

The Servant of India

Editor: S. G. VAZE.

Office: SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY, POONA 4.

VOL. XXI, No. 39.

POONA—THURSDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1938.

INDIAN SUBSN. Rs. 6.
FOREIGN 15s.

CONTENTS

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	493
ARTICLES:	
Perfidious Albion.	496
The Non-Violent Guillotine.	497
Historical Aspect of Polygamy under Hindu Law. By V. V. Joshi.	498
REVIEWS:	
Rural Development. By N. S. S.	500
Socialist Interpretation of Indian History. By M. V. Subrahmanyam.	501
SHORT NOTICES	502

Topics of the Week.

Industrial Development of India.

The Congress President has done well to call a conference of the Ministers in charge of Industries in the various Congress provinces at Delhi last week-end. This is a kind of conference to which invitations might have been issued to and accepted by the Industries Ministers in non-Congress provinces as well. If anything, the latter would have felt more free to promote large-scale power industry than the Congress Ministers who are hampered by the philosophy of domestic industries of the Mahatma. The Congress President formally broke away from that incubus and declared that industrialisation, and that too by forced marches as in Russia, was essential for India. "In the world as it is constituted today a community which resists industrialization has little chance of surviving international competition." If industrialization was an evil, it was a necessary evil, he said. The remedy was to mitigate the evils of industrialization and not to resist industrialization itself.

One of the means of mitigating the evils of industrialization is the equitable distribution of the wealth among all those who contribute to produce it. We notice that in the committee appointed by the Conference capitalists and Govern-

ments and technicians are represented but not labour. It is true that the Hon. Mr. V. V. Giri is on the committee; in fact, he seems to be the moving spirit. And he has long been identified with labour. But in his present position as Minister, he may not be able to give undivided attention to labour interests. It will be a good start if labour representatives are included on the committee.

* * *

The Congress President spoke of industrialization by forced marches as in Soviet Russia. The need for such rapid marches is obvious. Only it must be remembered that the process involves the diversion of large amounts of wealth from consumption to capital, and in consequence much tightening of belts. It is to be hoped that the sacrifice will not be asked for from labourers alone but that the whole nation will share it. The resolutions passed by the Conference contemplate a harmonious development of large-scale and small-scale industry. There is room for all types of industry in India. It may be advantageous to co-ordinate cottage industry with factory industry by making the former a feeder, as it were, to the latter, as is said to be done in Japan. A decentralization of processes in the same industry as of different industries will go far to mitigate the evils of concentrated industrialism. The need for an All-India planning was duly emphasised by Mr. Giri. It is hoped that all the Provinces and Indian States will join in this very vital work of reconstruction.

Musings on Munich.

HAS the Munich Agreement ensured a peaceful settlement of Europe? Few will envy the childish naivety of Mr. Chamberlain when he believed Hitler when the latter said that his territorial ambitions in Europe were satisfied with the settlement of the Sudeten problem. Hitler emerges from the Munich Agreement with his prestige at home and abroad magnified a thousand fold. He is more powerful after Munich than before. England and France have agreed to guarantee the new frontiers of the contracted Czechoslovakia. But they had given a similar undertaking under the Covenant of the League of

Nations. They did not hesitate to ignore it. If they did not defend Czechoslovakia when it was comparatively easy to defend her with her present natural and fortified frontiers, it is hardly conceivable that they will defend the new frontier, more difficult to defend. If England and France were prepared for the rape of Czechoslovakia to-day for fear of war, are they likely to face war later? Or will they, in order to avoid the horrors of war, ask Czechoslovakia, and for that matter, other small nations, to submit to Germany and the larger nations?

* * *

WHY did England, acknowledging no imperative obligation to defend Czechoslovakia against Germany, take the initiative at all, instead of leaving it to France and Russia? Why did even Czechoslovakia rely on France and England instead of on France and Russia? Why did England and France invite Italy to Munich but not Russia? The only explanation seems to be that, much as the British, the French and the Czech democracies dislike fascist Germany and Italy, they dislike communist Russia even more, notwithstanding that in international affairs Russia had all along stood by the League of Nations ideology. Democracy has apparently greater affinity with fascism than with communism.

