well at a mental test, but such that one has a large *g* and small *s*, the other a large *s* and small *g*, and consider whether there is sufficiently good correspondence of these variables with what on other grounds may be considered general mental energy and specific ability. Other results, such as the difficulty in transfer of training, may be of service.

Further deductions from the above expressions for *g* and *s* are being investigated. I have been greatly helped by my colleagues, Miss A. E. M. M. Dallas and Mr. M. M. Lewis. H. T. H. PIAGGIO.

University College, Nottingham,
Nov. 22.

I QUITE agree that Prof. Piaggio's proof is not only much simpler than that given in "The Abilities of Man", but also more illuminating. I agree with Prof. Piaggio generally, subject to the reservation that I do not consider (3), the interpretation of *g* as general mental energy, to be any essential part of the theory. Essential for me is that the determination of *g* and *s* leads on to that of 'group' factors; and then the varying magnitude of all three kinds of factors under varying conditions connect them up with all the laws of the human mind, as also with such influences as age, heredity, instruction. Thereby, I believe, psychology is placed upon a new basis, in which the old but still prevalent 'faculties' are replaced by statistically established unitary functions. I suggest that all these positive observations are at present being side-tracked by undue prominence given to such speculative (however luminous) hypotheses as that of a 'general energy'. C. SPEARMAN.

Administration and Anthropology in India.

MR. CODRINGTON is unaware of the facts that in this University lectures are given every year to I.C.S. probationers on the ethnology of India, and that an Indian area is selected for special study in the Tripos. The work done by Dr. Hutton and by Mr. Mills is evidence that fieldwork is existent in India. Nevertheless I share Mr. Codrington's regret that though the facts are accessible enough to those who have cared to work them over, the present discussions at the Conference are not enhanced by anthropology.

T. C. HODSON
(Reader in Ethnology).

University Museum of Archaeology
and of Ethnology,
Downing Street, Cambridge,
Dec. 15.

THREE of Mr. Hodson's criticisms I can answer very shortly:

(1) I am well aware of the existence of the I.C.S. probationers' courses: I have expressed the opinion that considering the importance of anthropology to the embryo administrator, they are scarcely sufficient.

(2) The option of selecting an Indian area in the Cambridge Anthropological Tripos is something. However, I have pointed out that the district gazetteers, which must be the source books for this work, are "uncorrelated compilations"; in my opinion, they are extremely difficult to handle critically, without some personal knowledge of the areas concerned.

(3) With regard to my alleged neglect of Dr. Hutton's and Mr. Mills's magnificent work, I can only point out that I was discussing the impending carving-up of India into federated units: the Assamese hills are not culturally part of India proper, and from the point of view of the problem under discussion, they

offer no great difficulty, because their cultural boundaries are clearly defined.

The only remark of Mr. Hodson's that I feel called on to reply to in detail is his assertion that "the facts [of Indian anthropology, that is, as bearing upon the creation of a federal India] are accessible enough to those who have cared to work them over". If this is so, why is there no generally accepted handbook of Indian ethnology? Why is there no volume covering the field of India folk-lore? Why is it that no work has been done on Indian technology since the pioneer publications of Birdwood and Watt, nearly thirty years ago? How is it that the 1-in. sheets of the Survey of India are unpublished for large and important ethnic areas in India, although they are absolutely necessary for research of any kind in those areas? Why is it that until very recently one so seldom heard Indian research matters discussed at academic gatherings? Why is it that there are still so few specialists in Indian cultural studies? Why is the flow of publication so sluggish? . . . The answer can only be that the basic data, physical and cultural, have never been provided in the necessary quantity over the necessary range, and that in default of critically conceived local studies, in which the environment is taken into consideration, we have no means of manipulating the impressively massive, but uncorrelated, facts of our source-books—the gazetteers.

In checking the accessible literature, after any discussion of points of interest, with local observers fresh from India, one is forced to acknowledge gaps and discrepancies on all sides, and furthermore a wellnigh hopeless confusion of nomenclature. The present system of recording the castes and tribes of India, upon which the monumental Census Reports, perhaps the finest of their kind in the world, are based, is an artificial system in the botanical sense. Such groups of people as the Khorwa, Kapu, Vellala, Megh, and such a group as the Kurumban-Kuruba-Kurma complex, which are all paraded as ethnic units in the Census Reports, are not proved entities in any scientific sense. Few, if any, of them have been studied as they actually exist, in their villages and families: none have been studied, even generally, over the whole of their very large areas of distribution. In other words, the units have never been defined in their own environment, and we are therefore ignorant of the degree of homogeneity or variation of the alleged class.

For example, there are two great castes of glass-workers, nowadays mainly occupied in the manufacture of glass bangles, the Manihar and the Kachera. The former have a distribution running through the Punjab, Rajputana, and the United Provinces: the latter, who are much fewer in number, are confined mainly to Central India. What is the real relationship, ethnical and historical, between these two professional groups, and what bearing has their modern craft upon the enormous glass-bead manufacture of South India in Pallava times, of which we have just become aware? It will be seen that this problem is the reverse of the former. In many cases it is certain that unrelated groups have been lumped together under one caste title. It is as certain in other cases that the same people have acquired two or more official caste-names, because their distribution area straddles one or more official, political boundaries with opposing, official machinery on either side. The Bada [Bedaru], Berad [Bedar] and Boya are all differentiated in the Census Reports and gazetteers, as "castes" or "tribes", but they are actually the remnants of a widely spread nation, numbering almost a million and a half souls, if the kindred Ramoshis of the Bombay hills and Vedars of the South are taken into consideration. They are at present politically administered, as