

and violated the railway loan agreement, commonly known as the "working agreement." In order to show what that part of this agreement implies, we reproduce as follows:

The Managing Director shall whenever necessary consult the General Manager with regard to the affairs of the Railway and the Heads of Departments with regard to matters concerning their Departments; and the General Manager shall keep the Managing Director fully posted regarding the working of the Railway, supplying him with duplicate copies, if received by him, of all reports sent in to him: (the General Manager) from all the Stations, shops, or offices excepting such reports as relate purely to the technical working of the several Departments.

The Managing Director, "whenever necessary," shall consult the General Manager, but the dismissal of an employee whose negligence is obvious and borne out by evidences and facts is a matter of routine on which no consultation is necessary. If, whenever an employee is about to be dismissed, the Managing Director has to consult the General Manager, considerable time would be wasted. Furthermore, the dismissal of any employee is the duty and within the powers of the Managing Director as a representative of the Board of Commissioners of which Mr. Clear is a member.

Fourthly, when Mr. Clear asked for an official inquiry by the Board of Commissioners, Mr. Choy refused it. As explained previously, the dismissal of an employee is within the power of the Managing Director, and no review by the Board is necessary. Moreover, the Board consists of Chinese as well as British members. Besides Mr. Choy, the other Chinese Commissioner is Dr. P. H. Loo who, we understand, already gave his consent to the dismissal. If the Chinese members of the Board did not deem it necessary to review the case, the British members alone could not act in a legal manner.

The Daily News, therefore, has dealt upon points which neither establish the "injustice" nor the illegality of Mr. Choy's action. What it should have done is to prove or rather disprove the six charges set forth by him. These particular charges are considered merely as "side issues" by our eminent contemporary, but it is the little side issues that constitute the basis for judging a person's efficiency or negligence. Unfortunately, they bear proof against Mr. Tappenden.

We agree with *The Daily News*, however, that "Mr. Tappenden's case is a test case," though for different reasons. It believes that this case is "only a preliminary to a general attack on the railway's foreign staff." This may be true, or it may be not. It all depends upon the efficiency of the foreign staff. The Ministry of Railways has recently welcomed into its fold two American experts at no small expense, and it can be hardly said that the Ministry is anti-foreign. We do sincerely believe in the recognition of service without regard of nationality, but our foreign friends will agree with us if we advocate the necessity of transferring to trained Chinese a major part of the routine which has heretofore been performed by foreigners. By this we do not mean that foreigners should be dismissed but that they may be employed in more responsible and useful positions, co-operating with but not dominating over their Chinese associates. Recently the Economy Committee of the Shanghai Municipal Council recommended the substitution of Chinese for foreigners in routine work, and certainly no one would accuse the Committee of anti-foreign feeling, consisting as it did of no one but foreigners. A railway line, though owned by the Government, is after all a business enterprise which must be run efficiently in order to realise a profit. All inefficient help must be weeded out, and judging from all evidences at our disposal Mr. Tappenden falls into this category. The Chinese Government may and does welcome foreign assistance, but it cannot be expected to pay foreigners for doing nothing.

Notes on Modern Marriage

By Quentin Pan (潘光旦)

Modern marriage is almost a contradiction. Modernity has little room for the age-old institution called marriage. Else the latter needs to be re-defined before it will get into its surroundings. The ancients such as the Romans defined marriage as "the union of a man and a woman entraining the obligation to live in inseparable communion." The Chinese used to have almost exactly the same notion. This of course has now only an ethnographical interest. Far more acceptable is undoubtedly the definition formulated by Westermarck over thirty years ago; that marriage is "a more or less durable connection between male and female lasting beyond the mere act of propagation till after the birth of the offspring." Yet how many modern marriages will abide by this definition? A glance at the statistics of divorce and of childless marriages wherever obtainable at once gives the answer.

But if modern civilization is to sustain itself, to keep what it has already accumulated, not to say to

grow and to soar greater heights, some system of replenishing human numbers must always find a place in the entire scheme of things. Perchance marriage in one form or another, as defined by Westermarck, may recover its former vogue and prestige, this time divested of its metaphysical or even theocratical incrustations.

A greater biological as well as sociological appreciation of the importance of marriage, however, must be first cultivated before the age-old institution can be properly re-installed in place. While not forgetting to be critical, the writer proposes to discuss the whole problem from such an appreciative standpoint. The discussion, to be fairly comprehensive, will hope to cover the following sub-topics:—(1) What is marriage for? (2) Marriage selection: its criteria and the role of the parents; (3) Consanguineous marriage and interracial marriage; (4) The future of monogamy.

