

The most valuable part of Mr. Marriott's book is the chapter on the movement for the reform of the British House of Lords, which contains his own suggestions for a reconstruction of that venerable fabric. His conclusions on this matter are very temperate, but it is to be hoped that they do not depend upon the inductive study which precedes them.

CHARLES A. BEARD.

Ancient and Modern Imperialism. By the Earl of CROMER.
New York, Longmans, Green and Company, 1910.—143 pp.

A comparison of modern with ancient imperialism, by a British statesman who has governed with signal success a country which formed one of the most important provinces of the Roman Empire, challenges attention; and Lord Cromer's little volume fully merits the careful consideration which it is sure to receive. As the author includes in his comparison only those portions of the British Empire "in which the inhabitants are not bound to us by any racial or religious ties," thus eliminating the self-governing dominions, he naturally ignores the analogies between Greek and British colonization which other writers have attempted to establish; and, after a brief review of Greek efforts to achieve national federation and to establish foreign dominion, he concludes that "the undisciplined and idealistic Greek, with his intense individuality, was far less suitable to carry an imperialistic policy into execution than the austere and practical Roman" (page 14).

The analogies which Lord Cromer finds between Roman and British imperialism are for the most part too evident to have been overlooked by other writers. Of greater interest are the differences which he suggests or asserts. He frankly admits that "an imperial power naturally expects to derive some benefits for itself from its imperialism" (page 41), and that, if Rome exacted from its dependencies heavy tributes, Great Britain pursued the same policy in India until 1773. He admits also that humanitarian ideals and the feeling that even subject peoples are entitled to justice existed in the Roman Empire. But in affirming that since 1857 it has been recognized as "the principle which lies at the root of all sound administration . . . that administration and commercial exploitation should not be entrusted to the same hands" (page 69), he suggests, by silence regarding any Roman efforts in the same direction, that the British policy in this respect is wholly novel. At Rome, however, even in the republican period, a similar principle seems to have been recognized, however imperfectly it may have been applied. Efforts were made in that period not only to prevent official exploitation but to check the tendency of administrators and unofficial

exploiters to conspire with each other against the provincials; and when, in the imperial period, tax-farming was replaced by governmental collection of taxes, considerable progress was made toward the realization of the very principle which Great Britain has recognized since 1857. It may be conceded that the taxation of the provinces was very heavy, even in the best period of the Roman Empire, and it would be unsafe to assert that the Roman Empire did as much for its subjects in return for their contributions as the British Empire is doing; but the conditions which prevailed in the second century, for example, are not properly indicated by limiting the examination, as Lord Cromer does, to the republican period and the principate of Augustus.

Another difference that is suggested by the author is the tendency of Great Britain, even in the administration of crown colonies, to develop local self-government. Lord Cromer is of course right in saying that the extension of Roman citizenship to provincials did not necessarily carry with it any powers of local self-government and that the authority which the Senate and people in the republican period and the princeps in the imperial period exercised over the provinces was legally unlimited. Equally unlimited, however, is the authority of the British Parliament in all British dependencies. Whatever local autonomy the inhabitants of the British Empire today enjoy, even in the self-governing dominions, has been granted by Parliament. In any comparison of Roman with British imperialism, accordingly, we should look simply at the extent to which local autonomy was conceded. On this point Lord Cromer's allusion to the disinclination of Roman imperialists "to interfere with local institutions more than was necessary" (page 116), and his citation from Mommsen in a foot-note on the same page, fail to give the reader any just notion of the amount of self-government which existed in the municipalities during the republican period; nor is there any suggestion of the extent to which this self-government was systematized during the early Empire. The degree to which members of the conquered races came to participate in the provincial and even in the central administration Lord Cromer does suggest, but in connection with another topic, that of assimilation.

That the idea of educating conquered peoples to such a point of self-government that they might become independent nations was never entertained by any Roman is undeniable; but to Lord Cromer himself this modern idea is wholly unacceptable, at least as regards India. "In this respect," he says, "something of the clearness of political vision and bluntness of expression which characterized the imperialists of ancient Rome might, not without advantage, be imparted to our own imperialist policy" (page 127).

