

## BLACKFRIARS

and religion. The book therefore has its undoubted merits, but one wonders how far this purely negative approach will carry conviction amongst non-Catholics. Darwinism also once upon a time was proved wrong in this purely negative way: but it was only when the positive side could be developed by showing just how genetics conformed not to Darwinian but to Mendelian principles, that the bottom of Darwinism dropped out.

In the same way, it is one thing to refute the Comte, Levy-Bruhl, Tylor, etc. of a, scientifically, bygone age: it is quite another to explain very simply just how human social origins developed historically—from a Primitive Food Collectors' age to the three distinct types of primary civilization, of hunters, shepherds and farmers. What the ordinary reach-me-down man of to-day needs is a small manual of what I would call "Proto-history"—that part of human history which lies anterior to the beginnings—less than 10,000 years ago—of those Higher Civilizations of China, India, Babylonia, Egypt and Iran, whose direct heirs we are. And as the ordinary manuals of Astronomy do not prove why the theories of Ptolemy must be wrong, or that Aristotelian physics is false, or that the earth is not a disk, but just tell us what is known of the stellar universe: so also a manual of Protohistory is badly needed, just giving a straightforward account of what happened to man after his expulsion from Eden and how the four fundamental varieties of Primitive, Hunter, Shepherd and Farmer arose and later on mingled again.

Perhaps it is absurd for a reviewer to quarrel with an author for not having written the book he would have wished her to write: but it surely is like playing *Hamlet* without the Prince of Denmark for an author—a Catholic author at that—to write on Social Origins and quote approvingly Fr. Wilhelm Schmidt, S.V.D., without as much as mentioning his four "Kultur Kreise" (i.e. the four fundamental civilization types), which he has done so much to establish, and acceptance of which he has rendered by this time scientifically inescapable. What Gregor Mendel has done for Genetics, Wilhelm Schmidt has done for Ethnology: it is the constructive, positive discoveries of these two Scientist-Religious that have brought about the final collapse of nineteenth-century evolutionism. One understands that agnostics do not feel much zest for a *haute vulgarisation* of theories which prove that Social Origins begin with Monotheism, Monogamy, etc.: but what grounds can Catholics have for fighting equally shy of them?

H. C. E. ZACHARIAS.

MODERN PRODUCTION AMONG BACKWARD PEOPLES. By D. E. Greaves. (Allen & Unwin; 10/6.)

This is a remarkable book and one that deserves close study on

## REVIEWS

the part of all who are perplexed by what Sir Norman Angell calls "This Have and Have-not Business" of Colonial and would-be Colonial Powers. The book forms part of a series of *Studies in Economics and Commerce*, issued by the London School of Economics, and is also a thesis for the Ph. (Econ.) Doctorate of the University of London. It professes merely to be an analysis of the economic metamorphosis that accompanies the extension of imperial rule over hitherto remote and self-sufficing communities: but the author's endeavour has been "to subsume these communities under the same analytical technique as is applicable to those more advanced."

This "subsuming" has been done with considerable psychological skill: in fact, Miss Greaves seems to possess that very unusual mind which is eager and competent "to undertake the analysis of the obvious." As a consequence the whole subject of "the native mind" is lifted out of that rather foetid glass-house atmosphere of sentimentality and brutality which depicts the mentality of any society which does not conform to Wall Street standards as "inscrutable," "mysterious" or "childlike." Instead of which rubbish we get some sane, clear, common-sense, which, for instance, fails to see why "barter between two tribes in Africa is deplorable backwardness, while barter between two nations in Europe is a step forward in the methodology of civilization"; or, "if natives are to be criticized for making inefficient use of their land, why the unploughed areas of Kenya and Nyasaland land grants and the empty spaces or *haciendas* in America are to be exempt from criticism." In Kenya the natives are not allowed to grow coffee because they are said to allow disease to develop: yet when the coffee industry of Ceylon was exterminated by leaf fungus, it was a plantation industry entirely in European hands: and the witchbroom disease has devastated not the native trees in West Africa but the estates in Ecuador. In a tribal society yams are provided, as roads are in a capitalistic society, i.e. as a public utility; in the former the person in want applies to the family, in the latter to the state; in the former the munificence of the wealthy must be in proportion to his riches, whilst in the latter he is made to pay graduated income tax. *Plus ça change, plus ça reste la même chose.*

Wilsonian ideology has defined "backward ones" as those "unable to stand alone under the strenuous conditions of modern life"—the author shrewdly observes that, "if they were left alone, they would not find the conditions of life so strenuous." The fact is that the economic structure of these communities is changing from collectivism to individualism under duress by outside forces which have proved no less irresistible because they speak of these people no longer as the assets of conquerors but as wards of

## BLACKFRIARS

Civilization. The "backward" tribe used to be self-contained, self-sufficient, self-sanctioned: the very purpose of Western penetration is to break down this isolation—is it then a wonder that these people regarded these economic influences as a danger to the whole balance of their lives, economic, social and religious? But, remarks Miss Greaves, "the habit of regarding foreign economic influences as a danger to the whole structure of national life is not confined to Africans, as we can see by recalling the protests that are being evoked by the flooding of the world with cheap Japanese goods."

To sum up, "*homo œconomicus* is essentially the same in every type of society, and to treat him as varying in character because the concrete manifestations of his impulses and satisfactions differ in time and place, is to invite a needless confusion of thought." But is that not the case, because one has really got to deal not with a logical concept, such as *homo œconomicus*, but with a live, human person? The production of goods is after all a human activity: as such, it is subject to psychological factors, first and last. Miss Graves' study is a most valuable contribution towards an understanding of these factors, as applied to people who are no less human for being coloured, and no less children of God for being sacrificed to Mammon.

H. C. E. ZACHARIAS.

## MEDÆVAL STUDIES

The first Dominican settlement at Paris was made in the neighbourhood of the Cathedral of Notre Dame in 1217. Through the benefactions of a famous Master in Theology, John de Barastre, Dean of St. Quintin, the Dominicans came in possession, a year later, of the Church of St. James, situated in the centre of the university city. Their aim in Paris, as attested by a contemporary chronicler, was "ut studerent, et prædicarent, et conventum facerent." Lacking a graduated Master in theology of their own, Pope Honorius III charged John de Barastre, their benefactor, to teach "fratres ordinis Prædicatorum in sacra Pagina studentes." The task, however, of presenting to the Mastership the first Dominican, Roland of Cremona, did not fall upon the Dean of St. Quintin, but was reserved to an English professor, John of St. Giles, who later on, in a quite unexpected manner, became himself a Dominican. In spite of the masterly study published in 1923 by Card. Ehrle, very little is known of this first Dominican Master in Paris. E. Filthaut, O.P., has taken upon himself to add our knowledge on the subject with a good monograph, originally presented as a thesis for the Doctorate of Divinity in the University of Bonn.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> E. FILTHAUT, O.P.: *Roland von Cremona O.P. and die Anfänge der*