It is quite platitudinous to ask what marriage is for. It is almost like asking what eating and drinking are for. But it is one of the sad truths in human experience that the greatest platitude is often one which is understood least, not to say its being practiced in actual life.

The object or function of marriage is primarily twofold. On the one hand, it satisfies, in a socially acceptable way, one of our major instinctive needs, sex. And on the other, it helps to perpetuate our kind. With the advance of culture and the increase in importance of the individual as such, a new and secondary function gradually asserts itself—one of romantic life and companionship between the sexes. In Western societies, and especially since the rise of romanticism as a life outlook, this function has assumed a magnitude which tends to quite overshadow those of sex and reproduction.

In Oriental countries, notably in China and Japan, owing to the important role played by the parent in the family, yet another function has been evolved and is even in these days of general revolt against authorities much in evidence. Marriage in these countries is contracted partly for the sake of serving the aged parents or, rather, parents-in-law, in the eyes of the married woman. Marriage in the traditional Oriental eye is thus a part and parcel of that system of family ethics known, for want of a better term, filial piety.

In the Far Eastern countries, there has been also the tendency for the functions of reproduction and of filial service to combine into one, that is, to regard the bearing of children as a filial tribute to ancestors, in fact, the most important tribute that one is capable of, according to Mencius and others. The rationale herein involved is easily grasped. The worst thing that can happen to a man after his death is to starve over an empty altar, an altar devoid of sacrificial offerings and bereft of any caretakers who should be his direct descendants. It was for the sake of obviating such spiritual embarrassment on the part of bygone ancestors, according to the after thought of our philosophers, that marriage was once instituted. So viewed, marriage acquires a considerable amount of religious significance, and almost assumes the importance of a sacrament—not to a personal deity as with the Christians, but to one's deceased ancestors who are taken to possess a collective personality.

While there has been a tendency for two of the functions of marriage to coalesce in the East, quite another tendency has manifested itself in Western social life. It is this: that the functions of sexual gratification and of romantic love, when at first hardly separable, become gradually dissociated, and incline to drift farther and farther apart, until we come to a *reductio ad absurdum* in what is known as Platonic love.

In the West again, there has existed for some time already another tendency of dissociation of the functions. It is a dissociation between reproduction and sexual gratification. It is of course the theory and practice of contraception that has made this dissociation possible.

There are thus four major objects or functions of marriage: (1) sexual gratification, (2) reproduction, (3) service to parents, and (4) romantic life and companionship. Out of these four, the Chinese youths of a generation or two ago were, to speak generally, cognizant of only the first three. And even these perhaps did not clearly appear to them as separate items; for (2) and (3) were by force of social heritage more or less united; united would also appear functions (1) and (2), since they were physically contiguous. Thus to them the question of the objects of marriage did not call for particular concern.

The youths of the modern West who are contemplating marriage will also take notice of no more than three out of the four functions. But the three form a different combination, in which the function of romantic life is substituted for service to parents. Thus neither to them is the question "Wherefore is marriage?" especially puzzling.

But to the Chinese youths of the present day who are so fortunate as to have remained immune from a *tedium vitae* resulting from personal maladjustment on the one hand and from lending an ear to false social prophets on the other, and in whose hearts therefore still throbs the normal desire for the company of the opposite sex to be satisfied someday through acceptable social ways, the question "Why marry?" becomes one of utmost seriousness. Standing on the causeway of two converging cultures, they are at once aware of the many separate functions that marriage may assume, and are at a loss to pin properly their attention and emphasis. To them, the functions enumerated above appear not only distinct, but are quite irreconcilable.

About a year ago, while serving as literary editor of one of the Chinese dailies in Shanghai, the writer had the opportunity of sounding, through the questionnaire method, the consensus of opinion of many educated Chinese youths on various questions affecting matrimony, parenthood, and family life in general. Regarding the question "What is marriage for?" the readers of the daily were asked to list in the order of importance the very functions we have been considering. The result, over 300 answers in all, is tabulated as follows:

Function		Order of importance.				Total votes
		I	II	III	IV	
Service to parents	votes by men	61	72	78	68	279
	" " women	12	14	12	7	45
Romantic life and companionship	" " men	86	42	86	58	272
	" " women	15	6	12	12	45
Sexual gratification	" " men	25	71	48	128	272
	" " women	2	9	10	23	44
Bearing and rearing of good children	" " men	100	89	60	23	272
	" " women	15	16	11	8	40

By multiplying the figures under I by 4, those under II by 3, those under III by 2, and those under IV by 1, and adding the products for each function, the general consensus of opinion as to its order of importance may be determined:

