

Servant of India

Editor: S. G. VAZE.

Office: SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY, POONA 4.

VOL. XXI, No. 19. }

POONA—THURSDAY, MAY 12, 1938.

{ INDIAN SUBSN. Rs. 6.
FOREIGN 15s.

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK ...	233
ARTICLES:	
Congress Flag in the States ...	236
The Oudh Rent Act ...	238
South African Protectorates ...	240
REVIEWS:	
India's Cultural Past. By S. R. Sharma ...	242
India's Financial Position. By V. N. Godbole ...	243
SHORT NOTICES ...	244
BOOKS RECEIVED ...	244

Topics of the Week.

Orissa Crisis Ends.

BY cancelling his leave the Governor of Orissa, Sir John Hubback, has ended the Orissa crisis and deserves the congratulations of the public on showing a sense of realism and refusing to allow considerations of prestige to stand in the way of peaceful administration in the province. The firm stand taken by the Orissa Ministry (backed up, we believe, by other Congress Ministries,) will not fail, we hope, to carry its lesson to those to whom it belongs to make appointments to Governorships. In this respect the suggestion of Sir Chimanlal Setalvad that civil servants should not be made Governors of provinces ought to be carried out. This has been a long-standing demand of almost all the parties in India. The civil servant, however efficient as an administrator he may be, must not be entrusted with the power of setting aside the Ministry's advice which the Act gives him if made the head of the Province. Sir Chimanlal says:

The civil service, since the introduction of the new constitution, should be purely a service in the same position as the civil service in England. The civil servant should no longer be in a position to dictate policy. He should merely be a part of the machine to carry out the policies of the popular Governments. The Civil Servant trained in the traditions of the service for a number of years imbibes such a service mentality and gets such a narrow view of things that it is not the right thing to put him at the head of the administration in which you require a broad outlook and vision which cannot be expected from a person who has been a part of the civil service machine.

Sir Chimanlal further suggests that the British Government ought now to start appointing Indians as Governors.

NOT only does the British Government pay no heed to the suggestion of appointing Indians as

Governors, but it pays no heed to the suggestion of excluding civil service men from the office of Governor. Lord Stanley stated the other day in the House of Commons that Government's policy in this respect stands, and pointed with an air of triumph that within the last fourteen months as many as nine members of the Indian Civil Service had received a gift of either temporary or substantive posts of Governors!

The Mysore Settlement.

THE news that the dispute between the Mysore Congress and the Government regarding the hoisting of the Congress flag has been settled will be received with great relief throughout India. The State will not now object to the hoisting of the Congress flag, and the Congress on its part will not hoist it in rivalry to or supersession of the Mysore flag. The compromise represents an improvement on the attitude expressed by the Government last week in a communique, which said that although it had no wish to interfere with the use of any colours or flags or other emblem indicating any political opinion in a peaceful manner it would not allow the ceremonial hoisting of any flag or emblem, the intention of which was to express allegiance to an outside authority. The hoisting of the Congress flag was, according to the Government, an indication of such allegiance. Said the communique:

Such must be the intention or implication if a political flag instituted by some authority or body outside the State is ceremoniously hoisted and honoured within the State; such action is, therefore, prohibited. Such ceremonies are quite unnecessary for the propagation of legitimate political opinions. The subjects of the Maharaja can express under the flag of the State any opinion compatible with their loyalty to the State. No flag should be set up or used in competition with that flag or in any manner derogatory to that flag, which it should be the pride of all loyal subjects of the State and all patriotic Mysoreans to honour.

THE compromise will result in the release of all political prisoners, in the withdrawal of the flag satyagraha, an increase of Congress representation on the Reforms Committee from four to six, and a widening of the terms of inquiry of that Committee which will include the possibility of the introduction of responsible government. On this last point the Mysore Government had yielded already. The Mysore Congress Committee has won a notable victory on the basis of its own strength in its struggle for democracy and its success should put heart into the efforts of other States' people's organisations.

Reservation of Bills.

THE Madras Estates Land Act (Orissa Amendment) Bill of the Congress Ministry in Orissa has been reserved by the Governor of the Province for the

consideration of the Governor-General, and similarly, it is said, the Bengal Tenancy Bill of the non-Congress Ministry in Bengal will be so reserved. If this is done or going to be done as a normal routine, and if the measures finally receive the assent of the respective Governors without any hitch and are passed into law, then nothing further need be said about it. But if the Governor-General or the Governors interfere, the duty of the Ministers and other members in the legislatures is plain. The power of veto must be nullified. The particular Bills are admittedly compromise measures and as such they contain shortcomings; but they are in the right direction so far as they go.

BUT the merits of the Bills are not in question here; if they are defective or entirely wrong, the remedy must be sought not in the veto power, but in the strength of non-Government parties displacing the Ministries and producing better measures. The question that would be presented in the event of the Bills being vetoed would be that of divesting the Governors and the Governor-General of the power of overriding the Ministries and the Legislatures which the constitution gives them. On this everyone, whatever his individual view about the merits of the Bills, must unite. The Ministries must resign and the non-Government parties must decline to form Ministries. We would go further and say that the Ministries in other provinces must also resign in sympathy. The Congress Ministries now present a united front to the British Government; the resignation of one is known to involve the resignation of all the others. But on a question like this Congress Ministries must back non-Congress Ministries and non-Congress Ministries must back Congress Ministries. It is a question which affects them all; it is a question which decides the reality or otherwise of provincial autonomy.

The Bihar Dowry Restraint Bill.

A MEMBER of the Bihar Legislative Assembly has stolen a march over social reformers in other provinces and brought a bill in the Assembly to restrain the dowry system. The Bill seeks to penalise the giving and taking of doweries in marriages and is drafted on lines similar to the Sarda Act. Both sides of the question were discussed in the Bihar Assembly when permission was sought for the introduction of the Bill. Opponents of the Bill advanced the plea, as was done against the Sarda Act, that social reforms could best be achieved by education and that legislation hardly ever hastened reforms in the social sphere unless the urge came from the people themselves. It was also argued that the legislation might remain a dead letter as the Sarda Act had done to certain extent and that it would be far better to inaugurate a country-wide propaganda against the dowry system than to hasten with a bill which might or might not achieve its purpose.

THE evils of dowry in certain parts of the country are notorious and in spite of the sacrifice of Snehalata in Bengal which stirred the country to its depths, it has not been checked in any way. Instances of the terrible hardships inflicted on parents of girls on account of this rapacious system are not rare. Only recently in Bengal two sisters committed suicide to save their parents' home from the clutches of the moneylender. Social legislation dealing with such reforms may not be as immediately effective as legislation dealing with other matters, but there can be no two opinions that it gives a tremendous impetus to the reformers' efforts and that as time goes on, such legis-

lation can be strengthened to deal with offenders with greater stringency. The Sarda Act might not have succeeded in altogether stopping early marriages, but none can deny that it has put the fear of law in the minds of the people and that, like suttee, child marriages are becoming less frequent. We do not suppose that the proposed Bihar legislation when passed would in a trice stop the dowry evil. Far from it. But it will certainly create a great movement towards it.

AN aspect of the question generally escapes notice. While child marriages are lessening among the educated people, the dowry system is by no means doing so. On the other hand, with the growing unemployment among the educated, a tendency is not infrequently noticed among the higher classes to squeeze as much money as possible from the bride's party. In such cases education and propaganda are powerless, only legislation can help. The Bill as drafted, however, has the same defects which the Sarda Act had before its recent amendment. The deposit clause and the non-cognizable clause are retained almost on the lines of the original Sarda Act. Perhaps it is done to make the passage of the Bill easier through the legislature. But we feel that if the Bill passes into law, sooner or later it will have to be amended on the lines of the Sarda Act. We hope that women's organisations in India will give the measure the attention it deserves.

