Historical Society.

EDWARD S. CORWIN.

Princeton University.

Non-Voting in a Typical Ohio Community. The investigation which is described in the following paragraphs was first suggested by a plea made by Professor Merriam at a meeting of the American Political Science Association for a more careful statistical study, and a more detailed analysis, of various units of the body politic. It was further stimulated by the report of Professors Merriam and Gosnell on the study of non-voting made in the city of Chicago which report is published in book form under the title *Non-Voting*.

This study, however, differs somewhat from that made in Chicago as to method and purpose. In the Chicago survey only non-voters were studied and the chief aim was to discover why the non-voters absented themselves from the polling-booth. In our investigation data were gathered, as far as possible, on all the persons entitled to vote in the city of Delaware, Ohio, for the purpose of discovering if possible the variations in the percentage of non-voting according to age, race, sex, occupation, education and so forth.

It should be clearly understood that this is not presented as a comprehensive and conclusive study. On the contrary the writer clearly recognizes that to attach great importance to the conclusions reached would not only be unscientific but provincial. Nevertheless, it is believed that the microscopic study of political units has value. While no one is ready to say that a given community is as likely to be typical of all communities, as a given cell of a plant or an animal is typical of other cells in the organism, it is perhaps true that there is enough similarity to warrant the statement that if enough communities are studied we may generalize, on a statewide, or even a nationwide basis. If a large number of local units were studied for facts on voting and non-voting it might be safe to draw general conclusions, and the results of this survey are presented in the hope that it may suggest similar studies in other localities.

The community studied is the city of Delaware, in central Ohio, with a population according to the 1920 census of 8756, and a fairly typical Ohio community. That it is a college town does not necessarily keep it from being typical. Ohio has so many colleges that one can say, without being more than half facetious, that an Ohio town