

The

# Servant of India

Editor: S. G. VAZE.

Office: SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY, POONA 4.

VOL. XXI, No. 2.

POONA—THURSDAY, JANUARY 13, 1938.

INDIAN SUBSN. Rs. 6.  
FOREIGN 15s.

## CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK ...	13
ARTICLES :	
Lord Lothian's Mission. ...	16
Central Problem of Indian Economy. ...	18
The Doctrine of Non-Violence. ...	20
SHORT NOTICES ...	23
BOOKS RECEIVED ...	24

## Topics of the Week.

### Federation Not Wanted.

BOMBAY has the honour of being the first province to inform the British Government in a most solemn manner that the all-India federation embodied in the Government of India Act is not acceptable to the people of the province and that the Government should desist from imposing it by force. The actual terms of the resolution are as follows :

The Assembly is of the opinion that the Federation proposed under the Government of India Act, 1935, is opposed to the declared will of the people of the province and is, therefore, unacceptable. This Assembly, therefore, requests Government to intimate to the British Government not to impose it on the provinces.

The Opposition naturally did not miss the opportunity of twitting Mr. Kher with defeating by Congress votes at the last session of the Assembly Mr. Parulekar's amendment to the constituent assembly motion which was to the same effect. Mr. Kher was very greatly embarrassed by his indiscreet action on the previous occasion, but apart from such exchange of courtesies inevitable to Parliamentary practice the resolution met with unanimous support of all parties with the single exception of the Progress Party consisting mostly of European members. The Muslim League's support was as vigorous as of any other party and was most valuable.

IN the debate the union of autocracy and democracy and the power of the States to block all amendments of the constitution were greatly emphasised. "Why not try this federation, bad as it is, since federation, of some sort is desired by all?" asked Mr. Saklatwala. He received a very effective answer: "No experiment is possible with federation. If found unsuitable, it cannot be ended. Nor can it be mended, for no amendments can be made in it without the joint agreement of the British Parliament on one side and every single federating State on the other," and the plea for a trial of this fantastic federation was laughed out of court. Mr. Saklatwala made a statement in his speech to

the effect that the Liberal Party had accepted federation. The statement is without the least warranty and was given a prompt denial. The Muslim League's support to the resolution ensures that not the seven Congress provinces, but the other four Muslim provinces as well, that is, all the eleven provinces of British India will stand out against federation and will formally communicate this fact to the British Government, and if federation is still brought into operation it will be clear that British India is being coerced. In which case the British Government cannot plead that it had not been duly warned before of the disastrous consequences that are sure to follow in the wake of such naked coercion.

### Responsible Government in Cochin.

HIS Highness the Maharaja of Cochin announced, on the occasion of the Durbar held in honour of his birthday (he entered on his 77th year on 30th December), a large and, in the history of the Indian States an epochal, measure of reforms. The Maharaja has shown great zeal for constitutional development during less than six years that have passed since the commencement of his rule. At the time he assumed the reins of power, he declared :

To enable a larger number of my subjects to be associated with my Government in the solution of these and other problems it is my intention to extend the franchise for the Legislative Council by lowering the qualification at present required for a voter. I also intend to increase the privileges and the responsibilities of the Legislative Council itself by conferring on it the right to elect its own Deputy President and by extending to all members of the Council the right to put supplementary questions on an original question put by any member. It is my firm belief that by these measures the usefulness of the Council will be increased in proportion to the added privileges and responsibilities conferred upon it.

And he has been as good as his word. The franchise of the Legislative Council has been so broadened that, as we stated in our issue of 9th December last, the number of voters will now be roughly thrice as large as before. Standing Advisory Committees of the Legislative Council were constituted in 1934 in connection with the nation-building departments of the State in order that non-official members may obtain an inner knowledge of the details of government and may be enabled to give help and guidance to the officials.

THE next step, of course, was to throw upon the elected members direct responsibility for at least part of the administration, and this is the announcement that the Maharaja has been graciously pleased to make. The Legislative Council consists of two-thirds elected members; these members are not sparing of criticism of the Government, and on occasions have shown themselves to be

very troublesome. Hardly a budget session passes without these members carrying from ten to fifteen token cut motions. Whenever a contentious Bill is brought forward, the member in charge has to be on his feet a good long time to explain Government's attitude and to conciliate opposition. The elected members wield no power, but, could exercise much influence in moulding Government's policy. What is more, Government welcomed their criticism, which is shown by the reason the Maharaja gives for introducing an element of responsibility in the government. He says—and it is a measure of his large-heartedness :

Having been impressed by the genuine interest evinced by the members of the Legislative Council, I have decided that steps should be taken to associate my people directly with the administration of my Government and make the Legislative Council responsible in a more effective manner for the administration of certain nation-building departments.

The departments that he has selected for making over to the control of the Legislative Council are: Public Health, Panchayats, Co-operative, Agriculture, Ayurveda and Uplift of the Depressed Classes. They will be in charge of a Minister for Rural Development, selected from among the elected members of the Legislative Council and responsible wholly to it, subject only to the Maharaja's prerogative of overriding the Ministry. We have not much fear that this power will be normally exercised and feel certain that the new Minister will have full scope within the sphere allotted to him.

OVER what part of the field of government may the electors through the Legislative Council now be said to have obtained control? The question perhaps will be best answered by giving the amount of money that is spent over transferred departments. In the current year's budget of Rs. 98,77,200 ordinary expenditure, the appropriations for the departments proposed to be handed over to the Minister are: Public Health Rs. 1,46,100; Village Panchayats Rs. 2,14,200; Co-operative Rs. 21,800; Agriculture Rs. 1,60,000; Ayurveda Rs. 18,000 and Uplift of the Depressed Classes Rs. 67,800; or Rs. 6,27,900 in all. It may be said, therefore, that an anna in a rupee of expenditure comes under the entire control of the Minister so long as he can retain the confidence of the Legislature. We cannot pretend that this is a large proportion, and particularly because these are all spending departments, the receipts budgeted on their account being only 10 per cent. of the expenditure, the Minister will be unable to leave his mark on the administration of these departments unless he has a say, and a big say, in the administration of the earning departments as well. But anyhow this is a big step forward; and the people of Cochin must be congratulated upon, and the Maharaja heartily applauded for, the beginning thus made in an Indian State in popular government. We wish this pioneer measure all success.

#### Communistic Propaganda.

It is commonly assumed that communistic propaganda must be suppressed inasmuch as the communists not only do not abjure violence but openly proclaim that the attainment of reconstruction of society such as they desire cannot come unless ultimately violence is resorted to. Such suppression did not evoke much sympathy as long as the bureaucracy was in control, if only because it gave us an added grievance with which to carry on an agitation against it. But because a party has come into power which wishes to show its special devotion to non-violence, there is a danger of the party following the same

ruthless measures of suppression as the bureaucracy. However, what was wrong in the bureaucracy cannot be right in the Congress, and the Congress must give freedom of speech and of association to communists as to others. In order to emphasize this, non-communist leaders like Messrs. N. C. Kelkar, N. M. Joshi and S. A. Brelvi issued a statement recently urging Congress Governments to remove the existing ban on the Communist Party.