"Give up Federation," says Sethna.

SIR PHIROZE SETHNA certainly does not belong in those politicians, if there are any such, who feel that the federal part of the constitution, full of defects as it is, should be brought into operation at an early date, if only to prevent the discontent in the country growing and the political situation deteriorating still further. On the contrary, he sees so clearly that the effect of putting the Act as it is in force, in despite of the vehement opposition of the people will be so disastrous that he is compelled to counsel not only delay but abandonment of the Act, unless it is suitably altered, to the British Government. He says in the *Hindustan Review*: "The British Government would do a graceful, wise and statesmanlike act if it would, out of regard for the opinion, feelings and wishes of India, declare that it would give up the idea of establishing the federation." The real thing to do is to set aside the Act and replace it by an agreed treaty between Great Britain and India. But, short of this, he suggests much could be done to improve the constitution. One such direction is "to give to the Federal Assembly some share, limited though it may be, in the decision of defence policies and in the control of expenditure on defence. The pace of the Indianisation of all the defensive forces must also be accelerated and the British Government must give genuine proofs of their desire to nationalise those forces."

ANOTHER reform that is necessary is the liberalisation of the Indian States' constitutions before federation is an accomplished fact. He says: "If, before the establishment of the federation, the Princes can be persuaded to introduce within their States suitable forms of representative, if not responsible, government and if also the the States' representatives to the federal legislature are elected on some basis of popular election, one great objection to the federal scheme will be removed. . . . It may be necessary to put some pressure on some of the Princes, and that may be done." This is exceedingly satisfactory. We are sure that, in regard to his second

suggestion, he will not be content with a facade of representative government in the States behind which autocracy will reign supreme, nor with a sort of election which will only be nomination in disguise.

WE are compelled to utter this word of warning because we discern a tendency even in progressive circles to fall hungrily upon any the least indication by any Prince, however remote, to change the system of administration and to say: "Now, with this change of heart on the part of the Princes, the difficulty on their side is very nearly out of the way." There must be a definite minimum standard in this respect which, if not reached, must disqualify the States from entering federation, though they must be entitled to enter it when they have reached the standard. British India and the Indian States will be woven in, when federation is established, as weft into the warp, and a common internal system of government is not merely desirable but essential if the federal machinery is to work smoothly and harmoniously. The uniformity which is here predicated may not be achieved immediately beyond a certain point—and this affords an opening for a compromise—but it must be achieved in a short period of time. In order that this may be insured, we must keep in view not only present requirements but future development. In other words, guarantees for the future are necessary.

The Anglo-Indians:

THE Anglo-Indian and Domiciled European community in Bombay was addressed the other day by Mr. Kher, the Premier, who told them that it was time they ceased to cast longing eyes towards the west and recognised that India was their home and that their destiny lay in this country. He reminded them of another microscopic minority community in India, the Parsis, which had created for itself an abiding place in the nation by its generosity, enterprise and identification of interests with Indians. The Anglo-Indian community has given little evidence of any of these qualities so far. On the other hand, it has relied for its prospects more upon the favoured treatment it demanded and received from the Government than upon the exercise of its native intelligence and enterprise. In the national struggle for emancipation, it has taken small part, if any. It is only recently, with the coming of the nationalist elements into positions of power in the country that the community's leaders like Sir Henry Gidney have changed their tune and begun to preach identification of their community's interests with those of Indians in general.

THE speech of the President of the Association in Bombay, Mr. Prater, on the occasion when Mr. Kher addressed it, gave proof of this exclusive mentality. It dealt largely with the privileges which his community has secured in the new Act at the Centre and asked for the same in the provincial sphere. The recent change in the mentality of some of the community's leaders has become manifest, be it noted, after they have secured practically all the safeguards that they wanted. Unlike the Parsis, who refused to be segregated into a favoured group and boldly took their chance in the common struggle, the Anglo-Indian community as a whole still clings to its demand for privileges based upon its descent from the rulers of the country. It forgets, however, that advantageous though their origin might have been when the national consciousness was not awakened, in a renaissant nation reliance upon birth will not do.

Sanctity of Treaties.

THERE is a natural tendency among Indian Princes, zamindars and other vested interests to stand pat on any pledges that they may have received from the British Government for the maintenance of their privileged position and they always insist upon a literal interpretation of the pledges, alleging breach of faith whenever the privileges are broken in upon even to the slightest extent. But all such pledges have to be interpreted in relation to the circumstances in which they were given, and when the altered circumstances require it a more liberal interpretation must necessarily be put upon them.

APROPOS of the pledges received by the natives of the South African Protectorates, with which we deal in other columns, Lord Courtney of Penwith spoke in 1909 on the correct mode of interpretation to be applied to treaties and engagements, which will be of general interest in India, at the present time. He said:

We are bound, in respect of Basutoland, for instance, in the most clear fashion by promises of a very deliberate and unmistakable character to give the Basutos the benefit of direct government from home. State Papers amounting to a contract exist, for Lord Derby's great Despatch, of 1888, guaranteed to Basutoland direct government from home. I admit that all these declarations, whether contained in treaties, conventions or other State documents, cannot be regarded as perpetually binding, as eternal obligations. They must be construed with reference to the circumstances in which they are given and the circumstances in which they are sought to be applied; and I admit that, despite Lord Derby's solemn assurance amounting to a promise, a case may arise and must arise, when Basutoland would be handed over from the direct authority of the Crown to the control of the Parliament of South Africa.

GENERALLY it happens that people advocate a loose or strict construction of treaties as it happens to suit them at the moment. But Lord Courtney's utterance is valuable because he favours a liberal interpretation of any treaty so as to permit of due allowance being made in the change in circumstances, although in respect of the particular treaty or contract he was dealing with he recommended a strict interpretation of it. He was totally opposed to the transfer of the South African Protectorates to the Union Government, but he rested the case against transfer on the consideration that, in the circumstances that existed then and could be expected to come into existence in future, transfer must not be effected, and that the promise given to the natives must be fulfilled, though he was prepared to concede that in completely altered circumstances that promise, like others, might have to be differently interpreted. No treaty, though framed in the most absolute terms, can be perpetually binding in a changing world.

Earl Winterton on Responsible Government.

THE accuracy of the reply which Earl Winterton gave in the House of Commons on 21st February to a question by Capt. Heilgers on the role that the Paramount Power plays in respect of proposals for the introduction of constitutional reforms in Indian States has been challenged by some State officials and ex-officials. The full text of Earl Winterton's reply, given below, will perhaps help to remove misunderstandings. He said:

It is not the policy of the Paramount Power in ordinary circumstances to intervene in the internal administration of full-powered States. In particular, I can assure my hon. and gallant Friend that the Paramount Power would

certainly not obstruct proposals for constitutional advance initiated by the Ruler. The consent of the Paramount Power has not been required before such advances have been approved by various Princes, nor, so far as I am aware, has it been sought in such matters. The Paramount Power would in ordinary circumstances confine itself to tendering advice when consulted.

THE meaning of this is plain. The Paramount Power retains its paramountcy and does not propose to relax its right of interference in State affairs when called for. But it does not think it necessary or advisable to require its previous assent to any measures of constitutional reform that the authorities in full-powered States, at any rate, may see fit to initiate. It gives them full liberty to initiate and mature these proposals; unless its advice is asked for, it does not propose to give it. Time for action on the part of the Paramount Power come only when these proposals are ready for being given effect to. Its consent will at this last stage be necessary, but the requirement is purely formal when the proposals placed before it are for the introduction of responsible government. It will not obstruct such proposals but give help in putting them into execution. The need for the rights of paramountcy being exercised arises because the States' administration is not amenable to popular control. When popular control is established, paramountcy retires.

