

president of the Chamber has changed its character according to time and circumstance and personality; he explains what it was in the hand of Grévy, Gambetta (that master after the fashion of Mr. Cannon), Brisson, Floquet and Bourgeois; and then he sums up, in an illuminating paragraph, the reasons why Deschanel's conception of the president's office, derived from the English model, is impossible to realize "en France où les passions sont plus vives et où d'ailleurs toutes les institutions tendent à subir l'influence politique" (page 436). After this survey of French experience he takes a comparative view (page 447). The presidents of the French chambers do not, of right, have any other functions than those of representing the assembly and directing debates. They do not have the special powers which belong to the speaker of the American House of Representatives; their functions resemble rather those of the speaker of the House of Commons. Unlike the latter, however, the French presidents do not abandon their individual rights or their careers as politicians. The tradition that imposes upon them impartiality in presiding does not forbid them to engage in active partisan operations outside of the chambers. By usage they are consulted by the president of the Republic when new ministries are formed, and very often a president of one or the other chamber is called upon to assume the direction of affairs as president of the council of ministers. No very broad generalization can be drawn from the whole survey, unless it be that it would be extremely hazardous to attempt the creation of an ideal presiding office out of the experience of divers nations. Each cobbler works best on his own lasts.

CHARLES A. BEARD.

Administrative Problems of British India. By JOSEPH CHAILLEY. Translated by Sir WILLIAM MEYER, K. C. I. E. London, Macmillan and Company, 1910.—viii, 590 pp.

India: Impressions and Suggestions. By J. KEIR HARDIE, M. P. New York, B. W. Huebsch, 1909.—126 pp.

It would be difficult to find two books on the same general subject that differ more widely in origin, in purpose and in character than those under review, or that arrive at results more different. The one is written by a Frenchman, a member of the French legislature and of the Colonial School. His work, as he explains, is "the fruit of twenty years of thought and ten of actual labor." He began by reading about India, then visited India and, after a period of four years, repeated his visit, charged on this occasion with a mission to study

British administrative methods for the benefit of French colonial administration. M. Chailley, therefore, is eminently well fitted for the task which he has undertaken. The other book is written by a prominent member of the Labor party in the British Parliament, who, during a visit to India of a few months' duration, apparently jotted down the impressions which he received as a traveler. These impressions he first set forth in a series of letters to the *Labour Leader*; and these letters form the basis of his book. M. Chailley evidently was and is in close touch with British official circles. The fact that his book has been translated by an Anglo-Indian officer and that the proofs have been read by a former member of the viceroy's council shows how intimate are his relations with Anglo-Indian officialdom. Mr. Hardie, as his book indicates, was in touch rather with the native malcontents and during his stay in India was looked at somewhat askance both by those in charge of the Indian government and by the British population in general.

The consequence is that M. Chailley, when he finds cause to criticize the English régime in India, is a somewhat gentle critic; while Mr. Hardie's blood has evidently reached the boiling point many times in consequence of his discovery of abuses, prominent among which is the treatment which he believes is accorded to the native population by their white rulers. M. Chailley, because of his general knowledge of the difficulties which always attend the government of Asiatic peoples by Europeans, and because of his special knowledge of the institutions peculiar to India, *e. g.* the caste system, and of the political and legal difficulties which these peculiar institutions create, has been inclined to give credit to the English for their really great accomplishments in India and to excuse errors in their policy and defects in their administration. Mr. Hardie, on the contrary, is apt to emphasize the mistakes rather than the achievements of Great Britain.

Mr. Hardie's remedy for the evils which he sees is the grant to the natives of steadily widening powers of government and the recognition of a practical social equality between natives and Europeans. In other words, Mr. Hardie is a firm believer in the equality and brotherhood of man, whenever and wherever man may be, and he repudiates the notion that differences in geographical situation, in historical development or in economic conditions should receive much if any consideration in determining the political position of men. Mr. Hardie's book, therefore, while giving a reasonably accurate picture of Indian conditions as seen by the ordinary tourist, cannot be said to contribute much to the settlement of the perplexing questions which at present confront the British rulers of India.