WE have no sympathy with communism, but just because we are opposed to it we deem it our duty, in the interest of civil liberty to which we are deeply attached, to appeal to the Congress Governments as we did to the old bureaucratic Government to give the protection of the State to the teaching of communism. The way to combat communism is to carry on a counter-propaganda, and, what is more, to apply promptly effective remedies to the economic evils created by rapacious capital. The Congress is in a position to do this in some measure, and it can count on the support of all in its endeavours. To the extent that it succeeds communists will have no opportunity of arraying class against class and of plotting to destroy the structure of government. But till this happens free scope must be given to communistic propaganda so long as no violence is committed.

THIS is no extravagant doctrine; we do not stretch individual liberty too far when we ask for a recognition of this right. Professor Laski says in *A Grammar of Politics* :

The view I am concerned to urge is that from the standpoint of the State the citizen must be left unfettered to express, either individually or in concert with others, any opinions he happens to hold. He may preach the complete inadequacy of the social order. He may demand its overthrow by armed revolution. He may insist that the political system is the apotheosis of perfection. He may argue that all opinions which differ from his own ought to be subject to the severest suppression. He may himself as an individual urge these views or join with others in their announcement. Whatever the form taken by their expression, he is entitled to speak without hindrance of any kind. . . . To be able to do any or all of these things, with the full protection of the State in so doing, is a right that lies at the basis of freedom.

For consider the alternatives. All criticism of social institutions is a matter of degree. If I prohibit X from preaching violent revolution, I shall ultimately prohibit X from suggesting that the given social order is not of divine origin. If I begin by assuming that Russian communism is politically obnoxious, I shall end by assuming that language-classes to teach English to Russians are a form of communist propaganda. There is never sufficient certitude in social matters to make it desirable for any government to denounce it in the name of the State. . . .

It is no answer to this view to urge that it is the coronation of disorder. If views which imply violence have a sufficient hold upon the State to disturb its foundations, there is something radically wrong with the habits of that State. Men cling so persistently to their accustomed ways that the departure from them implied in violence is almost always evidence of deep-seated disease. For the common man has no interest in disorder; where he either embraces it, as in Revolutionary Russia, or is indifferent to its occurrence, as in Sinn Fein Ireland, it is because the Government of the State has lost its hold upon its affections; and no government loses the affection of its subjects save from a moral cause. The degree, in fact, to which a State permits criticism of its authority is the surest index to its hold upon the allegiance of the community. Almost always—there are rare cases in which persecution has proved successful—the result of free expression is such a

mitigation of the condition attacked as to justify its use; almost always, also, to prohibit free speech is to drive the agitation underground. . . . Legally to prevent men from associating as communists does not prevent them from so associating; it serves only to make the forms of communist activity more difficult to discover.

This is precisely what is happening at present.

\* \* \*

THE danger to freedom of speech from the Congress Government is, to judge from the speeches of their spokesmen, very real. Many of them are found to say: "Those who are wedded to non-violence have nothing to fear from the Congress Governments." We know, of course, that non-violence is meant here in a very restricted sense, for the Governments themselves declare that they will never shrink from putting down violence by violence. All they mean is that aggressive violence will never be their policy—which is very different from Mahatma Gandhi's creed of non-violence as we understand it. But even those who believe in violence as an ultimate solution have a claim upon the Congress Governments. No one asks for protection of overt acts of violence; but preaching of doctrines which have violence implicit in them must be tolerated so long as no violent act is immediately intended or committed.

#### Civil Liberty.

THE Congress Working Committee at its meeting in Bombay gave general approbation to the action taken by the Congress Ministries in restricting civil liberty. This is only to be expected, as no one supposes that the Congress would desire its Ministries, so soon after coming into office, to quit it, as they would have had to, if the Working Committee had in its resolution even impliedly censured them. But anyone can see that, judged strictly by the formula it has laid down for a possible application of coercion by the Governments, they have done something which they had no authority to do. The Committee's resolution on this subject says:

Congress Ministries must abide themselves by the principle of civil liberty and the democratic approach by means of persuasion rather than by coercive action. But, in spite of every desire to avoid it, coercive action may become necessary, and in such cases Ministries will inevitably have to undertake it. Such coercive action should only be undertaken where there has been violence or incitement to violence or communal strife.

\* \* \*

To this principle no objection can be taken, for in cases in which men are charged with having committed violence or incitement to violence they have a remedy in a court of law. If they are really guilty they deserve to be punished, and if they are innocent they have an opportunity of proving their innocence. But what of the coercive action taken by the Ministries, not in the way of punishment but of prevention of crimes? In such cases the aggrieved party has no remedy. The resolution apparently disapproves of such preventive action, but several Ministries have taken and have been taking such action. Is it to be understood that the resolution of the Working Committee deprives the Ministries in future of all discretionary authority such as Section 144 of the Criminal Procedure Code vests in them, not to speak of the Criminal Law Amendment Act? A Minister feels that there is a danger to public peace from a certain meeting and he prohibits it in his own executive authority. Will this no longer be possible for a Congress Minister? The ethics of the matter is thus set out by Professor Laski:

To prohibit a meeting on the ground that the peace may be disturbed is, in fact, to enthrone intimidation in the seat of power. . . . No government ought, in its purely

executive aspect, to be the sole judge of whether its action is right. It ought always to be compelled to the submission of proof; and it ought always to be compelled to the submission of proof under the fullest judicial safeguards. There is no more reason to suppose that the judgment of an executive will, in this aspect of the issue, be right than there is to suppose rightness in the judgment of any body of thoughtful citizens. The test ought to be the ability of the executive to convince a court of law that there is the imminent danger of unlawful acts in the continued existence of the association.

\* \* \*

THOUGH the Working Committee's resolution lends itself to the interpretation that the Ministries will hereafter be divested of all discretionary authority, we do not think that the Working Committee really means it; and in any case we do not think that it will be so interpreted in practice. But even if preventive action is allowed, we wish to record our opinion that Mr. Munshi's preventive action was wholly unjustified; not only were the crimes complained of not proved, but they were unprovable.

#### Kisan Agitation in Bihar.

THE Working Committee of the Congress had also before it the question of the practical excommunication pronounced on the kisan workers in Bihar by the Provincial Congress Committee. It is stated that Babu Rajendra Prasad laid before the Committee a mass of evidence to prove that the workers were propagating violence among the kisans and generally creating an atmosphere in which relations between landlords and tenants were being poisoned. We have no knowledge of what is actually happening in that province and are not in a position either to endorse or to challenge the P.C.C.'s action. But it appears at least possible that, in view of the Congress-landlord agreement, the Committee may be anxious to prevent the landlords being harassed by any agitation, even if lawful. And the statement issued by Babu Awadheshwar Prasad Sinha, Secretary, Bihar Provincial Kisan Sabha, is at least frank on the matter. He says in effect that the Kisan Sabha is no more tender to violence than the Congress Committee and that if there are any workers in the former who incite to violence the two bodies should together weed them out. As the Congress likes its committees to take disciplinary action against Congressmen promoting violence, so should the Kisan Sabha be left to take disciplinary action against kisan workers promoting violence, and the P.C.C. might help in bringing concrete cases to its notice. Mr. Sinha says:

As regards the questions of creating an atmosphere of violence by Congressmen working in the Kisan Sabha the Kisan Council has repeatedly declared its preparedness to properly deal with those workers who might ever indulge in inciting violence. We have repeatedly requested the Provincial Congress Committee to bring to our notice any such activities of workers but no specific charge has been brought so far. I would like to declare once again that we would very readily co-operate with the Congress authority in purging undesirable workers out of the Kisan Sabhas. However, it is obvious that even if we are eager to do our best in this connection, we can only deal with concrete facts and not with prejudices or charges brought out with deep-rooted partisan spirit.