* * *

BUT how is one to understand the desire of the Sudeten Germans to leave democratic Czechoslovakia and join fascist Germany? However badly they have been treated in Czechoslovakia, they are not unaware of the worse treatment of Germans in Poland and Italy, nor of the tyranny of Hitler in Germany itself. By all accounts, and many authorities can be quoted to testify to it, Czechoslovakia has been most considerate to her minorities. In fact, that country has often been held up as the model for the treatment of minorities. Are the Sudeten Germans, in going over to Germany to which they never in the past belonged, not changing for the worse? If the form of a Government and its administration are significant, how is it that there are some people who at present enjoy democracy and who are promised considerable autonomy as well but yet long to come under fascist dictatorship? And how is it that we do not hear of a desire on the part of any peoples under a democracy or fascist dictatorship to come under the communist dictatorship in Russia? The explanation for this phenomenon seems to be that nationalism based on race and language and history seems to evoke more powerful loyalties than affinities based on economic ideologies or political systems and philosophies.

* * *

BUT we are presuming that all Sudeten Germans were desirous of joining Germany under Hitler.

Is that presumption itself true? Refugees who are fleeing Sudetenland towards Slovakia and Moravia are not all non-Germans. How many Germans in Sudetenland were desirous of assimilation with Germany would have been known only if there had been a plebiscite under international auspices. It is rash to jump to the conclusion that because a person is German in race and language, he must necessarily wish to come under Hitler rule. From this point of view, Hitler's own demand for a plebiscite was more reasonable than the Anglo-French proposal that all areas with 51 per cent Germans should automatically be ceded to Germany without ascertaining the wishes of the people, England out-Hitlered Hitler in the disruption and humiliation of Czechoslovakia, and in the transfer to Hitler's rule of some Germans who would have preferred to escape it.

* * *

Acceptance.

IN his speech in the House of Commons on the 3rd October, defending the Munich Agreement Mr. Chamberlain wished that the background of the meeting at Munich was remembered. "We did not go there," said Mr. Chamberlain, "to decide whether the predominantly German areas in Sudetenland should be passed over to the German Reich. That had been decided already when the Czech Government accepted the Anglo-French proposals." Who decided them and how were they accepted by the Czech Government? They were in the first instance hatched behind the back of the Czech Government. They were communicated to that Government only after they were submitted to the German Government. The Czech Government had no share in *deciding* them. Nor had it much choice in *accepting* them. In the statement issued by the Czech Press Bureau, based on authoritative and official sources, it was said that "Both Governments (England and France) had added that should Czechoslovakia not accept the offer, France could not keep her word regarding assistance as an ally and England could no longer show effective interest in the fate of Czechoslovakia." Germany did no worse than England and France in securing the *acceptance* of Czechoslovakia! Why, Czechoslovakia *accepted* the Munich Agreement as well! Where is the need then, for Mr. Chamberlain to defend the Munich Agreement?

* * *

From the Last Bastion of Democracy.

THE Pen India Centre has received a manifesto issued by twenty-nine reputed writers in Czechoslovakia. It is a "solemn appeal to all those who form the conscience of the world, in this fateful moment, when a decision between war and peace is being reached." It is as follows:

