

BOOK DEPARTMENT.

EDITED BY

ROLAND P. FALKNER and EMORY R. JOHNSON,

WITH THE CO-OPERATION OF

Charles F. A. Currier,	Mass. Inst. of Technology.
Winthrop M. Daniels,	Princeton University.
John H. Gray,	Northwestern University.
David Kinley,	University of Illinois.
H. H. Powers,	Smith College

REVIEWS.

American Marine. The Shipping Question in History and Politics. By WILLIAM W. BATES. Pp. 479. Boston and New York. Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1893.

Any book that will set the American people to pondering on the loss of their commercial power on the high seas is deserving of welcome. Mr. Bates has written such a book and it is a pity that he has unnecessarily marred its effectiveness by a vehemence of statement that often puts his facts and logic under suspicion. He was evidently wrought up when he began to write the book, and the more he wrote about the indignities put upon American shipping, the more his indignation grew. Yet, despite his vehemence, sometimes descending to puerilities, despite repetitions, omissions and lack of orderly arrangement, his book is the fullest and best treatise upon its important subject that has been published. It is a protectionist's argument for protection by subsidy and bounty to American ship-building and ship-owning, and that fact is so patent that the argument will have, it may be feared, less than its proper weight with many readers. A clear, cool statement of the facts that the author had at his command, without any denunciation of stupid statesmen and wicked foreigners, would have stirred the indignation of any reader, whether free trader or protectionist, and so accomplished the result which Mr. Bates has evidently aimed at. Inasmuch as the work by David A. Wells on the same subject, published in 1882, although lucid, compact and well ordered, is mainly an advocate's plea for free trade, vitiated by undisguised contempt for any form of subvention, it is evident that the book on American shipping to which the impartial student can refer with confidence has yet to be written.

The value of Mr. Bates' book is at the same time one of its weaknesses, namely : its attention to details. He has treated American

[468]

shipping from all points of view, excepting the purely objective or scientific, and has crowded his pages with facts, quotations and statistical tables. Hence, although the reader may at times lose his points of compass, there is in the book the necessary material for an intelligent judgment. Mr. Bates is a practical expert in his subject. He was commissioner of navigation under President Harrison, and says that for fifty years he has been "a student of ships and navigation." He begins by discussing the importance to a nation of a prosperous marine. He then gives twenty pages to the evolution of British maritime power and 100 pages to a sketch of the shipping of the United States from 1789 to 1892. These are the important parts of the book, all that follows being iterative or explanatory. The decline of the American marine, he contends, was due primarily and principally to the change from the protective to the free-shipping policy in 1815. Prior to that year carriage in American bottoms had been encouraged by partial rebate of duties on their freight. The act of 1815, which lifted all burdens from British vessels in American ports, was passed, according to Mr. Bates, solely to please England and gain a treaty of peace with her. In the similar acts of 1817, 1824 and 1828 he finds the successful culmination of the British conspiracy to drive the Yankee flag from the seas. He has, however, a great respect for the American ship-builder and sailor, and seems to admit that but for other aids the British conspiracy might have failed, for he devotes considerable space to explaining how the British Lloyd's Register Society, by its discriminations against wooden and American bottoms, compelled merchants either to patronize British ships or to send their cargoes to sea uninsured. He denounces vigorously the bonded warehouse act of 1846 as virtually an extension of credit to foreigners to enable them more quickly to annihilate an American industry. England's policy of subvention, under which the Cunarders received from \$400,000 to \$800,000 a year, beginning with 1839, paralyzed competition, although the success of the Collins line, which received from the American Government an equal subsidy from 1850 till 1858, demonstrated that the policy might have been effectively employed in retaliation. The continued decline of our shipping interests since 1860, during a period of high protective tariff, Mr. Bates accounts for simply on the ground that those interests were not sheltered under the wing of protection. All the other industries of the country were safe against the assaults of British capital and labor; the ship-owner alone was defenceless. Mr. Bates brings to the support of his views an abundance of facts and figures, many of which an opponent cannot lightly put aside as irrelevant or coincident. A reply to his book, if there is to be a reply, ought to come from a protectionist

rather than from a free-trader like Mr. Wells, for Mr. Bates and Mr. Wells, while agreeing often in their conclusions, start out from different premises, and argument between them would be quite futile. A believer in protection for American industries will meet Mr. Bates on common ground, and he alone, if anyone, can show why that protection, which has been accorded capital employed on the land, should not have been given with equal generosity to capital on the sea.