Bearing and rearing of good children	943 points	(I)
Romantic life and companionship	814	" (H)
Service to parents	794	" (III)
Sexual gratification	519	" (IV)

If only the votes of women readers are considered, we reach a somewhat different conclusion:

Bearing and rearing of good children	145	points	(I)
Service to parents	121	"	(II)
Romantic life and companionship	114	"	(III)
Sexual gratification	82	"	(IV)

It is interesting to note from the above that whereas the relative positions of the two more primary functions of marriage, reproduction and sexual gratification, are quite secure, those of the two others, romantic life and service to parents, being largely cultural products, are not. They occupy alternately the second and the third places. If we compare the number of points that each of these secondary functions has been accorded, it will be seen that the two are really competing for the second place at close range. When the votes of both sexes are considered, the function of romantic life appears better off only by 20 points. When only those by women are considered, the function of filial service appears better off by 7 points,—a difference equally negligible. This is to be expected. As has already been intimated, we are to-day, like Hercules, facing a crossroad. The newer points of view beckon us from one direction, while the older ones are yet powerful enough to attract us from another; and many of us are unable to reach a decision.

But we have not yet reached the end of our analysis. The writer had suspected before he drew up the questionnaire that romantic life and companionship between the sexes as a function of marriage must by far outweigh the rest of the functions, if the trends of social life as might be gleaned from news events and personal discussions were to be at all trusted. But the suspicion apparently did not come true; the function in question, according to the general estimate, only occupies the third or, at best, the second place.

But it will easily occur to the reader, as it did to the writer, that the individuals who answered the questionnaire cannot belong to a single type. They certainly differ in age, and also in educational attainment, and as a consequence, they must also differ in social outlook, which is a product of age plus educational attainment. To put it differently, while all are susceptible to Western ideas and standards, and while all are retentive of traditional Chinese ideas and standards, the degree of susceptibility on the one hand and of retentiveness on the other cannot be the same for all. Further, it will also occur to the reader that since modern Chinese education and scholarship consist largely of borrowed wisdom from the West, the degree of an individual's educational attainment will correspond fairly closely with that of his being Westernized in outlook and practice.

Granting all this, we may push our analysis further by correlating the different degrees of educational attainment of the answers to the questionnaire with their individual opinions as to the comparative importance of romantic life and companionship as a function of marriage, and then see if the latter still retains the second or third place throughout. Of the degrees of

educational attainment, three are here recognized, namely, completion of grammar school education, of secondary education, of college education, and their equivalents:

Educational attainment	Romantic life: order of importance	No. of voters	% of voters	No. of points
Grammar School	I	0	0.0	167
	II	2	8.7	
	III	12	50.0	
	IV	10	41.3	
Secondary Education	I	41	26.1	239
	II	24	15.3	
	III	47	29.9	
	IV	45	28.7	
College Education	I	56	47.9	307
	II	23	19.7	
	III	28	33.9	
	IV	10	8.5	
Points not correlated for lack of data				101
Total points				814

It is at once seen that, speaking generally, the higher is a man's educational attainment, greater importance does he attach to romantic life and companionship as a function of marriage. In fact, with those who were college bred or are just going through college, this function actually assumes the position of first importance; whereas those who received only grammar education, not a single individual accords it the first place. Those who have gone, or are going through middle school, come rightly in between. There is evidently a great deal of wavering and uncertainty in their judgment as to what place this particular function of marriage justly deserves; for, being in the midway of their education, which largely means being converted to Western ideas and standards, they are the very people whom the force of the old as well as that of the new pull with almost equal tension.

But our discussion so far has only touched upon the natural drift of things. Western ideas and standards including those relative to marriage have indeed come in like tides and people are simply wafted in them. Many progressive thinkers of the day have endeavoured to show that a whole-hearted acceptance of them will be profitable. Perhaps they are right. But upon closer examination, the position of these thinkers is really one of rationalization, it is the reverse of the one represented by the sour-grape fable, it is like saying "Since we have to eat it no matter how unpalatable, let's say it is sweet." And many there are who think it is sweet.

Many modern Chinese youths, thanks to a thorough Western education and to the progressive thinkers, are in such a predicament regarding their marriage question. They maintain, in spite of themselves, that love, which really belongs to the category of unknowns and unknowables, individual happiness, romantic companionship including what is extolled as post-nuptial courtship

and chivalry, must be at the very basis of a true and enduring marriage. For love and individual happiness in marriage they are willing to sacrifice anything else for which the institution is also intended.