That the Roman Empire solved the problem of assimilating conquered peoples far more successfully than Great Britain or any other modern state, Lord Cromer fully recognizes. This, he says, is "easily" explained on the ground that the task of the Romans was less difficult. What is said on this point, on pages 91 to 114, is undoubtedly true, but it is only half of the truth. There were positive as well as negative reasons for Roman success in this crucial matter. Of one of the positive agencies of assimilation, commerce, Lord Cromer hints an appreciation on page 115, note 2. Of another agency, the Roman law, he has seemingly no appreciation. He is apparently not aware that the Romans, so far from imposing their legal notions upon their conquered subjects, constructed from the various legal systems of the Mediterranean a really universal law, which they then imposed upon themselves. He is aware, however, that English legal ideas are often repellent to subjects of Great Britain. Thus he says :

Freedom of contract, the principle of *caveat emptor*, rigid fixity of fiscal demands, the expropriation of land for non-payment of rent, even the commonplace western idea that a man must be proved to be guilty of an offence before he can be punished, are almost as great innovations as the principle of representation accompanied by all the electoral paraphernalia of Europe. These divergent habits of thought on economic, juridical and administrative questions have served to enhance the strength of the very formidable and elemental forces, such as differences of religion, of color and of social habits, which are ever tending to sunder the governing race from that which is governed. There has been no thorough fusion, no real assimilation between the British and their alien subjects, and, so far as we can now predict, the future will in this respect be but a repetition of the past. *Fata obstant.*

In a foot-note to this passage the author cites, without comment, the Roman rule touching remission of rent when no crop can be reaped by the tenant. It may be added that the immoral rule of *caveat emptor* was rejected by the Romans before the Christian era, and that the very technical rules of the English law regarding evidence, which not infrequently frustrate justice, have no counterpart in the Roman law.

To the reviewer, Lord Cromer's testimony that English legal notions make for severance between the governing and the governed races in the British Empire is the most interesting suggestion in this very suggestive little book ; but it may perhaps be queried why this unfortunate result should be attributed to fate. Is it fate that keeps the Briton insular?

MUNROE SMITH.

Congrès international des sciences administratives. Brussels, S. Goemaere, 1910.

Among the congresses which assembled at Brussels during the summer of 1910, on the occasion of the International Exposition, was the first Congress of the Administrative Sciences. Its proceedings have been published in four volumes, to which it is intended to add a fifth. The volumes already published contain the papers which were prepared for the congress. The forthcoming volume will contain a stenographic report of the discussions which the set papers elicited.

The proceedings of the congress are interesting, first, because the calling of this, the first international congress on the subject, is significant of belief in the present importance of the matters which the congress was called to consider, and second, as showing the parts of the general subject of administration which seemed to those participating specially to demand consideration.

If we may regard the amount of attention devoted to a topic as indicative of its importance, it may be said without question that local government is at present the most important subject of administrative study; for two volumes of the proceedings, constituting considerably more than one-half of their total bulk, are devoted to various aspects of this problem. Reports from almost all parts of the civilized world were made upon local autonomy, upon the relations between the local areas and the central government, and upon the various administrative services of those local areas, such as the means of communication, local finances, charities, sanitation and municipal ownership and operation of public utilities. Of the other two volumes, one is devoted to the problems arising in connection with the central administrative organization, such as methods for recruiting the civil service, and strikes and associations of civil servants; the other, to methods of accountability and administrative records.

From the foregoing outline it will be seen that these proceedings are of great value to the student of administration, not alone because of the subject matter but even more because of the character of those who prepared the papers and who participated in the discussions. Many of the most eminent European students of constitutional and administrative law were present and took part in the proceedings. Their remarks, which were full of references to personal experiences and to the very latest administrative tendencies, will be found for the most part in the forthcoming fifth volume, which the American student of foreign administration should not fail to secure.

F. J. G.