It is to be regretted that Mr. Bates does not make more prominent the petty and abominable abuses and annoyances for which the blundering Acts of Congress are responsible. For instance, restrictions as to residence are imposed upon a native American who owns a vessel; under some circumstances American ships are subject to tonnage taxes from which foreign vessels are exempt; and if an American vessel once falls into a foreigner's possession, whether by sale or capture in war, it can never again be bought back and fly the American flag. Such burdens upon ship-owning cannot be regarded as minor, and there are enough of them to make the business of foreign commerce most vexatious and usually unprofitable.

In the concluding chapters Mr. Bates discusses the various remedies that have been proposed. He advocates the establishment of a department of commerce at Washington, independent of the treasury department, and defends the defeated bounty or tonnage bill of 1890, as being the best measure now practicable.

JOSEPH FRENCH JOHNSON.

University of Pennsylvania.

The Growth of English Industry and Commerce in Modern Times.

By W. CUNNINGHAM, D. D. Pp. 771. Cambridge: University Press, 1892.

[A sequel to "The Growth of English Industry and Commerce in the Early and Middle Ages," by the same author, 1890.]

There are few men deserving of more honor than he who makes the first practicable road through a new country. It is this task which Professor Cunningham, in the volume under review, has completed for the still only partially explored country of English economic history. Much had been done in the investigation and elucidation of certain periods and certain aspects of that subject by various writers, and Thorold Rogers in his great work had heaped up materials for the study of one of its most important sides during five centuries; but a continuous narrative of the whole course of English economic development from the earliest time to the present has now been given us for the first time. Especially in any field of history is the accomplishment of this particular kind of work of the greatest value for later

[470]

students. Until a general survey of the field has been made, all study must be more or less unhistorical. An investigation of the agrarian system of the Anglo-Saxons, or of the English in the fourteenth century, or in the eighteenth, is not history. The origin and growth of industrial and agricultural systems, their decay, with its causes and results, the reaction of economic changes on the broader social development, the march of economic ideas, and their influence, these alone are to be considered as economic history in its highest sense. The parts can then be safely re-examined and restated and still retain their character as history, when once the whole has been completely, even if in some parts inadequately, or mistakenly told. The value of Professor Cunningham's work would therefore have been very great if it had been even of moderate erudition, whereas his learning is broad and deep, and much of this second volume is an absolutely new contribution to our knowledge of the subject. The limitations in carrying out such a large plan in the present state of progress in the subject are of course considerable. Many difficult problems had to be left unsolved, and many obscure places still unexplored. The Saxon period is given less space and attention than one would have expected, the treatment of the gilds is certainly very inadequate, the discussion of the agrarian changes of the Tudor period is even more so. Generally speaking Professor Cunningham's elucidation of commerce and economic doctrine is fuller and stronger than that of manufacturing industry, agriculture and land-holding. The Middle Ages is also better understood, in spite of its lack of material, than many movements in modern times.

Of course many of these fields are confessedly lying still practically unstudied, awaiting the investigation of future students. The knowledge and labor of no one man is able to clear them all up. It is a matter of satisfaction that the continued work of such men as Cunningham, Seeböhm, Maitland, Ashley, Vinogradoff, Gross, Andrews and others, bids fair to do much toward filling in the details of the picture during the same generation as that in which its main outlines were sketched.

Yet our fundamental criticism of Professor Cunningham's work is not on the question of its adequacy, but on that of its method of arrangement. He says, "since the growth of industry and commerce is so directly dependent on the framework of society at any one time, it may be most convenient to take periods which are marked out by political and social, rather than by economic changes." He then proceeds, from the Norman conquest onward, to follow the outline of the salient points of English constitutional development. It seems to us that two serious evils result from this placing of political above

economic influences, first, a frequent confusion of cause and effect, and secondly, a false judgment of the economic importance of certain periods. It is possibly true that the constitutional organs of central government which were brought into force under the first Edward were influential in creating a "national economy," but the general character of the next period, 1377 to 1485, was on the author's own showing the result for the most part of purely economic causes and of their reaction on political conditions. Again, in the Tudor period, which were the controlling forces, the economic or the political? The whole force of the absolute government of Henry VII., Henry VIII., and the Protector was opposed to the enclosures and other changes in land-holding of that time, and yet almost without effect. The changes continued and ran their course. Indeed, it was the growing wealth of England, the rise of the middle class, and the separation of classes which made possible the Tudor despotism, and the new position which England was able to take in European affairs. Moreover, political and economic periods can seldom be made co-terminous without distortion of facts. The beginning of Elizabeth's reign was a distinct crisis in political history, but economically speaking, during the first half of that reign the changes of the preceding century were still proceeding, while its latter part was much more closely connected with the Stuart period that follows.