A Friendly Ireland.

THE financial provisions of the Anglo-Irish Treaty are all favourable to Ireland and disadvantageous to Britain, but Britain has accepted them because they will help in converting a sullen and even hostile Eire into a friendly Eire. As Mr. Malcolm MacDonald said: "The balance-sheet is not simply a financial balance-sheet. If we could receive from the Government of Eire also friendship instead of hostility, confidence instead of distrust, and co-operation instead of opposition, then I believe that the giver would be twice blessed." Britain would indeed be twice blessed if she follows up this initial step, important as it is, by others which are equally necessary. She would not have taken the first step if she had not resolved upon taking the rest which almost inevitably follow.

THE unconditional withdrawal of British garrisons from the occupied Irish ports must be gall and wormwood to British imperialists, for the security of Britain depends upon the ports being in the hands of troops whose loyalty is beyond question. How vital to British security is access of British forces and ships to the Irish harbours was recently described by the *Round Table*:

As Mr. Lloyd George pointed out during the debate on the Irish Treaty in December 1921, the security of Great Britain depends on what happens "on this breakwater, this advance post, this front trench of Great Britain." True then, this is much truer now. Recent developments of air power have made it even more imperative than before that Ireland's attitude towards the defence of these islands should be clearly defined. The speed and range of modern aircraft make it possible for a hostile European Power to render the English Channel an unsafe approach to Great Britain even if control of the sea were maintained. In such circumstances, approach would be possible only through the Irish Sea or by the Atlantic around the Irish coast. Moreover, it is quite conceivable that the existing repair bases of the British fleet on the south coast of England might become untenable, in which event the fleet would probably be based on Rosyth, Milford Haven, Cork Harbour and Bantry Bay. From these bases the western and southern approaches to Great Britain could

be secured by both air and sea, and the risk of their attack on the fleet would be considerably reduced.

Provision was therefore made in the Treaty of 1921 for the Irish harbours being under the control of the British forces, and this Treaty was incorporated in the Constitution Act of the Irish Free State. But Mr. de Valera objects to the Treaty just on the ground that it fetters Irish self-government.

IT need not be supposed that if Eire is left free in this matter, Mr. de Valera and his party would allow the Irish harbours to be used by the enemy. On this point he has always been explicit. He has always proclaimed his willingness "to co-operate in a policy that would safeguard Great Britain against foreign attack and prevent any hostile Power from using Ireland for military or naval purposes. He has always recognised that this must be a cardinal and essential point of British policy." Only he wants that Eire should not be compelled to follow any particular policy but left free to follow her own policy, in full confidence of the identity of British and Irish interests in this matter. Great Britain has done well to give her freedom and will reap a rich harvest in Irish friendship. Mr. de Valera will, however, exact a price, the price being in the form of union of Southern Ireland with Ulster. Mr. Chamberlain no doubt says that Great Britain cannot bring pressure upon Lord Craigavon, but this pressure will have to be exercised. She must agree to act as mediator between Northern and Southern Ireland and offer her good offices for a reconciliation. Mr. de Valera will no doubt use the defence clauses of the new Treaty to see that portion is abrogated.

Articles.

CONGRESS FLAG IN THE STATES.

"THE Indian States are not foreign states, and the rulers of these States are not foreigners."

This was the burden of the speech that Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel made at Bangalore on the eve of the settlement that the Mysore Government has arrived at with the Mysore Congress. And from the fact that the Princes are Indians he deduced certain conclusions, viz. that the struggle for freedom in the States has a different objective from that which the struggle for freedom in British India has; that the methods of agitation to be adopted by the States' people must be different from those that are adopted by British Indians; and that the emblem of political freedom in the States must be different from that of political freedom in British India. All these differences in objective and method seem to the Sardar to follow inevitably from the difference in the colour of the skin of the rulers in British India and the States. Although peace has now been made, at least temporarily, in Mysore and therefore Sardar Patel's observations have no immediate application in that State, the general policy underlying these remarks demands some scrutiny.

The Indian National Congress, according to the Sardar, is fighting for independence, i. e. independence of British rule, and it is fighting for independence for 350 millions, which means the people of the Indian States as well as British India. Independence, when won, will secure the Princes' independence of British

rule also. The Princes are not free; they are as much slaves as British Indians and the States' people, though the latter "are suffering from a double dose of slavery." The States' people and the States' rulers have both to struggle equally for freedom from British control, but the States' people have in addition to struggle for freedom from their immediate rulers' autocracy. So much follows naturally from the goal of independence which Sardar Patel posits for the people of the whole of India. What does not logically follow from it is his assertion that of the two tasks which await them the States' people should adjourn the winning of freedom from the autocracy of their indigenous rulers to the winning of freedom from the yoke of their own as well as British Indians' foreign rulers. After they have thrown off this yoke they can proceed to settle their accounts with their own immediate rulers. This can be only a matter of strategy, and the Indian States' people are not likely to agree to it, however convenient it may be to British India, just as the tenants are not likely to agree to a suspension of all their grievances against the landlords or labourers against employers till the British Government is by joint effort put out of the way. The grievances against the people with whom they have direct dealings weigh even more upon them than the grievances which the people as a whole have against the British Government, and the States' people cannot be blamed if, while taking their due share in the national movement, they wish to carry on side by side movements for the redress of their immediate grievances. Nor need Sardar Patel advise utter quiescence on the part of the States' people in the matter of freeing themselves from autocracy as he does not, and should not, advise inactivity on the part of labourers and peasants in the matter of getting justice from employers and landlords.

If the Congress flag is the emblem of independence for the whole country, and independence is to include independence for the States' people as much as independence for British Indians, there cannot be any less need for the former to be proud of the flag and to popularise it in the Indian States than for the latter to popularise it in British India. Indeed, as the independence to be achieved is to embrace the Indian Princes in it, they ought to be no less jealous of the honour of the flag than their subjects or British Indians. They ought to join the flag hoisting ceremonies on the same terms as others; in any case, they ought not to be antagonistic to it. By declaring that they were striving to obtain responsible government under the aegis of their Maharaja and that they were carrying on the flag movement in the State as part of the larger independence movement in the country, they had removed all cause for suspicion that the flag movement was hostile to Mysore. If the Mysore authorities could not bring themselves to participate in the flag movement as betokening India's determination to achieve independence of British rule, they ought to be expected by the Congress, which stands for independence, at the least to put no obstacles in its way. If this is the duty of the States' rulers, the duty of the States' people is (such should

be the Congress reasoning) to be as active in the flag movement in the States as British Indians are in British India. But Sardar Patel's reasoning is otherwise. "The policy of the Congress," he says, "is not to encourage the struggle for *that* flag (i. e. the tri-colour flag of the Congress) in the States." Because "the Congress in British India is in a state of rebellion against the British Government," and apparently the Indian States' people are not. But the Indian States' people are in rebellion against the British Government—the extension of the Congress creed to the States' people presupposes it—and, as an indication of their state of rebellion their duty towards the national flag can be no other than British Indians' duty towards it. The whole trouble arises because the States' rulers are not for independence or at any rate cannot avow their support; they therefore feel compelled to show their hostility to the flag which is the emblem of this independence, independence of which the Princes are to be the beneficiaries as well as the people. If the Princes show hostility the fault lies not with the States' people but with the States' rulers. There is thus no justification for the Sardar's statement: "Our position in British India, so far as the fight for the national flag is concerned, is entirely different from the fight for the national flag in an Indian State." What he says about the volunteers in the flag movement, viz. that they should have not only enthusiasm and zeal, but integrity, character, courage, humility, truth and non-violence is very true; indeed, it is true of every public movement. But we wonder whether he was equally keenly alive to this elementary truth when he carried on the flag movement in Nagpur several years ago or in Bardoli more recently or in other places only the other day. The States' people do not suffer in this respect from a double dose of original sin, nor the people of Mysore. They are no better and no worse than the volunteers in British India, unless it be that riffraff will do for carrying on an agitation against foreign bureaucrats but none but men of the most impeccable character are required for carrying on an agitation against indigenous autocrats.