We have lived with our German fellow-countrymen for many centuries in fruitful co-operation, and we

have vied with them in cultural efforts. When, upon the battlefields of France, Russia, Serbia and Italy, we achieved the renewal of our independence, we hoped, and also endeavoured, to make the native land which we share with each other, one of the living centres of a new, a better and happier Europe. Taking our stand to-day upon the last bastion of democracy in central Europe, we proclaim in full awareness of our responsibility towards historic truth, that our nation is guiltless in respect of the catastrophe looming before us. We are doing our utmost to preserve peace, but we shall likewise do our utmost, if need be, to defend the freedom of our country. We, therefore, appeal to you, whose function it is, above all else, to keep watch over what hitherto, was the most cherished possession of Europe and the whole civilized world, love of truth, freedom of the spirit and purity of conscience. We ask you to judge for yourselves where the genuine willingness for peace and justice is to be found, and where the aggressive spirit of despotism, which utilises every device of violence and untruth. We call upon you to make it clear to the public opinion of your respective countries that, if a grievous contest is forced upon us, a small and peaceful nation living on the most endangered territory in Europe, we shall wage that contest, not only for our own sakes, but for the sake of you and of the moral and spiritual possessions common to all free and peace-loving nations throughout the world. Let nobody forget that, after us, the same fate would befall other nations and countries. We appeal to all authors and to all others who create culture, to make this manifesto known, by every possible channel, to the nations of the world.

* * *

C. P. High Court on Civil Liberties.

ON the 30th September the full Bench of the C. P. High Court delivered a judgment on the *Habeas Corpus* application on behalf of Mr. V. Y. Dashpande, which is of considerable importance. The judgment was unanimous. Mr. Justice Vivian Bose, however gave a separate but concurrent judgment in which he dwelt at some length on the constitutional implications of the case and with justifiable righteous indignation castigated the C. P. Government for its arbitrary interference with civil liberties. Both the relevant facts and the findings can be gleaned from the following extract from Mr. Justice Bose's judgment, as published in the *Hitavada* of the 2nd September :

It is all gravely disquieting. Consider these facts. On 26-10-37 a petition for remission of sentence is dismissed. On 24-2-38, just four months later, another is solemnly allowed by a Government order issued in the name of the Governor of the Province and signed by a Secretary. The due date for release is 16-4-1938. Two days before this and seven weeks after the order of remission comes this extraordinary missive of 14-4-38 which, without even pretending to cancel or modify the order of Government dated 24-2-1938, directs the Superintendent of the Jail not to release the prisoner "pending further orders"; and the prisoner's History

Ticket, which purports to record events in chronological order as they occur, contains an entry : April 16, 1938 "Released on remission." It is scored out and underneath it and clearly written after it, is an entry two days earlier (that is to say, April 14, 1938) "Detained by order of Government"; and the only order produced is this curious memorandum. Five weeks pass and still no orders are issued and then on May 20, 1938 comes this application for a writ of *Habeas Corpus*. What does it all mean? Something seems to be seriously wrong.

But however that may be, I am clear that orders of Government affecting the liberty of the subject cannot be passed in this inconsequential way (I am referring to the memorandum of April 14). Such orders are solemn constitutional acts and are rigorously circumscribed by statutory provisions and rules. Men's liberties cannot be signed away in this casual fashion. Governments cannot function in this haphazard manner. They cannot play fast and loose with men's lives.

It follows that the order of Government solemnly and legally made on 24-2-1938 had not been recalled on 16-4-1938. Under that order the prisoner was entitled to immediate and unconditional release on that day. He was, therefore, in the eyes of the law a free man from that month. Thereafter he could not be kept in custody except in accordance with the due processes of law, that is to say, except by being resented by a competent court. He has not been so resented. He is, therefore, entitled to immediate and unconditional release. I concur in the order of my Lord the Chief Justice.

* * *

Vidya Bhawan

The Vidya Bhawan is a School in Udaipur (Rajputana). Judging from its fifth and sixth annual reports and the prospectus, it is much more than we usually mean when we speak of a school. It is the aim of this school to help children develop along the lines of their own inclinations and aptitudes, and to prepare them for useful lives both as individuals and as citizens of India. To secure this end the school is using the newer methods of education which include much individual work in the standard subjects as well as a parallel programme of physical labour, sports and games. An especially interesting feature of the school life is the annual open air session when the school children and staff shift to some place of charm and interest for about two weeks. The children make studies of various kinds including the history and geography of the surrounding territory and a study of the agricultural and natural life around them. Such schools as this are especially valuable to India just now when methods of education are receiving so much thought and study. It is to be hoped that many children will benefit from this and similar schools, and that the great masses of children may some day have schools as interesting and helpful as this pioneer in the new ways of learning.