Again, this classification obscures the fact that some periods are of far greater economic importance than others. The changes of the Middle Ages were slow. With the exception of the turbulent fourteenth century, conditions remained remarkably stationary down to the middle of the fifteenth century. The century or more succeeding was a period of rapid fundamental change, until something like equilibrium was reached. Another long period of comparative stability then extended to the last quarter of the eighteenth century. Yet Professor Cunningham gives less than two hundred pages to the period of rapid economic change from 1397 to 1558, while he gives more than four hundred pages to the comparatively barren century and a half of Elizabeth and the Stuarts. The result is that individual experiments in manufacturing and commerce, local, temporary, and comparatively insignificant movements, in such a period as the latter, are treated as if of the same importance as the enclosures of the fifteenth and the nineteenth century, or the changes in the gilds of the sixteenth.

Economic conditions would seem to have passed through a development of their own, largely independent of, though of course not unconnected, with other national forces. Kept stable by the perpetuity of the manorial organization in the country, and that of the gilds in the towns, we have the strong corporate character of mediæval life.

[472]

With the decay of this organization in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, began the rapid growth of individualism, a tendency which was, so to speak, checked half way, and restrained for another century and a half by the strong state policy of Elizabeth and her successors. Then in the latter part of last century, with the introduction of the factory system and other new elements, began a new growth of individualism, reinforced now by the teachings of a powerful economic and political school, a movement which only in recent decades seems to be meeting a distinct reaction. Some such thread as this, to be found in the relation of economic phenomena themselves, will alone prove to be permanently satisfactory in tracing the development of English economic history. But after all, this is only a minor criticism to make of such a work. We do not understand that the author feels that the last word has been spoken on any part of his subject, and the continuity, the learning, the good judgment, and the fair-mindedness of the book will make it more and more necessary to readers and later writers as a basis and a model for their own work.

University of Pennsylvania.

E. P. CHEYNEY.

History of Federal Government in Greece and Italy. By EDWARD A. FREEMAN. Edited by J. B. BURY. Second edition. Pp. xlviii, 692. London: Macmillan & Co., 1893.

The first and only volume of Freeman's "History of Federal Government" has long since established a permanent place for itself, so that an extended review, one commensurate with the priceless value of the work, need not be given to the present reprint, which includes, however, an additional chapter on Federalism in Italy and a fragment on Germany. The editor has made no change in the text, except to correct obvious errors; a revision of the references to authorities and an appendix of twenty pages are his main contributions. This single volume is complete in itself; the first two chapters are a masterful discussion of the general principles of Federalism, while the body of the work will probably always remain the standard history of the Greek confederations; in some matters of detail Freeman's conclusions have already been somewhat modified, and they will doubtless be still further affected in the future; but there is less likelihood that the work as a whole will suffer materially. Like Gibbon's "Roman Empire," Freeman's "Federal Government in Greece" seems assured an exceptionally permanent value. That Freeman was not a political prophet is evident; that he could not, in the preparation of his first two chapters, have had the example of a Federal monarchy, Germany, to add to the completeness of his survey,

is unfortunate. What is ever to be lamented is that he did not live to write the second portion of the work, for which, as for the first, he was so peculiarly qualified, the history of six hundred years of Swiss confederation.

C. F. A. C.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

La Beneficenza Romana dagli antichi tempi fino ad oggi: Studio storico critico dell' avvocato QUIRINO QUERINI. Opera insignita del primo premio nel concorso speciale all' Esposizione di Palermo. Pp. 500 with tables. Roma. 1892.

This work will prove to be of no little interest and value to foreign students interested in the general subject of public charity in Rome, for it contains the results of long and patient historical investigation of countless documents which the foreign student will not find easily accessible. The author has long occupied himself with historical studies in this field and has made several other contributions to its literature. His most recent work is, however, his best. It deals solely with Roman charities and is historical and critical and takes little direct part in the controversy that is waged in Italy around the Reform Law of 1890, regulating the public charities of the whole kingdom. Nor does the great question respecting the relation of the Catholic church to the public charities come in for as much treatment as we should like to see. Perhaps the author prefers to let the facts of the past speak for themselves to him who will interpret them. We believe, however, that the author's Catholic instincts and sympathies have led him to take for granted, or even to justify, a condition of affairs that is the outcome of the past, but which to one not accustomed to that mode of thinking is suggestive of grave problems which the present Italian government must solve in a radical and decided manner if it does not wish to give over all forms of charity into private hands.

Querini's work in the introductory part or "*parte generale*," discusses the forms of charity among primitive peoples and such questions as the origin of misery, and then makes a detailed examination of the laws, and the motives underlying them, that existed for the relief of poverty among the ancient Egyptians, the Israelites, Hindoos, Chinese, Persians and Greeks.