Here too the same question arises: Is the P.C.C. to be vested with discretionary powers or is it to be required to adduce evidence of guilt before it is allowed to inflict punishment. One thing at least the Kisan Sabha has gained; the Working Committee has admitted the right of kisans who are members of the Congress to organise their separate institutions, notwithstanding the Harijan's opinion to the contrary.

## LORD LOTHIAN'S MISSION.

IT is widely believed in India that Lord Lothian has come out to this country on a semi-official mission with the object of taking soundings of public opinion in British India on the question of federation and of laying a report on his first-hand impressions before the Imperial Government. We do not know whether this belief is well-grounded or not. But even though the British Government had no hand in deputationing him here, it may well be that he will deem it desirable to communicate the conclusions of his private inquiry on the attitudes of the different schools of thought in British India towards the impending federation to the members of the Cabinet, and the latter too may take sufficient interest in what he has to tell them to listen to him with some concern. If this is so it will be a source of relief to British Indians, for it will imply that the British Government attaches some weight to the feelings of the people on this all-important question; and that there is still a possibility of the Government crying a halt to federation if it is discovered that really and truly the bulk of opinion in British India is opposed to, and alarmed by, the federal scheme embodied in the Government of India Act. If the British Government does not say to itself: "British India has been consulted often enough before; its consent is in no case necessary in law, and even if British India be opposed to federation, we as the Government entitled to take decisions in its behalf are determined to have the necessary proclamation issued as soon as the requisite number of Indian States have signified their consent; British India comes no longer into the picture;" if the British Government does not say this, but is willing to take a note even at this late hour of what British Indians as a body think about federation, then there is yet some hope that the inauguration of federation may at least be delayed.

It may be that, in the British Government's judgment, public opinion as it expresses itself in the press and on the platform is largely factitious and artificial. If so, let it take what measures it deems best to gauge public opinion as it really is. We shall have no quarrel with the method that may be adopted; we shall be satisfied in whatever manner an inquiry is conducted, formal or informal, open or secret. We would only urge that an inquiry of some sort be held, and the Government find out for itself whether British India, in its inner most mind, is willing to give that ready co-operation which is essential if the federation is at all to succeed. All we would premise is that if the Government, after applying whatever criterion it may choose, is satisfied that British India is genuinely opposed to federation, it should be prepared to reconsider the whole situation. If it finds that British India's objection is fundamental, its reconsideration will have to take the form of a wholesale scrapping of the scheme of all-India federation and the substitution for it perhaps of a federation of provinces, as has been proposed. If, on the other hand, it finds that British India is labouring under a misconception as to some leading features of the scheme, it will have

in any case to postpone giving effect to the scheme till British India by an educative propaganda is brought to reconcile itself to it. The decision on the question whether British India favours the scheme or not may be left to the British Government, but it should be remembered in this connection that the question here is not whether the scheme is in itself good or bad—on that the Government has made up its mind and cannot be expected to modify its view—but whether, rightly or wrongly, British India, including all communities and all interests, has formed a wholly unfavourable opinion on it, so wholly unfavourable that it would be unwise in the extreme, from the purely political point of view, to thrust an unendable and unmendable constitution on it.

If such a review be contemplated, there are one or two considerations we should like to urge. A Round Table Conference, however representative it may be, formed *ad hoc* for the purpose, without any preparation of the public mind therefor is not the right kind of body to frame a federal constitution. Such a complete reconstruction of India's polity as an all-India federation implies must be discussed and debated threadbare by the public at large before a select group can justifiably seek to give definitive shape to it. In this particular case even the select group assembled in the Round Table Conference had no previous notice of a project for an all-India federation. A surprise was sprung on it, and the consideration that could be given to the project was necessarily meagre. Only those who had come to the Conference with a determination to get the scheme accepted had any ideas on the subject. Others were stampeded into accepting the scheme with all its imperfections, which at the time could hardly be understood in their full measure. To give an instance. Is it possible as a practical proposition that a British India looking towards democracy can have its fortunes linked inextricably in a federation with autocratically governed States, States which it would not be within the power of the federation to make democratic at any time in future? A question like this would be the first to be considered at any gathering which would approach the problem of federation in a dispassionate and comprehensive manner. But no one either in the formal meetings of the Round Table Conference or in private discussions as much as hinted at it. They had not yet overcome the shock of surprise which the raising of the problem of federation had given them to debate the question even with themselves. What is the result? Some seven years have passed, and so responsible a politician as Premier C. Rajagopalachariar raises this fundamental question now and roundly declares that unless the States democratise themselves British India will not federate with them. We do not ask the reader to agree with Mr. Rajagopalachariar's view; it is not necessary for our immediate purpose. What we wish to point out is that the Round Table Conference did not seriously consider the question and then arrive at the conclusion that a democracy and an autocracy

could well come into a federal union. They simply suppressed the question, but a question like this which goes to the root of things cannot be suppressed for long. It is sure to dawn on the consciousness of the public some time or other; and what should have been anxiously considered in the beginning has been brought up now when the Act is passed and is about to be put in force!

Take another question. If autocratic States are to be admitted to the federation, should they not be made to conform to democratic usages at least in so far as federation is concerned, e. g., the States' representatives in the federal legislature should be elected the same as British India's representatives? This surely is a vital question. Did the Round Table Conference consider it? One may go through the discussions of the Federal Structure Committee from end to end without coming upon even a bare mention of this question. The great men who took part in the Committee were either wholly oblivious of it themselves, in which case it is the clearest proof of their incompetence, or they thought they could easily win acceptance of their solution of the problem by the country, in which case it is a proof of their inordinate vanity and overweening confidence in their own powers. One might at least have thought of a provision making election of their representatives obligatory after a brief period of grace. No, the Round Tablers dismissed the question as if it was altogether irrelevant. The same thing happened about the diversified jurisdiction to be allowed normally to the provinces and the States in the federal legislature. This is a novel procedure in any federation. Did the Round Table gentlemen give any serious thought to it and decide that, in view of the peculiar circumstances of India, this should be allowable in our federation though it had been disallowed in every other? Again, they did not consider the matter at all. Did they consider whether they should or should not make a stand for the inclusion of criminal law as a federal subject for the States, in view of the fact that Canada had taken special pains at Confederation to rectify the mistake which the first federation in the world, viz. that of U.S.A., had made in making criminal law a State subject? Again, the whole question was just side-tracked. Here, too, we do not on this occasion plead for inclusion of criminal law or labour legislation in the federal list; our purpose is merely to bring to the notice of the reader that the question was entirely neglected. It would have been some consolation if the matter were considered and wrongly decided; but that it went by default is wholly inexcusable.

