

unreservedly Darwin's hypotheses as dogmas rather than scientific laws, he does not assume that evolution in any case means steady progress. The quotation from Ferrero which he places on a fly-leaf of his book shows that he has not, like most modern scientists, a hatred of the Middle Ages: "The Europe of 1317", he quotes from Ferrero, "was a paradise compared to the Europe of 1917; and this is the result of six centuries of progress—progress which surely gives the Chinese, Indians, and other peoples, to whom we are wont to consider ourselves so superior, every right to smile ironically—progress which fills the soul of many a European with deep distrust. Is this progress? we may well ask."

Ferrero is probably right, though the Europe of 1317 was anything but a paradise; and Mr. Means shows us unconsciously that neither the Chinese, nor the Indians look on our progress as ideal. In fact, so far as an attitude of superiority is concerned, the haughtiness seems—although they rarely show it—to be on the part of the Chinese. The Orientals condescend to use the rude weapons of the West in order to compete with us; but in soul and mind they still remain spiritually proud and condescending. In the limits of a brief review it is impossible to do justice to this very learned, very stimulating, and at times very irritating volume. It is so much worth while that one would like, not only to approve, but to combat some of Mr. Means's theories with violence. In analyzing what Mr. Means calls the culture of American aborigines, he accentuates certain facts which many of us have lost sight of in considering their lack of practical progress. For instance, he says very truly,—

WHAT IS HUMAN PROGRESS?

By Maurice Francis Egan

Mr. Philip Ainsworth Means offers us a book which can be read with real profit only by the analytical and intellectual person. It is the volume of a young man who has thought much, observed much, and studied hard; the only line of research which he seems to have neglected, is the careful use of English words. It is not often that he shows the result of this disregard of style, but when a Bostonian uses the word "riled" in a serious passage one demands with lifted hands to heaven that the vengeance of the spirits of the Back Bay shall be wreaked upon him.

It is not necessary to repeat the encomiums of distinguished scientists on the careful work Mr. Means has done in Peru: a layman can only listen to these with reverence; but on less strictly scientific matters the lay critic is entitled to his own opinion. Although Mr. Means seems to accept

... in all the western hemisphere not a wheel turned until Columbus arrived. The nearest approaches to wheels and wheeling movement are seen in the Alaskan region where some of the natives rolled the canoes into the sea on logs, and in Mexico where fire was ignited by means of a stick rapidly revolved between the palms of the hands while its point rested upon another bit of wood. Nevertheless, the ancient peoples of America were by no means lacking in mechanical devices. Litters were certainly used in Mexico and in Peru (and very likely in Yucatan) by great personages. The travois and sledge were used widely in the more northern parts of the continent.

Nearly as important as the matter of rotatory mechanism is that of domestic animals. With the exception of the comparatively useless dog there were none such in ancient America. Only the Andeans with their feeble, wilful, semi-subjected Llamas and the Eskimo with his specially developed sledge-dog had the slightest sign of an animal helpmate and burden beast. (Pages 123-124.)

Mr. Means defines culture as "the complex of conditions created by man and his psychological reaction to those conditions". It "has been shown to vary from place to place and from age to age". Mr. Means ardently desires the construction of a scaffold on which a better culture may rest—a world culture. This, he thinks, must be brought about by what he calls "race appreciation". He does not leave out religion in the process of reconstruction; but he does not tell us whether this religion is to be mystical or not so far as the religious revival among the Allies is concerned, and we are left in doubt as to whether religion among the various races of the world, not Christian, is decaying. It is interesting to trace the procession of

paradoxes by which he unites paternalism with democracy. He compares the wretched condition of Persia to the improved condition of India, the latter owing to the grafting of a newer civilization on the older. It follows from most of his observations and arguments that the world cannot exist as a world worthy of respect and safe to live in, unless paternalism so conducts the people that they are able eventually to govern themselves; we must then accept the task of being *in loco parentis* to those nations which, according to Mr. Means, are not really inferior, but only undeveloped. He is too sane not to see that democracy at present needs to be protected from itself in many countries; but he seems to make the mistake of imagining that democracy can only exist under a republican form of government — a mistake common among even the most intelligent of our fellow countrymen. He believes earnestly that human nature is perfectible, and that, after tremendous scientific thought and effort and struggle, the world will reach that "divine event to which the whole creation tends". It is a hopeful book, and yet not a book which indulges in the illusions of hope more fully than one expects from a young man who looks on life sincerely, if not with entire clarity.

Racial Factors in Democracy. By Phillip Ainsworth Means. Marshall Jones Co.