The first part of the book proper then commences with a discussion of charity among the ancient Romans. Here Querini finds that poverty increased rapidly in proportion as manual labor was held to be dishonorable, as agricultural pursuits declined and standing armies increased. He treats with much breadth of view and accurate

research, the corresponding growth of the multifarious social, political and legal institutions and customs for the prevention and amelioration of poverty. The laws of hospitality and those concerning the treatment of slaves were influenced by and in turn influenced the condition of the poor, but all positive legislation, such as the food laws, and in the times of the republic and the empire, the gratuitous distribution of food to certain classes, was prompted solely by fear and the desire on the part of the rulers to maintain an equilibrium among different classes and to prevent rebellion. The humane motive was of slow growth that gave rise to hospitals, to public medicinal aid, to care for the insane and for orphans. Indeed, it did not secure much hold on public legislation until Christianity had become the ruling power.

Part second is entitled "Christianity and the Middle Ages," and deals with the growth of organized charity under their combined influence. It is but natural to expect the *direct* influence of the Christian Church upon all forms of public relief to be greatest during the middle ages, when she so completely guided and controlled temporal affairs as was the case in Rome.

Querini, with admirable clearness, wealth of illustration and warmth of interest, discusses such questions as the principles taught by the apostles, their application by the church, the cardinal doctrine of the universal brotherhood of man, the introduction of church collections, the funds of which were administered by seven deacons, who were to know and look after the poor connected with each church, the foundation of asylums for travelers (termed by Querini the principal form of charity in Italy, and especially in Rome, that may be said to be typically ecclesiastical) the growth of the Church's wealth and its use, the special gifts of emperors and sovereigns to church funds, the part played by the monks and by monastic orders in relieving the material wants of the poor, and, finally, the special gifts of the popes to charitable purposes from their private wealth and from jubilee festivities. Throughout the middle ages Roman charity is characterized by papal initiative and monastic co-operation, with the result that it attained great dimensions, but was often of doubtful expediency as to method, for in the end it engendered a feeling of reliance on the church for material aid.

Part third treats of the modern era, and goes into the history of the foundation of each separate institution and the policy of the successive popes with great detail and chronological precision, bringing it down to 1870. As an historical record this will prove valuable, but it is less important as a discussion of principles and tendencies. Too little space is devoted to the period since 1870, with the policy or which the author is less in sympathy, but within which time some of the most

difficult problems have arisen. In his criticism of the law of 1890 governing existing charities, we fail to find the same liberal spirit that characterized the earlier pages, and where legitimate defects are pointed out there is little offered by way of remedy. The failings of the book consist in too strict adherence to historical details and too little appreciation of the relative importance of many single problems and tendencies that have run through the whole history of Roman charities, and have made its results either meagre or of doubtful value.

An appendix of about fifty pages added after the award of the Palermo prize is by no means devoid of interest. It treats of private institutions of charity in Rome in recent years; special charitable works among the Jews, who at one time formed an important part of the population of Rome, with many institutions of their own; and the beneficiary and mutual aid associations of Rome. A great amount of statistical information respecting the different institutions is given in the tables to be found at the end of the book.

Vienna.

S. M. LINDSAY.

Protezionismo Americano, Saggi Storici di Politica Commerciale.

Per UGO RABBENO. Pp. xxiv, 512. Milano: 1893, Fratelli Dumolard.

One of the characteristic features of recent Italian economic literature has been the interest evinced in following the trend of economic thought through different periods and in different countries. It is the scientific awakening which is attracting the attention of economists in all parts of the world, and which bids fair to lead up to a period of independent thought, using the material which is now being collected as a sub-structure upon which to build. In such men as Loria, Ricca-Salerno and Graziani we find the beginnings of this movement.

The work just published by Professor Rabbeno belongs rather to the former type. In a series of three essays, embracing fourteen chapters, he follows the commercial policy of the American Colonies and of the United States, both in their commercial legislation and in the history of commercial theories from the time of Hamilton down to the theories of Patten.

The first essay is devoted entirely to the commercial policy of Great Britain in her North American Colonies. The events leading to the Navigation Acts, the policy of Cromwell, of Charles II., and the circumstances leading to the rupture with the mother country, are duly considered. In the second chapter the genesis of the British commercial policy in the North American Colonies is treated. In this connection the theories of the Mercantile School are reviewed and traced in their modifications and in the liberal reaction which followed them through Adam Smith and Ricardo. In the third

chapter of the first essay the effects of England's policy upon the North American Colonies, the condition of their industries, as well as that of the mother country, are examined in detail.