That the rulers of the States are Indian demands a different mode of agitation in the States from that in British India is a statement which on the face of it appears to be true. Indian rulers should need less pressure from the Indian people than foreign rulers; they should also be less suspicious of such political workers. Ordinarily, therefore, a less strong agitation should be needed in the States. The facts, however, are otherwise. Not only is stronger agitation required there, but it is attended with far greater difficulties. Because repression is more severe in the States—the Congress itself has admitted it in so many words in the Lucknow resolution, though possibly Sardar Patel does not personally share the view—movements like civil disobedience are far less common; if they are not as frequent as in British India it is not because the people are happier but because they are less powerful and more crushed. But if the grievances from which the people suffer are to be the criterion, civil disobedience is more necessary and

would be more justified in the States than in British India. The Sardar told the Mysore people that they would have no need to carry on a struggle for responsible government, so far as their State was concerned. If this prophecy proves true, no one would be more glad than the Mysore people themselves. For a movement which involves tremendous sacrifices is never carried on for mere fun, and the Mysore people would have, we believe, no conscientious objection to receiving responsible government

as a gift and would not insist upon spilling their blood in winning it. For the moment we grant they have secured an honourable settlement, and we earnestly hope, with the Sardar, that the reconciliation now effected will be permanent and that they will never again be compelled to enter on a struggle against a Government which, after all is said and done, is one of the most advanced among the Indian States. But the philosophy that Sardar Patel has expounded is, we cannot help saying, faulty and erroneous.

THE OUDH RENT ACT.

FOR a proper appraisal of the proposals made by the Pant Ministry in the U. P. Tenancy Bill an account of the history of the rent and revenue laws of the Province must be brought in rapid review. We, therefore trace below the history of the Oudh Rent Act in brief outline.

At the time of the annexation of Oudh the taluqdars or feudal barons numbered 272 and had possession of two-thirds of the Province. After the Mutiny, the proprietary right in the land of these barons was confiscated but was soon restored and confirmed after their surrender by sanads which only bade them to treat their tenants with consideration without imposing any legal restrictions upon their power of enhancement of rent and eviction. A perfunctory inquiry made into the tenant-right was held to prove, and the Government accepted the conclusion, that the tenant had no sort of right before annexation. In 1866 Sir John Stratchey made the Oudh Compromise, by which, while the Government agreed to create no more occupancy rights, the taluqdars agreed on their part to confer under-proprietary rights on those who had enjoyed proprietary rights within 12 years of annexation and occupancy rights on all tenants who had been in proprietary possession within 30 years of annexation. Under-proprietary rights were heritable and transferable, while occupancy rights were heritable but not transferable. This arrangement was confirmed and secured by law by the Oudh Rent Act of 1868. The right of occupancy thus conferred included protection from eviction, except for non-payment of arrears of rent, and carried with it a privileged rate of rent which could not be enhanced beyond a rate of $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. below that paid in the neighbourhood by tenants with no right. Thus there were taluqdars with full proprietary rights, under-proprietors who possessed the right of a permanent, heritable and transferable lease at a rent to be fixed by the settlement courts and occupancy tenants whose right was similar to that of under-proprietors but who had no right of transfer. All others were tenants-at-will, liable to be turned out from their holdings at the close of any year on a month's notice and liable to any enhancement of rent which the landlords might exact. The number of tenants who had a fixity of tenure was at first believed to be rather high. In the life of Lord Lawrence in the Rulers of India series, Sir Charles Aitchison says: "By this means about one-fifth of the cultivators of the soil in Oudh received rights of occupancy in the lands they

titled." But later it was found that tenants with rights of occupancy, instead of being 20 per cent., were only 5 per cent., or 1 instead of 40 out of every 200. The figures given by Mr. Quinton in 1886, in introducing the Oudh Rent Bill in the Viceroy's Legislative Council, were: taluqdars numbered 346 and held 59 per cent. of the Province. Other landlords numbered 1,80,000; occupancy tenants 8,117; and the tenants-at-will 18,00,000. These tenants-at-will occupied 79 per cent. of the cultivated area. The only right which the Act of 1868 gave to the cultivators who were not occupancy tenants was the right to compensation for unexhausted improvements on the raising of their rents or on their eviction. For the rest the Government relied upon the terms of the landlords' sanads for protection against undue harassment of the cultivators.

Not only was the number of protected tenants infinitely small, but the safeguards provided for them by the Act of 1868 proved wholly illusory, and the number of enhancements of revenue and evictions grew fast. To remedy this evil the Oudh Rent Act of 1886 was passed. The introduction of a hereditary right of occupancy was not then considered. Mr. Quinton on behalf of the Government said in explanation:

Great as are the advantages of that form of tenure—and I myself believe that they are very great—the introduction of it into Oudh forms no part of the scheme embodied in the Bill. It was contended by a very influential school of officers in the early days of Oudh administration that such rights, though in many cases dormant, did exist, and that they should be ratified and strengthened by law. A full inquiry was made into this question during the viceroyalty of Lord Lawrence, and a somewhat bitter controversy was waged round it, the outcome of which was that the Government of India and the Secretary of State accepted the conclusion that no such rights existed at the annexation of the Province by the British Government which could be maintained by the tenant against the will of the landlord. Consequently the Government of that day resolved not to insist on the introduction of such rights into the Province against the will of the larger and more important sections of the landlords, who alleged that such a measure would violate the rights guaranteed to them by their sanads. This decision there is now no intention of reversing.

Under this law all tenants without a right of occupancy obtained the statutory right to retain the holdings occupied by them when the Act was passed, at the rent then payable, for a period of seven years from first occupation or from the last change in the rent or area of the holding. After each period of seven

years rent may be enhanced within a limit of $6\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. (or one anna in the rupee). On the death of a tenant his heir may complete the period of seven years then current, after which the landlord may make a fresh contract for rent without the $6\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. limit; but this in turn becomes subject to the septennial revision described above. A statutory tenant may be ejected at the close of a seven years' period; but unless the tenant is ejected because he has refused to pay a legal enhancement, a penal court fee of half the annual rent not exceeding Rs. 25 is levied, and in any case the new rent may not exceed the old by more than $6\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. This Act worked fairly well in Northern Oudh, where the competition for land was not very severe, but in Southern Oudh, where the pressure on the soil was great and consequently the value of the produce and the letting value of the land had risen very much more than $6\frac{1}{4}$ per cent., which was the limit of the enhanced rent the landlord could demand, the Act completely failed. In this part of the Province, therefore, the landlords freely took cash *nazranas* or premia from their old tenants who were liable to ejection by notice at the end of seven years and who desired to retain their holdings or from their new tenants who desired to obtain possession of the holdings. The tenants had thus either to lose their holdings altogether or to borrow exorbitant sums at high rates of interest for renewal of their leases.