Finally, we would bring up the question of the States' *liberum veto* on constitutional amendment. Could anything be more grievous than that the future constitutional growth of British India be placed at the mercy of the Indian States? But even on this question there was not even a word of discussion either at the meetings of the various Committees or the plenary sessions of the Round Table Conference. One might say at this distance that such veto power was implicit in the demand the Princes were making

from the beginning; and anyone with half an eye could have seen it right from the commencement of the Round Table Conference. But the fact remains that the Round Tablers did not see it. Those who were bent upon a federation and had laid plots for it beforehand knew it all, but the others were blinded. They spoke a great deal about dominion status, not being specifically mentioned in the Act and spoke eloquently about it. It was familiar ground, but federation was a subject with which they were not completely at home, and they allowed such an important matter as a compact theory of federation go forward without the slightest consideration. In all this, of course, the British Government is not to blame for the decisions arrived at. The blame lies, wholly and completely, at the doors of the British Indian politicians who took part in the Round Table Conference. The British Government's fault was that it adopted a method for fashioning a constitution which was wrong particularly when a rigid and perpetual federation was the problem to be considered. The public mind must first be seized of such a problem; leaders of thought should educate the public mind about it; and when the people as a whole are known to favour federation in its broad aspects, then constitutional experts may get together and give it a practical shape. But if, without such preparation of the public mind, a few superior brains concoct something, however fine the product may be, the inevitable result is that the public comes along at the last stage and upsets it all. The defect in this procedure is that the lay public cannot be kept out of the show for all time.

What was the mentality of the few knowing politicians at the Round Table Conference? They were resolved upon a federation. To adopt a Biblical phrase, they were determined to prepare the way for it, make straight its paths, fill every valley, bring every hill and mountain low, and make the rough ways plain. We should have had no objection to their doing so if they had frankly stated possible objections, explained their own point of view and convinced the people that it was the right view. But they decided to rush the few men, hand-picked by the British Government, who were members of the Round Table Conference into accepting the scheme without giving them time to think about it, and if perchance any should show an independent mind about a matter or two, they decided to follow a hush-hush policy with regard to them. Several British politicians have complained that Indian objections are growing wider and wider every day. This is the inevitable result of the Round Table Conference method as it was followed. It is only now that the public is realising the implications of the scheme, and the objections which should have been stated plainly at the beginning and answered if possible are now finding expression in discussions by the common people. The Britishers have a legitimate grievance in this matter. They can say to the Round Tablers: "You appeared agreeable to all the features of the scheme which to your own people now seem obnoxious: admission of the Princes into federation with their autocracy; the



right given to the Princes, without any limit of time, to nominate their representatives; variation of the States' federal subjects from the provinces; exclusion of the States' criminal law from even the standard federal list; the Princes' power of veto over constitutional amendments. You did not raise objection to any of these at the Round Table; you did not even indicate that objection might possibly be taken to these features on your side. You gave us to understand that, however much the people might be opposed on the other scores, on these we should hear of no opposition. But what do we now find? In current discussions greater stress is laid upon these features which you assured us were not only unobjectionable but incapable of being objected to, than to other features to which you too objected. And are you doing anything to win over opposition? You have retired into your tents and do not stir out at all. No propaganda of any kind on your part. Of course we now know that your influence is very limited, but you might make a little effort. However, you are motionless; you do nothing to counteract the anti-federation agitation and, what is worse, some of you quietly support the agitation. For instance, Sir Chimanlal Setalvad now takes objection, after the Act is passed, to the *liberum veto* of the Princes. We think he had opportunities before of making known his views. Does he expect us now, at this time of day, to remove this defect, which could only be done by setting aside the whole Act? He joins with others in throwing on us the odium of imposing on the country a constitu-

tion to which it objects, but would do nothing to tell the people why he approved originally of the features to which he now deems fit to offer opposition. The Round Tablers have betrayed us—the whole lot of them who gave an easy acceptance to the scheme at the Conference."

Such a complaint would be just. But the fundamental fault of the British Government consisted in the supposition that a few selected men could hatch a constitution without letting the people at large have any share in the process, and then get the constitution accepted by the country. If the Government has now come, or is likely soon to come, to the stage at which it will consider alternatives to imposing a stoutly opposed constitution by *force majeure*, then we would urge it to consider not only the objections to which voice is given in newspapers and in public meetings most insistently, but also to those which the man in the street takes. For unless the man in the street is somehow reconciled to the constitution, it will not work, however loud some of the politicians may be in saying: "Let us resign ourselves to our fate." For this is the utmost that even apologists for it can say. The common people have a knack of having their own way in the end, though they may seem utterly powerless at the moment. Their view must be taken into consideration where the question is one of bringing into existence a federation of the most extraordinary inflexibility and of a perpetual lease of life. If they are ignored, things will happen that will happen.

## CENTRAL PROBLEM OF INDIAN ECONOMY.

PROF. P. J. THOMAS of the Madras University, who presided over the 21st session of the Indian Economic Conference recently held at Hyderabad (Dn.), fittingly described the poverty of the Indian masses as the central problem of Indian economy. Unlike the usual run of criticism on this subject, Prof. Thomas does not believe in either excessive population or foreign rule as an explanation of Indian poverty. Inefficient production and inequitable distribution appear to him to be the root causes of the very low standard of life prevalent among the Indian masses. Neither in agriculture nor in industry has science been yet harnessed to the service of man. Hence the emphasis on inefficient production was well deserved.

It appears to Prof. Thomas that the state and the middleman in India levy far too big a toll on the produce of the land and hence he favours a scheme of controlled credit and marketing, accompanied by an extensive expenditure out of public funds on the beneficent services. A greater extension of irrigational facilities, adoption of better farming methods and a resort to systematic cattle breeding are also mentioned as means for the economic betterment of the farmer. On the subject of subsidiary occupations for the villager Prof. Thomas appears to be more optimistic than many of his colleagues. A decentralisation of industry and an intensive development of cottage occupations are prescribed by Mr. Thomas.

One wonders whether the time has not come when some protagonist of these village industries should give us more details about particular industries so that one may judge of their economic merits.

The economists were received, as it would appear from reports, with great cordiality by the Government of His Highness the Nizam. We hope the Indian economists felt somewhat compensated for the most undeserved and rude telling off that they recently received from the very self-assured Finance Member of the Government of India. His Exalted Highness had sent an encouraging message, in which he spoke of the value of concerted research in the problems of Indian economy, and even permitted himself to hope that at no distant future India will come in line with the most advanced countries of the world. The speech of Sir Akbar Hydari, Chancellor of the Osmania University under whose auspices the Conference was held, was naturally more detailed. Sir Akbar's insistence on the continuity of the traditions of Indian culture prevalent in the Indian States may be passed over as an irrelevant, though by no means justifiable, obsession. We cannot, however, allow to pass without comment Sir Akbar's advice to British India to follow the so-called departmentalisation of finance initiated by him in Hyderabad.