The subject of the second essay is the elements of the commercial policy of the United States. The first chapter embraces the period from the Declaration of Independence to the adoption of the Constitution, and treats of the genesis of the idea of protection. In the second chapter, devoted to the tariff of 1789, the author carefully considers the question of the character of this measure, coming to the conclusion that it was merely a tariff for revenue, because of the primitive condition of manufactures and means of transportation. The modifications of the act of 1789 form the subject of the third chapter. Into this period the report of Hamilton on manufactures falls, and marks a decided progress of protectionist ideas. In the three subsequent chapters the tariff history of the United States, from 1807 to the McKinley Bill, is followed step by step. The essay concludes with a chapter contrasting the periods of protection and relative free trade.

In the third essay the author takes up the theory of protection, tracing it in the writings of its principal scientific expositors. In the first chapter the ideas of Alexander Hamilton are carefully summarized. His position relative to Adam Smith, to List, and to Carey is clearly defined. The same method is employed with List and Carey, whose theories are so well known and understood as to make the main merit of the author his clearness of exposition rather than any originality of treatment. In the fourth chapter of the third essay, and the concluding chapter of the book, the author has given himself much pains to place before the Italian public for the first time in Italian economic literature, a résumé of the theories as developed in the various writings of Professor Patten. For this attempt the scientific as well as the lay public owe a debt of gratitude to Professor Rabbeno, though many reservations must be made both as to method of treatment and completeness of presentation. It would, perhaps, be asking too much of a foreigner at the present time to expect a thorough and adequate appreciation of the exact position occupied by Professor Patten, and, what is more important, of the relation of the different parts of his economic system. To select from any author only those theories pertaining to a particular subject is, at its best, a somewhat delicate proceeding, which, however, becomes thoroughly unsatisfactory when applied to works of the type of those by Patten. The result has been as was to be expected. Those of Patten's theories either leading to, or bearing directly on, the subject of protection, have been taken out of their intimate connection with the remainder of his system. The impression

left upon the reader is that of a series of more or less novel theories, which do not, by any manner of means, represent a new economy. Had Professor Rabbeno, instead of attempting to undermine the originality of the author through a search for the elements of his theories in the writings of such men as List and Carey, devoted this valuable space to a more complete presentation of the immediate subject in hand, the value of his book would have been greatly enhanced.

In considering the relation of these three economists to one another Professor Rabbeno has failed to appreciate fully the nature of the premises upon which their systems have been built. That List and Carey had certain points of contact in their theories, is perfectly natural and the explanation is to be found in their environment. When we come to compare them with Patten it is necessary to do something more than to show a seeming analogy in their conclusions. Between Patten and Carey there is very little sympathy of doctrine. Their starting point is different and when correctly interpreted their conclusions lead to very different economic polity. In one sense Patten is much more in sympathy with List than with Carey. They are both national economists, in a sense in which Carey never was. But the one fundamental fact distinguishing Carey and List from Patten is their conception of the relation of American conditions to those of older European countries. Both List and Carey exploit to its fullest extent the "infant industry" argument, claiming that being a young and undeveloped country protection is necessary to bring us to the level of the countries of the Old World. Patten's position is diametrically opposed to this. His works clearly show that he does not consider America a nation existing under primitive conditions, in the sense of Carey and List. On the contrary, it is because of our more advanced dynamic state that he considers protection from the static influences of foreign countries necessary. Thus with List and Carey protection means the development of an "infant" country to the standard of its more aged contemporaries, with Patten it means a preservation and continual strengthening of those dynamic forces which are elements of progress and are found under particularly favorable conditions in a country with the resources of the United States.

The author distinctly states that it is not possible for him to give in the short space of a chapter a summary of all the theories of Patten, but this fact only goes to prove that he did not fully recognize the intimate connection between the theory of consumption and distribution as developed by Professor Patten. Professor Rabbeno first develops Patten's theory of consumption and from it, leads up to the theory of protection as outlined by him for a dynamic