Under the spell of individualism and the pleasure philosophy, they even forget to reason that had their parents come under the influence of the same philosophy and had had the mean to live it out, the world would have waited in vain to be graced by their presence as a new generation and to see the same philosophy held in turn by them.

Thus, even a little reflection upon man as a social and biological being will bring us to realize that no matter how highly we may value our cultural idiosyncrasies, the primary functions of marriage are best left to keep their primary places. While the average man may not be powerful enough to extricate himself from the grip of circumstances, and may have to order his life under their dictates, enlightened people do now see that conscious control of social processess is a feasibility. They are the people who have to come realize that under whatever cultural conditions the bearing and rearing of healthy and intelligent children will remain, and will be made to remain, the first important function of marriage. Men must leave enough progeny to keep their cultural idiosyncrasies alive, respected, and appreciated, if not for anything else. There is really little need for the biologist and eugenicist to raise the alarm that human racial heritage is at stake, if this much is understood.

In summing up, let it be re-iterated that of the four objects or functions of marriage, the bearing and rearing of sound and sane children deserves the strongest emphasis, if our social and cultural life is to sustain itself and to grow. In the above paragraphs nothing has been said as to the ultimate place that the function of filial service should take. But those who agree with the writer's point of view as expressed in Familism and the Optimum Family (THE CHINA CRITIC, Vol. I, No. 20) will see that a place of preference must be accorded to it, inspite of the current general attitude to the contrary; not because it is a heritage peculiar to the Far Eastern peoples, but because of its great social and ethical value, when not overdone. The other two functions, romantic life and the gratification of sexual desire appear to the writer, or to anybody who knows something about biology and physiology, to be two stages, of a single function. Romance that does not culminate in sexual gratification is debilitating, and sexual gratification unattended to by any romantic touch is morbid.

If man lives by mere instincts, there is little room for problems of the kind that we have been discussing. The same will be true if he lives by intelligent guidance. But as a matter of fact, he lives largely by false intelligence, and no more false intelligence is to be found elsewhere than in the fields of marriage and politics, and no greater hotbed of such false intelligence is to be found than modern education. "Wherefore is marriage?" is a platitudinous question only to those who are little stuffed with false intelligence on the subject.

National Scheme of Railway Construction

(Continued from the last issue)

By Sun Fo (孫科)

A. DESCRIPTION OF PROJECTED LINES

GROUP	LINE	CHARACTER	TERRITORY	LENGTH MILES	ESTIMATED COST OF CONSTRUCTION
I.	Canton-Hankow (Chuchow-Shiuchow section).	Previously projected	Hunan		
	Lung Hai, (Tungkwan Lan chow Section).	do	Kwangtung	270	\$65,000,000
	Shihchiachuang - Tsangchow	do	Shensi Kansu		
	Nanking-Changsha	do	Hopel	657	78,650,000
II.	Nanking-Canton	Projected with the 2 following lines as alternative	Kiangsu Anhui	138	11,928,830
			Kiangsi Hunan	6145	90,992,340
			Kiangsu Anhui		
	Shiuchow-Nanchang		Chekiang Fukien		
	Foochow-Nanchang		Kwangtung	1212	165,525,000 (1)
	Canton-Yunnan		Kwangtung Kwangsi	503	68,060,000 (2)
		Projected with Changsha-Yunnan lines as alternative	Fukien Kiangsi	523	75,230,000 (3)
	Changsha-Yunnan		Kwangtung		
			Kweichow Yunnan	13125	167,640,000 (4)
			Hunan Kweichow		
III.	Paotou-Ningshia	Previously projected	Yunnan	1100	153,213,000
	Chengtzu-Chungking	do	Suiyuan Kansu	344	43,414,640
	Taekow-Tsinan	do	Szechuen	324	44,722,900
			Shantung		
	Tatung-Puchow	do	Hopel Honan	182	13,428,243
IV.	Paoching-Chinchow	Projected together with Changsha-Yunnan Line to be alternative to Canton-Yunnan	Shensi	510	83,544,674
			Hunan Kwangsi	750	104,000,000 (5)
			Kwangtung		

1. Based on the Southeastern System of Dr. Sun, (11) the Nanking-Kiating Line.

2. Based on the above System, (10) the Nanking-Shiuchow Line, South Division.

3. Based on the above System, (4) the Foochow-Wuchang Line, East Division.

4. Based on the Southwestern System of Dr. Sun, (5) the Canton-Yunnan-Tali-Tengyueh Line.

5. This is another form of Chuchow-Chinchow Line, the north end of which connects with Pao Chin.