To remedy the evils of arbitrary ejection by notice and the exaction of *nazrana*, the Act of 1886 was amended in 1921. The amending Act struck out the limitation placed by the earlier Act on the raising of rents of the statutory tenants but gave to all such tenants the right to retain their holdings for life at fair rent. Under this law every statutory tenant is entitled to receive a lease for ten years, instead of for seven years as under the old Act, and at the close of every such term to receive another similar lease provided that he agrees to the enhancement of rent claimed by his landlord or, in case of dispute, ordered by the court. Special provisions were made for the fixing of rent rates to be used by the court in determining fair rent, the limitation on enhancement of an anna in the rupee being removed. The tenant cannot be ejected so long as he pays the rent either agreed to by himself or determined by the court. He thus gets a life tenure. When a statutory tenant dies, his heir is entitled to retain the holding for a further period of five years, but is then liable to ejection at the pleasure of his landlord. A determined stand was made by several non-official members when the Bill was before the Legislative Council for the conferment of hereditary rights on tenants, but the Government pleaded that the taluqdars were opposed to this concession and that it was under an obligation under the terms of the Oudh Compromise not to create hereditary occupancy rights without their consent. Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru proved that a life tenancy was implicit even in the 1886 Act and that the new Act did not carry the basic principle any further. The old Act had laid down that the enhance-

ment of rent that the landlord could claim at the end of the statutory period of seven years could not exceed $6\frac{1}{4}$ per cent., whether the old tenant was retained or a new tenant was admitted, and the framers of the Act had hoped that the temptation of exacting more rent being removed, the landlords would not disturb the sitting tenants. The hope was falsified on account of certain loopholes for evasion left in the Act, but the new Act, instead of merely closing the loopholes, ought to give hereditary rights to tenants. In fact the Senior Member of the Board of Revenue had stated that the landlords were prepared to grant life tenancy in 1886, and that the Government must press for occupancy rights. It was also pointed out that even if no occupancy rights could be conferred in taluqdari areas, they could be conferred in other zamindari areas. However, the Bill did not provide for the conferment of such rights even in non-taluqdari areas, in respect of which the Government was under no kind of obligation.

While the 1921 Act thus conferred upon the tenants no rights which the framers of the 1886 Act had not intended to confer upon them, it was instrumental in preventing any tenant right from accruing in a large proportion of land in respect of which a certain amount of security against enhancement of rent and against ejection had been given. This was the effect of the provision in the new Act which considerably enlarged the extent of the *sir* lands. *Sir* land is the home farm of the landlord held in severally and with wholly unrestricted rights. The landlord does not necessarily cultivate it either himself or by hired labour, but often lets it out to tenants; the tenants, however, can acquire no right in respect of such land. The Act of 1886 conferred upon the landlords the right of *sir* in land which they had cultivated for seven years before the passing of the Act, but it did not contemplate the creation of new *sir* right in future. The Act of 1921, however, converted whatever land was *khudkasht* or happened to be cultivated by the landlord at the time into *sir*. It is believed that between 4 and 5 lakhs of acres were thus added to *sir*, from which all tenant rights were excluded. The Government's contention was that this benefit was intended for small landholders, who habitually cultivate their own land. The Council was prepared to treat the case of small zamindars sympathetically but asked that the benefit should be limited only to those who pay a certain maximum amount of revenue. The Government, however, refused to insert any provision which would insure that only petty zamindars would be the beneficiaries of the concession. A far more harmful provision that was introduced in the Act by the landlords, in disregard of the wishes of the Government, was the one which gave landowners the right of acquiring *sir* in all land continuously cultivated by them for a period of ten years commencing at any time after the Act came into force. The Finance Member, Sir Ludovic Porter, in opposing this amendment, which was eventually carried, said:

The chief objection in my eyes is that it will constitute a constant temptation to landlords to eject the heir of a

deceased tenant when he reaches the end of his five years' period. . . . If the landlord has before his eyes the possibility of ejecting an heir and taking over his holding, and eventually acquiring *sir* rights in that holding this must be a very dangerous temptation. Had the taluqdars been able to concede hereditary rights in the direct line of male descent, the objection which I am taking would, in my opinion, have largely vanished, but they have not done so; and I consider that to make this concession in the absence of any such provision is most dangerous.

In view of the fact that by another provision the landlords were permitted to acquire tenants' holdings compulsorily, on payment of compensation, for agricultural development or for their own cultivation, the concession extorted by the landlords from the Government could only be given at the expense of the tenants. Mr. H. R. C. Hailey, in opposing the proposal, said:

In Oudh it must inevitably mean that a number of families will cease to be statutory tenants and will be either dispossessed or reduced to the position of *shikmia*. Further, I would like to point out that in Oudh there is nothing to prevent the landlord from taking into his possession much of the *gobind* or *gohan*, that is, much of the best land in the village which generally, in point of fact, does amount to some 10 or 15 per cent. of the whole. There is absolutely nothing to prevent the landholder from gradually taking this *gobind* land into his possession and relegating the tenant to the bad portion of the village. It seems to me that the Council in passing this amendment would be stultifying itself. With one hand it would be granting rights to families of tenants and at the same time with the other hand providing means for those rights being taken away. . . . The inevitable conclusion seems to be that these concessions can only safely be made if hereditary rights are granted.

THE SOUTH AFRICAN PROTECTORATES.

THE question of transferring the three territories—Basutoland, Bechuanaland Protectorate and Swaziland—which are at present administered directly by the British Government to the control of the Union Government of South Africa has entered on a new phase. The Dominions Secretary, Mr. Malcolm MacDonald, announced in the House of Commons on 29th March the British Government's decision to constitute a Joint Advisory Conference consisting of the Secretary for Native Affairs and two other officials of the Union Government together with the Resident Commissioners of the territories "whose function it will be to study openings for co-operation between the Union Government and the administrations in matters affecting the development of the territories and to consider any means of joint concern to the Union and the territories such as prevention and control of animal diseases, marketing of produce, prevention of bubonic plague, etc." There can be no doubt that the setting up of this body is intended to facilitate the transfer of these vast native territories (Bechuanaland is of the size of France and Italy combined, Basutoland is of the size of Belgium and Swaziland is of the size of Wales) to the whites of South Africa. General Hertzog has long set his heart on absorbing these areas, and the British Government has taken the first step which will certainly pave the way to their complete absorption in a few years' time. The Union Government is to be permitted to issue memoranda telling the natives of "the conditions under which the territories would be governed (in case of transfer), the position in regard to the maintenance of the tribal institutions of the natives, the economic advantages which the Union Government anticipate would accrue to the peoples of the territories and any other relevant matters." The British Government has apparently succumbed to the pressure of General Hertzog.

When the British Parliament conferred self-government on South Africa in 1909, the question before the British statesmen was how far they could trust the whites in South Africa to mete out fair treatment to the natives and whether any special safeguards had to be inserted in the constitution for

this purpose. They finally decided upon adopting both kinds of measures. With regard to the natives inhabiting the colonies which formed the Union, they came to the conclusion that, subject to certain minor restrictions, native policy and native administration should be entrusted to the Union Government; but, in so far as the natives in the Protectorate areas were concerned, they would continue to be under the direct control of Great Britain, and, if and when transferred to the Union, they would be in the enjoyment of certain securities specially designed for their protection. In two respects the Union Act of 1909, based upon an agreement of the South African whites, was repugnant to British sentiment inasmuch as it attacked or threatened to attack the rights that the natives of the Union had possessed. Under the then existing laws the natives of the Cape enjoyed a franchise and could stand for election and sit in the Cape legislature. The Union Act made it ineligible for any natives to offer themselves for election to the Union Parliament. This was a direct deprivation of a right which the natives had enjoyed, at least in theory. The Act also enabled the Union Parliament to deprive the Cape natives of their vote by a two-thirds majority. The British Parliament submitted to the former deprivation with a shrug of shoulders, but the latter it tried to ward off by providing that a Bill disenfranchising the Cape natives, if passed by a two-thirds majority in South Africa, should be automatically reserved by the Governor-General for His Majesty's assent, and it was thought that the two hurdles thus provided would be wholly impassable. It was thought, first, that it would be impossible to obtain a two-thirds majority in South Africa for a Bill for taking away the native franchise and secondly, that if it obtained such a majority it would be promptly disallowed in England. "I myself refuse to believe," said the then Colonial Secretary, Lord Crewe, "that there is any probability that this particular provision will be carried into effect." We know, however, that the deprivation has already taken place. One of the two "most formidable obstacles" (to use the words of Mr. Asquith, the Prime Minister) by which such deprivation was supposed to be hedged

round, viz. two-thirds majority in the Union Parliament, was never an obstacle of any sort, and the second was completely removed by the Statute of Westminster. The colour bar preventing the natives from sitting in the Union Parliament was also expected not to survive for long. Mr. Asquith said on the second reading of the Bill :