society. Before examining the inadequacy of this presentation it may be well to correct a misunderstanding under which Professor Rabbeno labors. He attacks the method employed by Patten, accusing it of being deductive to such a degree as to lose sight of the actual world around us. Any single one of his works, even taking the most deductive, as for instance his "Theory of Dynamic Economics" should be sufficient proof to the contrary. When, however, the whole range of works is carefully examined there is no longer room for doubt. One of their most characteristic features is a deviation from the deductive methods of the Austrian school, to a more inductive examination of economic phenomena. The fact that the theory of value is neither starting-point nor goal of his system should have immediately convinced Professor Rabbeno of his error. All of Patten's theories, but more especially that of consumption to which the author calls special attention, are based on observation. It is true that upon this inductive basis he makes free use of deduction, but this should not obscure his starting-point. At times Patten evinces a certain impatience with the Austrian analysis of the elements of value and of the relation of value to cost, and devotes himself to a problem which concerns itself more directly with actual economic conditions, that is, with the theory of prosperity, the conditions of a progressive society, the effects of distribution on national well being, etc. Nothing is therefore, more misleading than Professor Rabbeno's charge "*that Patten too often limits himself to researches of a subjective nature, which lead him to that abuse of deduction, into that labyrinth of fruitless abstractions, so characteristic of the 'Austrian School.'*" Professor Rabbeno does not seem to have recognized that the new political economy brings with it a reaction against mere logical analysis—that it is no longer satisfied with the unsatisfactory division of the science as found in the works of the classical economists, but that, striving for a more organic treatment of economic phenomena, it arrives at the principles underlying economic progress, without losing itself in the minute analysis of the elements of production, which fails sufficiently to appreciate and analyze the relation of these elements *one to another*, and which relegates to a subordinate position the consideration of their relation *to economic progress*. Cannan in his recent work upon the "History of the Theories of Production and Distribution" has admirably developed this thought. To appreciate Patten's work, even in connection with his theory of protection, it is necessary to constantly keep in mind his relation to the economists of the earlier portion of this century. The change in point of view is then clearly seen and shows in what way these theories are becoming parts of a new economy.

In having failed to fully appreciate this, Professor Rabbeno has allowed a rare opportunity of doing a real service to Italian economics slip by.

We have confined ourselves for the most part to this last chapter, as it represents the part most interesting to American readers. It would have led us somewhat too far into the consideration of the subject of method to have discussed the author's opinions regarding the Austrian school. He expresses himself very strongly upon this point and hardly does them justice. What defects there are in the book are, for the most part, to be found in the last chapter. The remainder of the book shows careful research and deep study and will be an invaluable aid to Italian students of commercial policy.

Philadelphia.

L. S. ROWE.

The Principles of Ethics. By HERBERT SPENCER. Vols. I., II. Pp. 572, 465. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1893.

Even the most strenuous opponents of the Spencerian system of philosophy cannot help joining with the friends and adherents of Mr. Spencer in congratulating him on his completion of the final volumes of his great life work, the "Synthetic Philosophy." He has attained this result in spite of persistent ill health and greatly advanced age, and, while one feels that there is not that fullness of illustration and solidity of treatment so characteristic of his earlier volumes, due to the fear lest he should not be able to finish his work, yet one does not perceive any falling off in Mr. Spencer's marvelous power for keen, rigid and comprehensive analysis of the complex relationships of social life. It is fortunate for evolutionary ethics, and for science generally, that Mr. Spencer has given a final and an authoritative exposition of his views on the economic, political and social problems now so prominent.

These volumes are made up of parts issued at different times. With the exception of the now famous "Data of Ethics," 1879, the parts (II) "Inductions of Ethics," (III) "The Ethics of Individual Life," (IV) "Justice," and (V) "Negative and (VI) Positive Beneficence," have all been published since 1891. Volume II treats of Justice and Beneficence.

The sum and substance of Mr. Spencer's discussion of the ethics of social life consist in elaborately setting forth the conditions prerequisite to a harmonious and progressive social life. Examining inductively, as well as reasoning deductively, concerning the conditions of existence in the whole animate world, then among ancient and present primitive races, and finally among civilized peoples, he finds the one absolute condition of the ideal social state, wherein perfect

[480]

justice prevails, to be the fulfilment of the great law (first enunciated by him in 1850) of equal freedom, that "every man is free to do that which he wills, provided he infringes not the equal freedom of any other man." This is the central idea of the Spencerian system of political and social ethics. It is the major premise from which follow Mr. Spencer's well-known and generally disputed deductions respecting the rights and duties of the individual and the limited sphere of governmental action and predominance.

Having established this ultimate and absolute dictum of justice Mr. Spencer deduces the several corollaries thence derived. They are set forth in their logical sequence in the chapters on "The Right to Physical Integrity," "Free Motion and Locomotion," "Uses of the Natural Media," "Property," "Incorporeal Property," "Gift and Bequest," "Free Exchange and Free Contract," "Free Industry," "Free Belief and Worship." The maintenance and protection of these "rights" become the sole function of "the State," the nature, constitution and duties of which he next proceeds to discuss.

"The end to be achieved by the society in its corporate capacity, that is, by the State, is the welfare of its units." The State is simply and solely the agent or instrumentality of a community or people for "preventing interferences with the carrying on of individual lives;" and "the ethical warrant for [State] coercion does not manifestly go beyond what is needful for preventing them." If governments assume other duties than those of maintaining justice and equal freedom for all by arrogating to themselves industrial, educational and other functions, it is violating the very law of equal freedom which alone gives its existence an ethical warrant.