The simple fact appears to be that since Sir Akbar came to guide the finances of Hyderabad, grants allotted to the various departments of state are

fixed for a triennial instead of an annual period. The result naturally is that the tendency towards wasteful expenditure during the closing months of the financial year is postponed to the end of the third year. Where no democratic legislature claims the right to control year after year, and even day after day, the raising and spending of public funds such a procedure perhaps possesses some administrative merit. But a long settlement of public expenditure is clearly inconsistent with the elastic revenue system of a British India province and with the constitutional claim of the legislature to vary the scheme of expenditure in correspondence with the prevailing opinion of its members. In fact, the Hyderabad scheme is no more than a rough device rendered possible by a comparatively backward economic and political structure of society.

The trade cycle is a very topical subject just now inasmuch as before we are out of the depression caused by one cycle the economic prophets are already prophesying another 'recession'. The theory on this subject formed the topic of discussion at one of the sittings of the Conference. Where so many 'pundits' had gathered it was natural that all shades of opinion should find expression. But the most widely supported theory was that which finds in an unregulated money and credit system the chief cause of the trade cycle. The use of the interest rate to maintain a perpetual condition of mild boom and the direct control of incomes and consumption so as to prevent serious maladjustment in the economic system are now being preached by a large number of 'respectable' economists in America and Europe. It was inevitable that the Indian economists should also be influenced by the new currents. Though the technique of handling the cyclical movements must be governed by peculiar conditions prevalent in India, the need for an active trade-cycle policy is as pressing here as in other countries. The Government of India are, however, suffering from a self-imposed taboo against 'monkeying' with anything except perhaps monkeying with itself. It is none the less important to notice that almost to a man the Indian economists stand for an active policy to deal with the recurring phenomenon of the trade cycle.

Another topic influencing the prospects of a planned economic system in India is the position of the indigenous banker *vis-a-vis* the Reserve Bank. There was a very wholesome recognition at the Conference of the truth that it is as important for the purposes of the Reserve Bank as for that of the indigenous bankers that the two should come in closer contact with one another. The need for audited accounts and published balance sheets as also for limiting, and eventually terminating, non-banking business is now widely recognized, even by the more enlightened among the indigenous bankers themselves. As Hyderabad is an important centre of indigenous banking it is to be hoped that the formal and the informal discussions on this subject held at the Conference will do something to facilitate the accession of indigenous bankers to the system of credit regulation now planned by the Reserve Bank. The

indigenous bankers have a very long record of efficient service and we trust that they will retain sufficient adaptability to continue to be important members of the credit organisation of the country.

In the absence of any statistical and institutional data it was only natural that the discussion on the very important subject of unemployment should lack reality and vigour. The absolute and permanent underemployment in the country was mentioned and the need for intensive reorganisation of industry and agriculture was stressed. The development of part-time cottage industry came in for the usual hopeful reference which conveniently conceals many a deeper pitfall. It is, however, clear that so far as unemployment in India is concerned, while the grass grows the steed starves. While learned discussions as to the causes, nature and remedies of the evil of unemployment are engaging the attention of scholars, the victims of the unwelcome phenomenon are left in the cold. The old institutions of family, neighbourhood and caste no longer avail to relieve indigence caused by involuntary unemployment. Poor as the country as a whole is, the less unfortunate sections of the community cannot altogether ignore the claims of social solidarity. Nor can the problem of genuine industrial unemployment be long ignored with impunity. The introduction of organised poor relief in rural and urban areas, the encouragement of trade union benefits for unemployment relief and the extension of the principle of famine insurance to distress caused by industrial unemployment are pressing reforms. The details of such a scheme will have to be worked out by local inquiry. But it can hardly be disputed that something has got to be urgently done to assure the unemployed that the community as a whole will not leave them to their own fate, so long as they are capable of an honest effort.

Reorganisation of provincial finances was tabled as the topic of current importance and a free debate took place on the merits of the several proposals now before the provincial Governments. The inadequacy of present resources and the need for fresh taxation was generally recognised. It was also agreed that the new taxes should fall on the middle and the richer classes, and that the bulk of the new expenditure should be incurred in rural areas and especially for the benefit of the poor. The prospects of an early sharing of the income tax have indeed improved during the last few months. If there is any early prospect of the Central Government instituting a Provincial Fund along lines indicated by Sir Walter Layton, many of the political and economic difficulties of the new provincial Governments will recede into the background. But, failing a substantial improvement in the financial position of the Government of India, an early introduction of new measures of taxation, e.g. a tax on agricultural incomes, death duties, sales and professions taxes and enhanced tobacco taxes, appears to be inevitable at least in some of the provinces. The poorer sections of the community are more likely to benefit by state expenditure than by reduction of taxation.

By focussing public attention on some of the important problems of Indian economy the Economic Conference has justified its existence to a large number of people outside the ranks of University teachers. It is to be hoped that the economists will continue to discharge with ever-growing enthusiasm and success their task of interpreting economic experience and of

guiding economic policy. We understand that the next session of the Conference is to be held in the University of Nagpur, and that the subjects of discussion include theory of interest, debt legislation in India and trade agreements. We trust that the Conference will succeed in giving an instructive lead to public opinion on those important subjects.

## THE DOCTRINE OF NON-VIOLENCE

### AS APPLIED TO NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS.

THE verbatim report of the National Convention held in London on 18th September last has now been published under the title of "The Challenge of Positive Pacifism." The Convention consisted of some 2,000 delegates representing about 400 peace organisations all over England like the Society of Friends, Fellowship of Reconciliation, Canon Dick Sheppard's Peace Pledge Union, Labour Party, Trade Unions, Co-operative Societies and Women's Co-operative Guilds and Peace Fellowships of various Christian denominations. It was presided over by Mr. George Lansbury, and resolutions were moved or supported at it by such distinguished persons as Canon Stuart D. Morris, Dr. Alec Wood, Dr. Alfred Salter, Rev. Henry Carter, Lord Arnold, Miss Rose Simpson, etc. The resolutions passed by the Convention call for the renunciation of war as a crime against humanity and a sin against God, for disarmament, even if unilateral, by nations and for founding the authority of the League of Nations "on the moral influence of world public opinion rather than upon the armed coercion of collective security or of an international police force." The Convention proceeded on the basis that the use of force was intrinsically wrong, and its report gives us a good opportunity of examining this thesis both in its application to national and international affairs. In India where non-violence as a creed is so glibly mouthed by large numbers of people, such examination is highly necessary, but before we proceed to do so we shall set before the reader some of the arguments advanced by those who took part in the Convention mostly in their own words.