I am sanguine enough to believe—and I do not know that the strong expressions of opinion from all quarters of the House and in the country may not in itself have some effect—that as time goes on the Union Parliament may see its way, by its own gracious and spontaneous act, proceeding of its own free will to remove this bar which for the time being, at any rate, it has seen fit to impose. Surely it would be far better, in the interests of South Africa and in the interests of all of us, to leave it to the generosity and the experience of this freely elected representative and responsible body to take that step than that under any circumstances we should attempt to force it upon them from this Parliament. . . . I hope that before very long it (the colour bar provision) will be removed.

Again, in committee he said :

It will be open to the Union Parliament, if and when it is so minded, to remove this colour bar, and for my part I do not hesitate to repeat that we hope confidently and I may almost say have the expectation, which I expressed on the second reading, particularly in view of the debate which has taken place and of the almost universal agreement of opinion in this country, that the new Union Legislature when it comes into existence, when it surveys this problem, as it will do, with a perfectly free and unfettered mind, may itself see its way without unreasonable delay to remove this colour bar, and will confer upon the natives who, as far as Cape Colony is concerned, are in enjoyment of the franchise, access, if their fellow citizens so desire it, to the Legislature itself. Is it not far better for us, having regard to all the interests which are concerned in this matter, instead of interfering from above by the exercise of what I agree to be our own absolute and sovereign authority in a matter of this kind, having placed on record, as we have in these debates, our own opinion in this matter, to leave it to the spontaneous and unfettered judgment of our fellow-subjects there, and to our fellow-subjects alone, to exercise the privilege which this constitution is about to confer upon them as a matter of grace or as a matter of right, and to recognise the desirability of extending the avenues of access to the legislature and of removing this invidious race distinction between one class of the community and the other ?

Lord Curzon said :

The prospect, the fear that any such thing (the taking away of the native franchise) may take place is one of which I, at any rate, am not at all alarmed. I cannot believe it to be in the least likely that public opinion in South Africa or in this country would allow of any such deprivation. Rather I should hope that public opinion in South Africa will steadily move in the opposite and more liberal direction in the future.

These long extracts are given here to show how catastrophically naïf was the faith of the British statesmen in the generosity of the South African whites. Sir John Harris has stated that a gentlemen's agreement had been arrived at to extend the native franchise to other Provinces. However, not only is the Cape franchise not extended, but it has been abolished; and the question of removing the other colour bar cannot possibly arise.

But the natives of the South African Protectorates the British Parliament was not so willing to leave to the tender mercies of the South African

whites. While, on the one hand, it was thought that these territories, intermixed as they are with the area governed by the South African Government, could not be permanently removed from that Government's authority, their transfer, when it comes about, must be subjected to certain conditions. Provision of eventual transfer was made in section 151 of the South Africa Union Act. This was a permissive provision which it was promised would not be brought into operation until the wishes of the local populations had been very carefully considered and until the British Parliament had had the fullest opportunity of expressing its views. The undertaking about consulting the natives has been amplified in the White Paper of 1935, agreed to by the Union as well as the British Government, to mean that the transfer "would be effected with the full acquiescence of the populations concerned," and General Hertzog himself has said that "unless these people are prepared and desirous to come in I am not going to insist upon having them." So it may be taken that the pre-condition of transfer is not only that the natives will be consulted about it, but that, when consulted, they will give their consent to it. Only General Hertzog is now to be allowed to make a propaganda drive to obtain native consent, and care must be taken to see that the natives are not jockeyed or manoeuvred into consenting. But even when the transfer takes place it will be subject to conditions mentioned in the Schedule attached to the 1909 Act, popularly called the Selborne Schedule. Lord Crewe explained, what he described as an unusual provision in a constitution as follows : "We felt bound to regard ourselves as trustees for these bodies of natives, and considering that it does not do for a trustee to hand over his trust to another man, however great his personal confidence may be in him, without a guarantee that the trust itself will be taken over, we decided to ask South Africa to accept the provisions embodied in the Schedule." These provisions form a Native Charter. The Schedule provides for the setting up of a special form of government for the Protectorates. This form of government is necessitated by the fact that the Union Parliament will consist of members whose constituencies "may have interests at direct variance with the interests of those for whom it is proposed to legislate." And the provisions of the Schedule were intended to create "something in the nature of a permanent buffer between the territories and (the South African) Parliament." In the administration of the Protectorates the Prime Minister is to be advised by Commissioners who are to have a fixed tenure of office. These Commissioners are, however, appointed by the Prime Minister, who, although bound to consult the Commissioners on any new scheme of legislation or taxation, is not bound to accept their advice. In the event of their advice not being accepted, the Commissioners have a right to record their dissent, though the Prime Minister has the power, with the concurrence of his colleagues in the Cabinet, of not publishing the Commissioners' advice if, in his opinion, such publication would be opposed to good policy. The laws and regulations are

made by the Governor-General-in-Council, i. e. by the Ministry, and are then submitted as Provisional Orders to Parliament, and unless Parliament by affirmative resolutions desire their repeal, the laws take effect. The King's power of vetoing any of these laws made is fully preserved. But, notwithstanding this, the criticism that is made against this form of Government is that the safeguards devised against unjust exercise of authority by a white Parliament are shadowy and insubstantial. The criticism is just, and means must be taken to inform the natives of the true position in which they will find themselves after transfer. For the rest, the Schedule provides for the preservation of the land rights of the native inhabitants of the Protectorates ("it shall not be lawful to alienate any land in Basutoland or any land forming part of the native reserves in the Bechuanaland Protectorate and Swaziland from the native tribes inhabiting those territories"), for the restriction of the liquor traffic ("the sale of intoxicating liquor to natives shall be prohibited in the territories, and no provision giving facilities for introducing, obtaining or possessing such liquor in any parts of the territories on terms less stringent than those existing at the time of transfer shall be allowed"), for the permanence of the native assemblies and for the application of the revenues derived from the territories to objects concerning those territories. Finally, all bills to alter the provisions of the Schedule are subject to the veto of the Crown.

The question that is very much to the fore at present is whether, since the Statute of Westminster gives full power to the Union Parliament to amend the 1909 Act in any way it likes, the Statute does not in effect abrogate the Selborne Schedule laying down the conditions on which transfer can take place. Mr. Malcolm Macdonald was specifically asked as to what bearing the Statute has upon the Schedule, and he replied, on 29th July, 1937, as follows:

It has a bearing on a certain paragraph of the Schedule and I certainly agree that, if transfer were contemplated, the general scheme of the Schedule should be observed, and anything which is in the Schedule and which is not appropriate to the present constitutional position should be a matter for discussion so that other appropriate safeguards with regard to these matters could be substituted.