It will doubtless be a surprise to many writers to learn what comprehensive words justice and equity are in Mr. Spencer's mind. He justifies and encourages legislation which makes railroads responsible for injuries sustained by their employes. Quarantine and sanitary inspection laws he would have. The State care and municipal supervision of our public roads meets with his approval. Inheritance taxes have an ethical justification. He would have the State protect individuals free of expense, not only from foreign foes and criminals, but from offenders classed as civil. Thus he utters his wonted vigorous protest against the "miserable *laissez faire* which calmly looks on while men ruin themselves in trying to enforce by law their equitable claims," and at the same time allows governments to supply them "at other men's cost with *gratis* novel reading."

The publication of the divisions on Negative and Positive Beneficence should dissipate the charges usually preferred against Mr. Spencer and his philosophy that there is no heart in him, that he has

no generous consideration for the strugglings and sufferings of humanity, for in these closing parts he points out how the ethical progress of the race is retarded if altruistic actions be not constantly dwelt upon and practiced by all. The beneficent and maleficent effects, both immediate and remote, of man's actions upon himself and fellowmen are treated in a manner at once philosophical and inspiring. His chapter on "Relief of the Poor," contains some timely warnings; and those on political and social beneficence inculcate man's duties to his fellows in no uncertain language. Even though one holds views opposed to Mr. Spencer's, the careful reading of these two masterly volumes must needs make one regard with profound admiration this fearless mariner who has so long opposed the hostile waves of public opinion.

Philadelphia.

FRANK I. HERRIOTT.

Our Indian Protectorate, An Introduction to the Study of the Relations between the British Government and its Indian Feudatories. By CHARLES LEWIS TUPPER. London and New York : Longmans, Green & Co., 1893.

So little is known in the United States concerning the government of India, its history or its present working, that we welcome with pleasure a new work on the subject. The average knowledge of even our educated classes, concerning what we may well call one of the noblest monuments of Anglo-Saxon genius—the organization of India—is indeed indistinct. We believe that the general impression in this country of English rule in India is that it is oppressive and bad. Such an impression only shows our ignorance of the subject, an ignorance which a perusal of the present work will go far to dispel.

Mr. Tupper writes as one thoroughly familiar with the subject with which he deals. This very familiarity, and the fact that he confined himself to the Protectorate in India, renders his work in no sense an elementary treatise. One unfamiliar with the English government, or the main facts of Indian history, must read the text carefully if he would carry away correct ideas. The Indian Protectorate is that part of the territory of the Indian Empire under the rule of native princes, whose authority is upheld by the British government, but over whose acts the English government exercises more or less direct control. According to the official return in 1886, there are 629 of these Feudatory States in India, with a total area of 638,672 square miles, and a population of 65,000,000 of people, or over one-fourth of the entire population of the Empire. The work is a discussion of the relations between these feudatories and the English government, including an historical outline of how these relations were brought

about, with a view to determining the proper general principles to be applied by the Indian government in its dealings with the native governments of the protected States. Mr. Tupper, therefore, has nothing to do with the government of that part of India which is under the exclusive administration of English officials. Neither does he treat of those governments, such as Afghanistan, whose relations to the British government are those of semi-independent powers. The States, with which he deals, are those, which, while having local autonomy under native princes, are strictly dependent on the English government, having no political relations with foreign powers or with each other.

The history of the growth of these protected States is told in an entertaining manner by the author. As we have before pointed out, Mr. Tupper starts with the assumption that a general knowledge of Indian history is possessed by his readers. His own efforts, therefore, are confined to reviewing the important points of that history from a purely political-administrative standpoint. There is no more entertaining, and to Americans no more instructive, chapter than that which describes the annexation of the province of Oudh as a result of the misgovernment of the native prince. The rule of this potentate, Wájid Ali Shah, was upheld by British authority. The vivid picture of the horrible debauchery of the native government of India, and the misery of the people under their own rulers, will here be found graphically depicted, and in the picture we must see the justification of English rule. The history of Oudh is also instructive from the fact that the deposition of the Wájid Ali was the first distinct recognition by the English government, that in upholding the rule of a native prince, they became responsible to the people of the province to protect them from gross misrule, on his part. If such misrule is incurable, as in the case of Oudh, their duty is to depose the local sovereign and rule the country directly by English agents.