PERFIDIOUS ALBION.

THERE can be no doubt that England as represented by the *Times* and Mr. Neville Chamberlain played the decisive part in bringing about the Munich Agreement. Russia and France were allies of Czechoslovakia. So were the members of the Little Entente. But during the whole course of consultations which led up to the Munich Agreement, none of these allies, except France, was called in. Curiously enough, Italy was called in at the last moment; and even more surprising, Czechoslovakia, the party most concerned and most to lose, was throughout excluded. As the Czechs said, the decisions at Munich were about them, but without them and against them! England, which made light of, and practically repudiated the obligations arising from, the League of Nations Covenant, and had no direct treaty obligations towards the Czechs, however, took the lead and played the decisive part in bringing about the Agreement. The Czechs put their faith more in England than in Russia. France, played second fiddle to England and counted for little. The Munich Agreement was thus very largely the work of England.

From the beginning England was inspired by the desire to make friends with Germany at the sacrifice of the Czechs and conspired to that end. It should be recalled that the basic provisions of the Munich Agreement were first propounded, not by the Sudetens nor by Herr Hitler, but by the London *Times*, the mentor and unofficial spokesman of the pro-German Cabinet and the Conservative Party in England. On the 6th September last, the *Times* suggested the secession of the Sudeten districts and self-determination for the Sudeten Germans as the best solution of the problem. At that time neither the Sudetens nor Hitler had asked for outright secession or even self-determination. According to Lord Runciman, whose mission it was to promote a settlement between the Sudetens and the Czech Government and who was on the spot, the problem was still an internal one, between the State and some of its subjects. On the 21st August the Czech Government offered concessions to the Sudetens which Mr. Chamberlain said "appeared to have been regarded by the Sudeten Germans as a suitable basis for the continuation of negotiations." On the 6th September the Czech Government offered more concessions to the Sudetens, which, in Lord Runciman's opinion, gave the Sudetens all that they wanted. It was on that very day that the *Times* gratuitously suggested secession as the solution, and thereby sabotaged the conciliatory concessions of the Czech Government. So great was the British public opposition to the suggestion of the *Times* that the British Government felt it prudent to disown it at that stage.

Be it remembered that the *Times* made its suggestions nearly a week before Hitler's Nuremberg speech in which he, according to Mr.

Chamberlain, demanded self-determination for the Sudeten Germans. He had promised his armed intervention to secure this right to the Sudetens if they could not get it otherwise. Even so, Herr Hitler did not ask for the unconditional secession of any districts without a plebiscite. All that he asked for was self-determination for the Sudetens, and no more. Be it also remembered that even the Sudetens had publicly asked for self-determination only on the 14th September, two days after Hitler made that demand at Nuremberg and over a week after the *Times* made its more drastic suggestions.

On 15th September Mr. Chamberlain met Herr Hitler at Berchtesgaden. At this meeting Hitler repeated what he had said in his Nuremberg speech three days ago and asked for an assurance that the British Government accepted the principle of self-determination. Mr. Chamberlain was not in a position to give that assurance without consulting his colleagues in the British Cabinet. It seems incredible that the British Cabinet was unaware of Herr Hitler's demand for self-determination for Sudetens made some three days earlier at Nuremberg and had not formulated their attitude towards such a demand.