Either the precise guarantees mentioned in the Schedule or similar ones so framed as not to be nullified by the Statute of Westminster are to be maintained in case of transfer. So far so good, but one cannot help coming to the conclusion, first, that the guarantees are not sufficient, and, secondly, that the natives are being hustled into consenting to transfer.

Reviews.

INDIA'S CULTURAL PAST

CREATIVE INDIA. By BENOY KUMAR SARKAR. (Motilal Banarsi Dass, Lahore.) 1937. 22cm. 714p. Rs. 15.

THE LEGACY OF INDIA. Ed. by G. T. GARRATT. (Oxford University Press.) 1937. 20cm. 428p. 10/-

COEVAL with the world's oldest civilisations creative India is yet on the threshold of a new life in common

with the young hopeful nations of modern times. To deal with the whole range of such a country's life and culture 'from Mohenjo-daro to the age of Rama-krishna-Vivekananda' might appear to many too stupendous a task for more than a scrappy treatment. But should it at all be possible for any single person to make such a gigantic effort with a large measure of success, his scholarship and intellectual acumen should be so comprehensive as to be almost encyclopaedic. In *Creative India* Professor Benoy Kumar Sarkar has come very near to achieving the impossible. He is equally at home with Eastern as well as Western learning and thus writes with comprehension. He has brought to bear on subtle themes the objective outlook of scientific criticism. His range is as wide as his field is rich. In five recondite chapters he has dealt with "India as a Creator of Values", "Indian Creations in Institutions", "The Creations of Hindu Philosophy in Political Science", "The Literature, Art and Social Philosophy of the Indian People", and "The Creations of Modern India." Of special interest are the Sections on "The Role of the Hindus in the Development of Material Science and Scientific Methods", "The Anti-Idealistic Systems of Indian Philosophy in their Bearings on Economics and Politics", "Manu as the inspirer of Nietzsche", "Kalidasa as Art-critic", "Indian Art-Principles in the Interpretations by Rodin, Van Gogh and Gauguin", "The Humanism of Namdeva, Kabir, Nanak, Chaitanya and Vemana," "Democratic Strands in Hindu Social Thought", "The Positivism of the *Dasabodha*", etc. Altogether a thought-provoking volume of rare erudition.

Turning to the chapter on "the Creations of Modern India" which covers a substantial part of the book (pp. 412-696), the reader is equally well impressed with the writer's insight, erudition, and range of interests, no less than by the mastery with which he has marshalled such vast material into an illuminating commentary on Modern India. Here he deals with "India To-day and the Equations of Comparative Industrialism and Culture-History"; with "Technocracy and Capitalism in India", as no less than with "Rammohan to Gandhi: the Quest of World-Forces and Nationalism"; with "the Futurism of Dayananda" as well as "Muslim Renaissance"; with "Indian Workingmen" as well as "The Aims and Methods of Indian Feminism"; with "The Literature and Art of Modern India", as well as "Education and Research in Science". In short, Professor Sarkar has eminently succeeded, in this close-packed encyclopaedic volume to provide his readers with a wealth of information and reflections on creative India, ancient as well as modern, hard to find within the same compass anywhere else. India, according to him, far from being weighed down by the burden of her rich traditions, is impelled by her national vitality to assimilate the *new* to the *old*. "Every man, institution and movement in India during the last three generations or so registers the synthesis of 'the home' and 'the world' in all thoughts and activities" (p. 460).

The Legacy of India is another welcome publication of like interest. India has suffered much from misrepresentations abroad by interested parties. Not being a free country she has been freely maligned by foreigners with impunity. Partly being too much preoccupied with her own internal problems and partly out of sheer helplessness she has not been able to counteract this anti-Indian propaganda. The authoritative dissemination of correct knowledge about our country and civilisation is therefore the greatest service that the friends of India can render to humanity. So far as India's past is concerned, this has been well done in *The Legacy of India*. The volume keeps up the high standard of the series

to which it belongs. Its chapters dealing with the several aspects of Indian civilisation are contributed by writers whose names are in themselves a guarantee of good faith and unquestionable scholarship. The Marquess of Zetland introduces the volume in terms that reveal close insight and correct perspective. Mr. H. G. Rawlinson points out with careful research the contributions of India to European literature and thought. India, as he has put it, "suffers today, in the estimation of the world, more through the world's ignorance of her achievements than the absence or insignificance of those achievements" (p. 36). Mr. F. W. Thomas deals with Language and Literature in two chapters that do not fail to do adequate justice to his theme despite the terseness imposed upon him by the scheme of the volume. No one is better qualified to write on "Indian Art and Archaeology" today than Codrington who has contributed one of the most valuable chapters of the book under review.

It is not necessary in a brief notice like this to stress the merits of individual contributions where the standard aimed at is the best that could be achieved within the scope of the volume. Yet, without being specially invidious, we might draw the attention of readers to some interesting chapters in particular, viz., Mr. R. P. Masani's on 'Caste and the Structure of Society', Mr. Abdul Qadir's on 'The Cultural Influences of Islam,' and Mr. G. T. Garratt's on 'Indo-British Civilization.' These, as well as Sir S. Radhakrishnan's chapter on 'Hinduism,' show that the scope of the volume is not merely archaeological. Rather, in the words of the Marquess of Zetland, "The legacy of India is not static, it is an organism growing in richness and content" (p. x). The most thought-provoking contribution in the whole book is undoubtedly Mr. Garratt's closing chapter on Indo-British Civilization. His candour may not be mistaken for pessimism, though he writes: "Unfortunately it must be confessed that the last 150 years have proved the most disappointing, and in some ways the most sterile in Indian history. The English, working or domiciled in India, have not provided a good channel for spreading abroad the more valuable elements of Indian culture" (p. 394). The present volume which is the product of joint effort by Indian and English hands is an earnest of the reorientation in Creative India.

S. R. SHARMA.

INDIA'S FINANCIAL POSITION.

INDIAN FINANCE YEAR-BOOK, 1937.

Ed. by P. R. SRINIVAS. (20, British Indian Street, Calcutta.) 1938. 27cm. 420p. Rs. 5.

THE year was a satisfactory year for world-economy. There was an increase in investment in joint-stock companies and a forward movement of commodity prices. A marked feature was the increase of Rs. 36 crores in the value of India's exports. Higher profits were realized by the cotton, tea and cement industries. There was a welcome increase of Rs. 5 crores in the railway earnings. This was a year of cheap money and consequent increase of output in almost all industries.

The Central Budget showed a deficit of Rs. 1½ crores which was wiped out by the increase in the Sugar Excise duty and the Silver Import duty. On the whole the Budget was a humdrum budget and it is a surprise that the constitutional changes entailed by the new Act do not cost India more than Rs. 42 lakhs. The debt of Bombay has been consolidated and stands at the figure Rs. 22.56 crores. In all provinces, a higher revenue is shown and Bengal has

for the first time turned the corner after a series of deficit years.

There is nothing spectacular in the Currency and Exchange review of the year under report and, in spite of the 'frequent waves of disturbance' to which the world currencies were subjected, the Indian exchange has been stable, and for this the authors of the year book give the principal credit to the Reserve Bank. In our opinion, the credit ought to go to the Bank of England which is straining every nerve to stabilise the dollar-sterling ratio; a stable rupee is simply the consequence of a stable pound. We must thank our stars that the revaluation of the dollar-price of gold proposed by U. S. has not materialized. One may bless the 18d. ratio, but one cannot help thinking that it is this ratio which has prevented India from sharing in the rise of prices all over the world.