To those who are familiar with Indian history, it will be of interest to learn that Mr. Tupper is entirely in accord with the present policy of the Indian government in perpetuating through the Senad the local rule of the native princes over the different principalities of the Protectorate. In other words, that he believes the Protectorate should remain a Protectorate, and not be incorporated into the territory ruled directly by the Indian government. We may say, in explanation, that the Senad is a compact between the Indian government and the native prince, that if his own family dies out, which is very likely to be the case, owing to the barrenness of the women of the higher classes, that he will then be permitted to adopt an heir and thus perpetuate the native rule and

prevent the administration lapsing into the hands of the English. He also, while a strong federalist, approves of the movement toward local autonomy, which is taking place throughout India. The most valuable part of his work, however, is that which impresses upon Englishmen, from whom his readers will be mainly drawn, that while the native princes may be upheld in their government, the English owe a great responsibility to India. This responsibility is that the government of the dependency whether by English agents or native princes should conduce to the welfare and peace and happiness of the natives, and that misrule on the part of the native prince, is no more to be tolerated than the misrule on the part of the British agent.

We recommend Mr. Tupper's work to all those who desire to understand something of the problems with which the members of our race on the other side of the world have to deal, and something of the great work they have accomplished.

Haverford College.

WM. DRAPER LEWIS.

Outlines of Economics. By RICHARD T. ELY, Ph. D. Pp. xii, 432. New York: Hunt & Eaton; Cincinnati: Cranston & Curtis. 1893.

The teacher has a perennial interest in the improvement of economic textbooks. Most teachers feel that the books in use at present neither give due emphasis to the different portions of economic theory, nor succeed in arousing that interest which the great problems of the science ought to awaken. The public still has a lingering antipathy to economic science as a result of the controversies of the political economists of the early part of this century; thus all interested in the progress of the science must welcome every endeavor so to restate economic doctrines as to extend their influence to new classes of people.

Dr. Ely's book is the first systematic attempt to present economics in the form which it has been given under the influence of German thought by the recent work of American economists. The ideas of the English school are clearly stated in the books of numerous authors; but, though most teachers still use these excellent manuals to start their classes, each instructor is compelled to supplement the class work by presenting important doctrines not even hinted at in the textbook. Such a method as this must obviously be unsatisfactory, except in the larger universities where the instruction is well differentiated and the students have access to good libraries.

The progress of the science is well indicated by the improvements in the present, as compared with the earlier, edition of Dr. Ely's book.

The last few years have brought many changes in the tone of American economics, and the new edition shows that Dr. Ely has kept abreast with the times. This change is clearly indicated in the divisions of the book. The first part contains a historical introduction; the second relates to private economics, and the third to public economics. This division is logical and enables the student to enter the whole field of economic discussion. The changes in the first part are the most important of the book. In the first edition, Dr. Ely strove to give his book a sociological cast. The tone of the present work is different. In the place of a general talk about the place and possibilities of sociology he has given an account of social progress from the standpoint of economic history. Sociology may be the great science of the future, but a textbook will do much more good by giving definite treatment to economic history than by making brief remarks concerning sociological laws.

The most original part of the book is the one on public economics. In these topics, Dr. Ely is at his best, and the discussion has all that freshness and force which characterize so many of his writings. Teachers owe a debt of gratitude to him for embodying these topics in a textbook, and for the happy way in which he discusses them.

I cannot regard the part on private economics as on a level with the two other portions of the book. Exception ought, however, to be made of the section on the transfer of goods, where the new ideas on value are happily introduced and clearly presented. The section on distribution is too inductive and descriptive to convey a clear idea of the subject. The relation between the different parts of income is not clearly brought out, and there is an absence of that definite concept of distribution which makes so valuable the works of President Walker. These defects are due, for the most part, to the spirit of progress which shapes Dr. Ely's thought. He has left the old standpoint of economics, as represented by the classical school, and has not yet acquired a new theory of distribution in harmony with the concept of the science which he now holds. A transitional stage necessarily lacks the clearness of the old position.

In my opinion, Dr. Ely will not be able to raise that portion of his book dealing with private economics to the level of the other parts of his treatise, without making consumption the basis of his discussion. Even now, his standpoint is plainly that of consumption; but his discussion of utilities and of the standard of life is so widely diffused through the whole volume, and is mixed in with so much other matter, that the force of the argument is lost. His section on consumption is not rightly named. It should be called an analysis of expenditure—an important problem, but one distinct from the theory of consumption.

The lack of a theory of consumption also causes Dr. Ely to neglect the theoretical basis of monopolies. The inductive side in the treatment of monopolies is clearly presented in the discussion of public economics, and comes out also in the discussion of economic history ; but in his theory of private economics he has not definitely enough broken away from the static economy of the past to enable him to find the ultimate causes of monopolies, and thus properly to correlate the different parts of his book.

Notwithstanding these defects, Dr. Ely's book is a most valuable one. I see in it many indications of the form and content of the future textbook. It is certainly much better than any treatise with which it can fairly be compared. If he has not reached the goal, it is due more to the present transitional state of the science than to defects of presentation.

SIMON N. PATTEN.

University of Pennsylvania.