#### I.

With one argument that recurs again and again in the proceedings of the Convention everyone must heartily agree: Wars are usually the result of some acute grievance which appears to the aggrieved nation impossible of redress by less drastic means, and if they are to be stopped the best method is to seek redress of the grievance by suitable economic or territorial adjustments and not to threaten reprisals against those who out of sheer desperation disturb the existing arrangements. The League of Nations, whose main objective is to abolish war, provides in its Covenant a machinery both for redressing legitimate grievances (Art. 19) and for preventing unprovoked aggression (Art. 16); but we hear more often of the League invoking Art. 16 (though even of this we don't hear too often) than Art. 19. And what Mr. Carter

said is quite true: "If half the thought and energy given to the support of Art. 16 had been directed to making Art. 19 effective, the world would be far different to-day." But because the League does nothing to secure treaty revision and agreed territorial change, but only bids its member States to respect the integrity of the territories, whatever they happen to be at the present time, of all the nations, it has in effect become the perpetuator of existing injustices, and the Versailles Treaty inflicted numerous such injustices. Dr. Salter thus put into words the feeling of bitterness which the have-not countries entertain against the have's:

You, Great Britain, own more than a quarter of the total surface of the globe. Your allies, France and Russia, own considerably more than half of the total surface of the earth, and between you, you three own 86 per cent. of the total mineral wealth of the world. Of course you want peace; of course you do. You have been brigands in the past; you have seized every delectable piece of land there is to be seized. You have got the swag and now you want to be allowed to enjoy it undisturbed. You have retired from the international burglary business and you have created the League of Nations to act as an international policeman to guard your ill-gotten gains. If we try to arrange a conquest and obtain some necessary extension of our territories here and there—the method by which you have profited in the past—if we attempt to do that, you hold up your hands in holy horror and denounce us from the moral standpoint. Yet we are only doing exactly what you have done over and over again.

The League comes upon the scene just after some States have grabbed nearly all that there is to grab, and, under the domination of these sated nations, says to the rest: "The present territorial distribution none shall disturb." The dissatisfied powers take the law into their own hands, and the League threatens sanctions. But the seeming aggressor nation may have right on its side. Dr. Salter quoted some opinions on the subject:

A great jurist has put the matter in this way: "Although in law the aggressor is the culprit, in justice the culpability of the defender may be no less if he has refused to the aggressor all reasonable consideration of wrongs deeply felt, and of demands, even if only in part legitimate." In law, the aggressor is condemned; in justice the defender is equally, or more, culpable if he refuses to render justice. Listen to the words of a great publicist: "If war should come through the reluctance to make the necessary sacrifices, the responsibility will rest not on the so-called aggressor, but on the nations that by their fears, their selfishness and their moral cowardice, have given the aggressor no other alternative."

By refusing to bring Art. 19 into play, the League has made itself, to the extent of its capacity,



a preserver of the *status quo*, an unjust *status quo*, and thus it lacked moral authority in some degree even when it made some feeble attempts to restrain unlawful and unjust aggression.

## II.

To this charge brought against the League that it is utterly inactive in removing legitimate national grievances everyone must plead guilty, but assuming that it was as assiduous in bringing about international justice as it is supposed to be in enforcing international law, the League plan of collective security must be pronounced to be sound. The plan is simple. No nation can hope, without massing huge armaments, to achieve security from attack by any possible enemy and, in the event of the attack materialising, to repel it successfully. If, therefore, such security is to be afforded to peace-loving countries without imposing on them the necessity of wasting their resources in destructive armaments, all such countries should undertake to contribute what lies in their power to resist aggression, in whatever part of the world aggression may take place and however little the particular act of aggression may affect the countries called upon to help the attacked country. Isolated, each country may feel insecure in face of such an aggression unless it maintains forces stronger than those of the powers from which an attack is possible; but if other countries make it their common concern to resist the attack, undertake obligations to this effect and respect those obligations, then every country will be safe and no country will be required to have a defence establishment much greater than what is required for policing purposes or for the preservation of internal order. This method of a pooled security in fact closely follows the organisation by each country of its domestic police. As no private individual now maintains a police force of his own but entrusts his protection to the State, so should all the States leave their external protection in the charge of an international body which should either maintain an international police force by levying contributions upon its member States or cast upon them an obligation to go to the aid of whichever country is a victim of aggression. Thus world disarmament will be possible and peace will reign undisturbed everywhere or, if disturbed in any country, will be quickly restored. Needless to say that this League plan has not worked at all; but if it has failed, as it most undoubtedly has, it is not because of any flaw in the plan, but because the countries which have undertaken the obligation of resisting aggression have no mind to respect the obligation. The founders of the League thought that if the would-be aggressor could be convinced that he would have to meet in the field of battle the armed forces not only of the particular victim of aggression but of all the other countries as well, his aggression would in all likelihood be halted; but if he were so mad as to embark upon his scheme of aggression, the superior armed forces which he would have to encounter would foil the attempt in no time. Thus, in the background of the League machinery for collective security lies

force, even as in the background of a State's machinery for its internal security lies force, and to this the National Convention strongly objects.

To the League all wars are not unlawful or unjust; aggressive wars are, but defensive wars are not. This principle which lies at the basis of the whole League structure the Convention combats. One of the resolutions passed by it says: "War is a crime against humanity, and, to the Christian pacifist, a sin against God. It can never be justified, whether conducted by a section of a nation, by a nation as a whole, by an alliance of nations, or by the League of Nations." The Convention's aim is to take force out of the Covenant of the League of Nations, to get the League to abandon its coercive powers and policies and concentrate on its conciliatory and welfare-building activities, such as the Court of International Justice which gives advisory opinions on questions submitted to it; peace-making by means of fact-finding and persuasion; the International Health Organisation; the I.L.O.; the Commission on Mandates; the Minorities Commission; work against slavery, against the traffic in dangerous drugs and against the white slave traffic. As Mr. Carter said, the League can become in certain circumstances "a council of war", decreeing military sanctions against offending countries, and this must be stopped. For "there is no morality in war, whether it be waged by a national or international force. Instruments of murder are always instruments of murder." The Covenant should, therefore, leave no room for war, which is evil in all circumstances. The League, which is in part a League of coercion, must become wholly a League of conciliation. The question then arises: What would the Convention ask a country to do when it is invaded by another, if it is not to defend itself (and in case it has unilaterally disarmed itself it will be unable to defend itself even if it wishes to) and if other countries are not to fight in its defence either? The Convention's answer is: Such a thing is not very likely, but if it does happen there is nothing for it but to submit for the time being in full faith that things will right themselves in the end. Lord Arnold said:

If you were disarmed and were honestly willing to meet all grievances, I do not believe you would get people to come and bomb us and fight us. It might begin, but it would not go on. I do not believe the attacking country would get the necessary morale in its people to do it.

Miss Mary Gamble said:

Suppose we disarmed by ourselves. But supposing that the other countries did not follow our example and did not disarm and that in the final issue we were attacked, what would happen then? In the onslaught of aggression, there would be terrible suffering, but I ask you, can we imagine ourselves going on attacking a defenceless people? The enemy, whoever it might be, is made up very much of people like ourselves; so it is not likely that the attack would continue for long. Our national pride would suffer. We might have to give up our Empire. We might have to live under the rule of another nation, under a different form of government, but from the Christian point of view are these fundamental questions? Can we argue even about these things when we cannot get away from that inescapable fact, that at the heart of our religion there is a Cross?