In the year there was a 50 p. c. increase in the total visible balance of trade principally owing to the reduction of imports from Rs. 134 crores to Rs. 125 crores and the rise of exports from Rs. 164 crores to Rs. 202 crores. We are glad to note that the authors are not such fanatical free-traders as to cry over reduced imports which are, an anathema to that species. Among exports raw cotton shows an increase of nearly Rs. 11 crores and oil seeds an increase of Rs. 8 crores. Wheat has gone up from Rs. 9 lakhs to Rs. 2 crores. One of our best customers for jute manufactures is U. S., which took Rs. 8.65 crores of bags. The export of Rs. 12 crores worth of groundnuts is an important factor in our favourable balance, France being our best customer.

The Tariff Board tabular statement has been brought up to June 1935 and is a valuable summary for a layman who has no leisure to go into the minutiae of the reports of the Board. For want of space we shall only make a few comments on the leading industries, but we are sure that the whole industrial section would repay careful reading. The total production of cotton piece goods in 1936-1937 was about Rs. 300 crores of yards while the imported quantity was 76 crores of yards; so that the output of Indian mills is four times the quantity of imports. The iron and steel industry is progressing slowly but surely and imports of all kinds have declined considerably; one sign of the healthy condition of the industry is the resumption of dividends by the Tata Company, whose equipment has been "kept in first-class condition." The sugar industry in spite of protection seems to be far from prosperous, owing to the fact that the supply exceeds the demand. The authors rightly stress the need for organization and stabilization. It is to be hoped that the Indian Sugar Syndicate recently established will not allow this industry to go to rack and ruin, after such a phenomenal success.

How far backward we are in agriculture will be seen from the fact that while the average percentage of recovery of sugar in India is about 10 it is about 12½ in Java. Perhaps very few know that 70 p. c. of the production of sugar cane is used for making gur. The low quality of Indian tobacco ought to make us think furiously and the importing of foreign cigarettes is a great scandal. Sending people abroad to learn better curing seems to be one remedy. In groundnuts India occupies the first place and our exports bring us a round sum of Rs. 155 lakhs.

For the railways the year has proved to be the turning point from the financial point of view, but it is too early to be jubilant about a bright future. The company management is decidedly more economical to-day, as is shown by the fact that while State railways earned 3.14 p. c., the company-managed

railways earned 3.79 p. c. on an average. It is good that arrears of contributions to General Revenues from 1932 to 1937 have been wiped out and that we shall start with a clean slate from that year.

Even now India is behind other countries in the development of insurance; whereas per capita insurance in India is 5.5, it is 732 in England and 176 in Canada. But during the last few years there has been rapid progress; the number of policies issued by Indian companies, which was 4,12,000 in 1928, was 7,42,250 in 1934. The total business done so far amounts to Rs. 132 crores, whereas the same stood at Rs. 47 crores in 1925. In the year under report almost all the banks earned higher profits. The total advances in India, at the figure of Rs. 105 crores, indicate buoyancy of trade and industrial activity. The 3½ p. c. paper was quoted at 99 about the middle of the year, indicating easy money conditions.

The comment upon the Reserve Bank is the inadequacy of the rupee coin kept in the reserve against the note-issue; against 192 crores worth of notes in (nett) circulation, only 64 crores of coined rupees are kept, the only consolation being the 41 odd crores worth gold coin and bullion. English precedents are not a safe guide in India. In the sphere of co-operation the usual complaint about unpunctual payments is repeated in this Year-book too; this is a grave defect which the societies should consider seriously. Bombay lags a good deal behind other provinces in co-operation and occupies a rank even lower than Madras. Among Indian States the place of pride is occupied by Bhopal and Gwalior.

V. N. GODBOLE.

SHORT NOTICES.

FARM ACCOUNTS IN THE PUNJAB, 1934-35.

By LABH SINGH and AJAIB SINGH. (The Board of Economic Inquiry, Punjab.) 1937. 25cm. 296p. Re. 1-8-0.

THIS is the eleventh year's account of some farms in the various districts of the Punjab published annually. All the other usual aspects of the series, except that of the cost of lifting water from tube wells in Ambala and Jullundar districts, are to be found here.

This year with a rainfall less than the normal and with a lower intensity of farming, the estates show better net incomes due to higher prices for all crops. This year (with the exception of some un-irrigated fields and some tenants) no estate has suffered a deficit. The net income has been 52% of the pre-slump days. Work done per man and a pair of bullocks has been 273 days and 165 days respectively. The net income per day for every cultivator ranged from 0-1-5 to 1-0-1, the annual net income being Rs. 24-14-4 to Rs. 320-12-11. The wages of a casual labourer for a year ranged from Rs. 34 to 84-3-6.

The custom is to take into account the price of Bhusa and green fodder at current rates and calculate the gross income on its basis. It is to be doubted whether green fodder can be really marketed at such prices in far-off and out of the way villages where these farms lie. When all the fodder is consumed only by the working cattle it might be alright, but otherwise it will unduly swell the gross income of the estates. Especially when arriving at the proportion of land revenue to gross income, this will lead

to miscalculation. The expenditure on cattle again leads to another difficulty. Cattle other than the working force are fed and at times the amount comes to a pretty good sum. In part I holding A, the amount spent on the non-working cattle force comes to Rs. 470-3-7 (on roughage itself) and the total net income of the estate is only Rs. 886-15-10. What is the condition of a man who spends more than half his net income on his non-working cattle, how does it help him, and how can he do it? These are doubts that arise. The statement giving the proportion of the land revenue to gross and net income of land is also misleading as water rates are calculated separately. Land revenue and water rates are both paid to the Government, and the combined amounts (of water rates and land tax) should be compared with the gross and net income of land. Two instances reveal the real tax paid to Government by the landholder. In part IV holding B, the statement gives the percentage of land tax to gross and net income as 3.1% and 5.2% respectively. But, including water rates of Rs. 52-11-11, the estate pays to government Rs. 88-7-10, while it gets a net income of Rs. 502-10-3. In part VIII estate the percentage given for gross and net incomes is 14.6% and 21.1% in statement XV, but the estate pays Rs. 282-14-6 to Government as land tax and water rates while it retains a net income of only Rs. 647-2-1.

This is an excellent study of agricultural conditions and is essential for the study of agricultural economics.

N. S. S.

INDUSTRIAL WELFARE IN MADRAS. (Binny & Co., Ltd., Madras.) 25 cm. 23 p.

THIS brochure gives us an idea of the welfare work carried on by the Buckingham and Carnatic Mills, Madras, for its workers. The welfare work has been also noticed by the Royal Commission on Labour, which observed that "their manifold welfare activities include schools, meal sheds, a Co-operative Society, Workman's Stores, an ambulance corps, athletic associations, a work-peoples' institute and club, a dramatic society, debating Society and Village Committees." It is reported that there are 1200 boys studying in their schools, and that 80% of the labourers are literate. We do not think that this high rate of literacy is solely due to the educational facilities provided by the mills. There are fully trained maternity nurses to attend to maternity cases in the Mill villages. The Mills have also provided houses for 659 of their workers out of a total of 9000. We commend the Madras example to other mill-owners in India. The brochure is profusely illustrated.

S. R. V.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

POTTERY FOR HEALTH AND POTTERY AS A COTTAGE INDUSTRY. By R. V. LAKSHMI RATAN. (Author, 316, Thambu Chetty Street, Post Box 20, Madras.) 18cm. 26p.

TELLING YOUR CHILDREN. Part I-For Mothers of little Children; Part II-For Mothers of Older Children. By ENID SMITH. (The Alliance of Honour, 112-114, City Road, London, E. C. 1.) 12cm. 11 and 12p. each. -/1 each.