M. Chailley, on the other hand, although he comes from a country where liberty, equality and fraternity are household words in a fuller sense than is perhaps accorded them elsewhere, attacks the Indian problem in an eminently scientific manner. Before attempting to state his conclusions or even to describe the administration of India, he devotes several very interesting chapters to the geographical, ethnological, religious, social and economic conditions of the country. Perhaps the most interesting of these chapters is that on caste, the all-pervading, mysterious and, to a European, almost incomprehensible feature of Indian life.

M. Chailley's most serious criticisms relate to the administration of justice. The love of litigation on the part of the natives, the multiplication of lawyers, the number of instances of appeal and the attempt to apply the English law of evidence to Asiatic peoples, who do not, so to speak, play the game according to its historic rules, have all contributed to produce very unfortunate results. The people regard the courts with suspicion, attributing to them many evils for which they are not responsible, and crime is increasing at an alarming rate. A perusal of M. Chailley's criticism of Indian justice can hardly fail to call to the mind of the American reader some of the prevalent criticisms of the administration of justice in the United States. Numerous appeals, a great increase in the membership of the bar and technical rules of evidence appear to have been followed by, if not to have produced, similar results. A suspicion can hardly fail to obtrude itself that the English law, notwithstanding the laudations which it receives from those who have studied it to the exclusion of other legal systems, is hardly cosmopolitan enough in character to suit any other than the peculiar local conditions in which it had its origin and has had its greatest triumphs.¹

One of the reforms in Indian conditions that M. Chailley suggests is an improvement of the educational system. This he considers wretched, and the least satisfactory parts of it, in his opinion, are the so-called universities. He pleads for better and better paid professors, who will raise teaching and examinations to a higher level. Such a plan, he thinks, would be followed by a notable diminution in both candidates and degrees. Those who pass should be encouraged to study distinctly Indian subjects and should be disabused of the notion that university training must necessarily be followed by admission to the bar or entrance into the government service.

¹ Cf. Review of Lord Cromer's *Ancient and Modern Imperialism*, *POLITICAL SCIENCE QUARTERLY*, December, 1910, vol. xxv, p. 725.

M. Chailley feels little confidence in a government of India carried on by literati "whose knowledge is of a narrow and theoretical character, who lack a past and hereditary or acquired experience." Indeed, he deploras any participation by natives in the determination of the policy of the government, unless the plan under which such participation is granted is based on undoubted loyalty, recognition of religious differences and of aristocratic traditions and adequate representation of diverse interests. He sees quite as clearly as Mr. Hardie the social gulf which separates the natives from the Europeans; but he appreciates more fully than the English writer the reasons for this cleavage. He finds them in the social customs of the natives, of which caste is the most potent, as well as in the pride or prejudices of the Europeans.

These are but a few of the matters which M. Chailley discusses. On many other points his book is equally interesting and instructive. It is a long time since any work so intelligent, so sane and so suggestive has appeared about Indian matters. It is an excellent antidote to the fervid, lurid and, if it must be said, rather unintelligent appreciation of the English occupation of India which Mr. Hardie has given us.

F. J. G.

Chinese Immigration. By MARY ROBERTS COOLIDGE. New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1909. — 531 pp.

The American people cannot view with pride the history of their dealings with backward races. For three centuries the Indian has been murdered and robbed of his heritage, and the period covered by the semblance of treaties of friendship has been really a "century of dishonor." For two and a half centuries the African was bought and sold, and for a half century he has been Ku-Kluxed, lynched and mobbed. For more than a half a century the Hawaiian has been undergoing Christianization, dispossession and decimation. The Filipino, too, has begun to feel the hug of benevolent assimilation. And now, through the patient industry of Mrs. Coolidge, we have authentic and cumulative proof that our treatment of the yellow race is on the same level with our ignominious abuse of the red, black and brown races. If the record of iniquity is to be made complete by adding minor offences, we may note the transient exploitation of European races—Irish, Italian, Slav and Jew—at the period of their first appearance in masses, without property or citizenship and, in many instances, without knowledge of the language of their exploiters.

It is well that we should have before us and should contritely ponder these tales of our inhumanity. For here we seem to be getting down