Dr. Wood said :

If a nation becomes pacifist, it thereby makes war impossible. But it does not make armed occupation impossible. We have got to face the possibility that our policy might mean armed occupation. What then? . . . Do not let us ever give the impression that pacifism means lying down and being walked over. Pacifism is an active method of struggle . . . We develop best when we are insecure, when we are taking risks, and the finest qualities of manhood and womanhood are evoked when men and women are facing risks, and not when they are living in ease and security and comfort. And, therefore, we offer this pacifist alternative not as a method which will inevitably lead to security, but we offer what is the only possible method by which the world can escape from what threatens it to-day, and we are prepared to follow our pacifism to the end whatever it may cost, and we are prepared to take, and to invite others to take with us, all the risks that are involved in it.

It will be seen that although Dr. Wood denies that pacifism means lying down and being walked over, it means nothing else as he interprets it. Mr. Lansbury said :

All of us hate what is happening in Spain and China, but I am wholly unable to understand how anyone can expect these horrors to be settled by ourselves and others settling down to universal slaughter. Whenever the end comes, and we all hope it will come soon, in China and in Spain Chinese and Japanese, republicans and others, will still be together and forced to discover how to live together in peace. These wars will settle nothing at all.

On Mr. Lansbury's showing, pacifism is that extreme form of isolationism which leaves the warring elements to settle their controversy by a trial of strength. No doubt peace will come by this means ; but peace will be ensued by the lamb finding itself in the inside of the lion. Peace there will be, but not necessarily justice, for which apparently pacifists do not care very much. We remember John Haynes Holmes exclaiming in his paper *Unity*, after the invasion of Abyssinia by Italy : What would Abyssinia have lost if she had followed the Tolstoyan principle of non-resistance and if other countries had left Italy to do her worst, without any fussy interference on their part? As the event proved, nothing. But if Abyssinia had been strong, and if Great Britain and France more loyal to League principles, the one African country which till then had maintained its independence would not have been enslaved. But was there even a possibility of Abyssinia saving herself by pacifist methods ?

### III.

One is tempted to ask the pacifists at this stage : If the use of force is intrinsically wrong in international affairs, is it not equally wrong in national affairs ? If all international war, whether aggressive or defensive, is a crime against humanity, is not violence, even when used in self-defence in domestic matters, equally a crime against humanity ? If the League of Nations cannot be allowed to use armed force even in rescuing one nation which is a victim of aggression by another nation, can a State be allowed to use its police power in putting down crime within its borders ? Both cases appear to stand on the same footing, and if force is necessarily evil, it should be so in domestic as well as international con-

cerns. Probably the pacifists who foregathered in the National Convention are divided on this issue. Some of them may be anarchists by conviction, and they would reprobate coercion in any form and in any sphere. But no one among the speakers attempted to formulate a direct answer to the question. Only Canon Morris, who opened the proceedings, referred to this question, and he pleaded that the use of force in international affairs stood on a different footing from the use of force in national affairs, thus implying that while the first was sinful the second was not. Let us hear him in his own words :

We are being told that after all domestic law has got to have behind it the sanction of force, and that if, therefore, you are going to vindicate international law you must also be prepared to use force, that it even becomes a Christian duty to support international law, to maintain it by resort to violence.

But surely there are two things at least about which we insist in regard to domestic law. We insist that the law shall be able to distinguish in its operation between the innocent and guilty. We are immediately suspicious of anything like corrupt evidence, anything approaching bribery, anything which will tend to let off the guilty or still more to punish the innocent. But what happens when you try and transfer your arguments into the realm of international policy ? Obviously, if you are going to think in terms of action against a breaker of international law and you think it can be vindicated in that way, you have got to use against him, in support of law, the same method he uses in breaking law. You have got to be ready to be more violent than he is. Now, are we in doubt about what these methods are, the method of economic blockade and air bombardment ? When words come to proof, sanctions and collective security whilst employed by an alliance of nations or the League are revealed as the old policy of violence and war seen in terms of economic blockade and air bombardment. . . . And if we think of the results of air bombardment, we know that we immediately have to use such a quantity of force that it completely changes its quality. We are no longer thinking in terms of force for your safety and protection, which we believe the policeman stands for ; we are thinking in terms of violence, not of the policeman who leads little children safely across the road, but of the airman who goes on dropping bomb after bomb, willy-nilly, on children, and blowing them to bits.

If anyone is prepared to justify and use the method of modern war, even in defence of some ideal which they hold dear, even in the name of the League of Nations, he should know that the result of that action means that it is impossible to distinguish between the innocent and the guilty, and must destroy the very ideals which he has in view.

The distinction that is sought to be drawn here between force applied in upholding national law and that applied in upholding international law is not real and does not correspond to facts. If national law distinguishes between the innocent and the guilty, so does the League's international law. No country is named an aggressor unless it is proved beyond doubt that the country has been guilty of aggression, and indeed the international tribunal is much more exposed to the temptation of letting off a guilty country under the influence of considerations of expediency, than a national tribunal to the temptation of letting off a criminal. There is no fear of an innocent country being unjustly branded an aggressor and subjected to sanctions. But what Canon Morris means when he says that, in the operations of international

law, the guilty and the innocent cannot be separated, is that punishment falls upon the innocent as well as the guilty. It is the Government of the day that is responsible for aggression, but when war breaks out the innocent people suffer just as much as the guilty Government. But this is an untenable view. Wars too have their own laws. In the first place, only defensive wars are lawful. In the second place, the aim of defensive wars must be to break down the opposition of the enemy and to put him out of action; but a nation may not aim directly at the death of the enemy. No more violence is held legitimate in a citizen engaged in resisting an unjust aggressor in a State, and international law too does not permit of greater violence being used in self-defence by one nation against another. In the third place, and as a consequence of this, while it is lawful for a nation to beat down and scatter all enemy combatants, war confers no right of violence as against non-combatants. Among combatants are included soldiers in uniforms or soldiers called to arms and also others who perform auxiliary services, such as munitions workers, persons connected with the supply of food, the implements of war, etc.

Here pacifists may object: All this sounds very well, but can you imagine a modern war without air bombing and a blockade in which no distinction can possibly be made between the innocent and the guilty? But international law prescribes that while air-raids upon fortifications, arsenals, military barracks, munition factories &c. are lawful, indiscriminate air-raids upon open towns are unlawful. And we cannot understand why some of the speakers at the National Convention should have been so sarcastic about the protests made by eminent persons, both clerical and other, at the bombing of Guernica by the Spanish rebels and of many towns in China by the Japanese. Efforts are being made to outlaw air-raids, and if they are successful the principal pacifist objection to lawful war will be removed. In any case, the pacifists offer nothing else instead than that one lay oneself out for being walked over, in spite of Dr. Wood's contradiction. As for the blockade, the law on the subject is thus described:

The sinking of food ships destined for the enemy is not disallowed in natural law, since it is the soldiers in the field that have the first call upon all incoming supplies, and it is lawful to deprive them of these supplies. To sink passenger vessels, or liners, carrying munitions of war or engaged in some other belligerent mission, is lawful, provided that all that is possible is done to save the lives of the passengers. To sink passenger vessels not engaged on any mission of war is wholly disallowed; and, if loss of life occurs, the act is to be regarded as one of sheer and unadulterated murder.

Of course, as wars are carried out, these laws are observed more in breach than in observance; and even if they were strictly carried out, some amount of indiscriminateness is bound to occur. But does municipal law provide wholly against indiscriminate punishment? When Mr. Munshi, who calls himself a votary of non-violence, prohibits meetings or processions in a strike area on account of a fear that intimidation will be practised, he uses coercion not only against the intimidators but also against others, and

when his police shoot, innocent people are liable to be victims just as much as the guilty. Nor are the police such genteel folks as Canon Morris, for the purpose of heightening the contrast between violence by the State authorities and violence by an international body, tries to make out. They do not always "lead little children safely across the road"; they too are known to do gory things. No, the distinction between the use of force for the maintenance of peace in a State and for the maintenance of peace between States is only one of degree and not of kind. The principle is at bottom the same. War is admittedly full of evil, and every one must make an attempt to avoid it as much as possible. But it will be possible to avoid it wholly only when in a State the use of force will become wholly unnecessary in the interest of public justice. However, so long as this millenium has not arrived, war cannot be regarded as intrinsically evil even as the use of force is not regarded as intrinsically evil in domestic matters; and the former is not less allowable than the latter.

#### SHORT NOTICES.

**PHYSICIANS AND MEDICAL CARE.** BY ESTHER LUCILE BROWN. (Russell Sage Foundation, New York.) 1937. 20cm. 202p. 75 cents.

THIS is "a monograph dealing with the present status of the medical profession in the United States" and we can get therefore much useful information from it about the medical profession there. As every other country, America is also faced with "the problem of the inability of large numbers of persons receiving low incomes, especially in rural areas, to purchase as much professional service as they need." The U.S.A. Government has done, and is doing, all it could and can to supply medical care to the indigent, but still the cry goes on for more and more care. Compared with its achievements, the efforts of the British Government in India pale into insignificance, and we are reminded of what huge tasks lie ahead of our own Provincial Congress Governments in this respect.

Evolution of medical education in U.S.A. provides a very interesting reading. We therefore invite the attention of our Provincial Governments to this chapter with a view to impress upon them not to set a very high standard for the Ayurvedic and the Unani students who seek education and registration. In 1869 the President of the Harvard School of Medicine "proposed to the head of the medical school to have written examinations for the M. D. degree". The head of the school replied: "More than half of the students can barely write. Of course they can't pass written examinations!" In 1903 Dr. Lyon wrote about a medical school in Indianapolis: "It consisted of two rooms... over a feed store. In one room was a table on which a cadaver (dead body) might once have been placed. In the other room were several chairs and a black board. That was the entire physical equipment." Yet he says: "Graduates of that school were eligible for registration in nearly all the States." Of course medical education is now on the peak of its glory and we have full admiration for its development. But what it was even at the beginning of the present century may be noted by these who are concerned with it in India.

Another problem there, as here, is the "unequal distribution" of doctors. There has been "a progressive concentration in the larger urban and

industrial areas and the problem of rural medicine is as difficult there as in this country. State subsidy has been used as an inducement for doctors to settle in the rural areas, but the complaint goes on about "the quality and quantity of medical care" which the poor people get from these subsidised doctors. They say that the quality and quantity "vary in a marked fashion from one locality to another". This should be noted by those who advocate subsidy to doctors here.

The book is very interesting from many points of view and should be read by all those who have the interests of the profession at heart.

V. M. BHAT.

**THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC RECONSTRUCTION OF TRAVANCORE.** By V. ACHUTHA MENON. (B. V. Book Depot and Printing Works, Trivandrum.) 1937. 21cm. 125p. Re. 1.

THE author begins with the political and economic survey of Travancore State, his thesis for the reconstruction of the State on a co-operative basis. He discusses the merits of capitalism, socialism and co-operation and accepts co-operation as a faultless means of social reconstruction. His case for co-operation and against socialism is thoroughly confusing. His scheme of central planning and regulation with the necessary decentralisation can be had in no other structure than in socialism. The vigorous co-operation which is the basis of his plan can thrive effectively only on socialist foundations. Again the author's notions of state socialism are not clear. His conception of socialism, as suited only to large-scale production, is ununderstandable. What his plan of reconstruction reveals is that the author wants to have all features of socialism *sans* its name.

His scheme is for a state development board constituted by the representatives of five groups of co-operative central organisations and Government servants. The central organisations will have district, taluk and village primary organisations.

These five groups of agricultural, industrial, fishery marketing and banking, and co-operative organisations should among themselves work out the economic development of the State. The panchayat of the village is the Governmental organisation which will carry out the social regeneration of the village. How education should be changed to suit the changed conditions and how it should be imparted are dealt with by the author. He gives a suggestive list of industries to be improved and introduced in the different localities of the State. The scheme is attractive, but it needs a lot of man-power to work it out, and it seems too much to ask for all these even of a benevolent prince. The book is well-written and the scheme, as far as it goes, is a progressive one.

N. S. S.

#### BOOKS RECEIVED.

- THE BRITISH EMPIRE. (Oxford University Press.) 1937. 22cm. 336p. 15/-.
- THE ATLANTIC AND SLAVERY. By H. A. WYNDHAM. (Oxford University Press.) 1935. 21cm. 310p. 12/6.
- NARAYAN GANESH CHANDAVARKAR (IN MARATHI). By DWARKANATH GOVIND VAIDYA. (Karnatak Publishing House, Bombay.) 1937. 22cm. 567p. Rs. 3.
- THE CRESCENT IN INDIA. Parts I and II. By S. R. SHARMA. (Karnatak Publishing House, Bombay.) 1937. 22cm. 718p. Rs. 6 for two parts.
- NEW CONSTITUTION OF INDIA. (Second Edition.) By SUDHIR KUMAR LAHIRI and BENOYENDRANATH BANERJEA. (The Politics Club, Post Box No. 175, Calcutta.) 1937. 20cm. 412p. Rs. 4-8.
- THE CHALLENGE OF THE NORTH-WEST FRONTIER. By C. F. ANDREWS. (Allen & Unwin.) 1937. 20cm. 208p. 3/6.
- YOUR DIET IN HEALTH AND DISEASE. By HARRY BENJAMIN. (Health for All Publishing Co., London.) 1936. 20cm. 156p. 5/-
- NATION BUILDING. A Five-year Plan for the Provinces. By M. VISVESVARAYA. (Bangalore Press, Bangalore City.) 1937. 20cm. 76p.

**SUPREME FOR YEARS—  
SUPREME TO-DAY—  
QUALITY ALWAYS TELLS.**



Mysore Sandalwood Oil, B. P. quality, the finest in the world, is perfectly blended and milled by a special process with the purest ingredient to make.

**Mysore  
Sandal Soap**

"It's good through and through  
to the thinnest water."

Available Everywhere.

**GOVERNMENT SOAP FACTORY,  
BANGALORE.**