On returning to England, Mr. Chamberlain consulted the British and French Governments and particularly Lord Runciman who had by that time become a convert to the view of the *Times*, and put forward the Anglo-French proposals. These proposals went beyond what Hitler himself had asked for. He had asked for self-determination; that is, a plebiscite. The proposals offered him unconditional secession of certain districts, and plebiscite in other districts. The Anglo-French Governments, who had not consulted the Czech Government in arriving at their decisions, advised that unhappy Government to accept their proposals and that too immediately. The Czech Government lamented the indecency of its friends. It called their attention to the Czecho-German Arbitration Treaty of 1926 and suggested that, since the dispute, because of German intervention, had ceased to be an internal problem and concerned both the countries, the Treaty of 1926 should be invoked. Far from holding Germany to her obligations under this Treaty, the Anglo-French Governments advised the Czech Government to ignore it and hurry up with unconditional submission to their joint proposals. Under this duress the Czech Government submitted to the demands. Mr. Chamberlain acknowledged later in his speech in the House of Commons on the 28th September that in so doing the Czech Government had made immense sacrifices in the cause of world peace and had gone to the extreme limits of concessions and had thereby won world-wide sympathy.

Be it said to the credit of Hitler that he did not anticipate that the Anglo-French Governments

would agree to his demand for self-determination for Sudetens; he gave them more credit than they in the event deserved. When, at the meeting in Godesberg, Mr. Chamberlain informed Hitler that the Czech Government had agreed to the Anglo-French proposals, Hitler rejected them and put forward other and larger and more peremptory demands which, Mr. Chamberlain confessed, were totally unexpected by him and profoundly shocked him, for they amounted to an ultimatum of the most humiliating kind, terms which only a conqueror in a war was ever known to have dictated to the vanquished. Hitler's ultimatum was such that even Mr. Chamberlain could not support it and he simply undertook to forward it to the Czech Government without comment and advice. Whereupon the Czech Government rejected it on the 25th September.

But soon Mr. Chamberlain changed his mind and informed Hitler that he could get all he wanted without war and without delay, and offered to meet Hitler and this time Mussolini also to discuss details. And at Munich Mr. Chamberlain agreed practically to all the conditions of Hitler, conditions which had shocked him beyond

words a week ago. His surrender and submission to Hitler was complete, but it was at the expense and humiliation of Czechoslovakia.

What is even more humiliating and infamous is that England and France have joined Germany against Czechoslovakia. If England and France had said from the beginning, as they said in the end, that they were not going to fight for Czechoslovakia, the latter might have submitted to Germany but without the present exacerbation of feelings. At any rate, England and France would not have been parties to the betrayal of their trustful friend. They would have been free to condemn Germany even as they were free to condemn Italy over Abyssinia and Japan over Manchuria. As it is, by the Munich Agreement, it is England and France (and Italy) that guaranteed to see that the evacuation of Sudetenland was completed by the 10th October. They have agreed to do the dirty work of Hitler.

And the unkindest cut of all was to acclaim this infamous, this perfidious, this treacherous, this cowardly act of betrayal of their trusting friend to a ruthless enemy as an act of honour!

THE NON-VIOLENT GUILLOTINE

THE All-India Congress Committee which met at Delhi last week passed the following resolution on civil liberties:

Inasmuch as the people, including Congressmen, have been found in the name of civil liberty to advocate murder, arson, looting and class war by violent means, and several newspapers are carrying on a campaign of falsehood and violence calculated to excite readers to violence and to lead to communal conflicts, the Congress warns the public that civil liberty does not cover acts of or incitement of violence or promulgation of palpable falsehoods. In spite, therefore, of the Congress policy on civil liberty remaining unchanged, the Congress will, consistently with its tradition, support measures that may be undertaken by the Congress Governments for defence of life and property.

The resolution is admittedly a warning to the people, especially to those who believe that with the coming to power of responsible Congress Governments in several Provinces the hitherto suppressed civil liberties of the people are restored to them. After the spacious Karachi pronouncements of the policy of the Congress regarding civil liberties were thrown to the wind by Congress Governments in the Provinces, some such glossing over of the flagrant contradiction between word and deed was naturally thought necessary.

The preamble of the resolution speaks in the same breath of the advocacy of murder, arson, looting, class war, falsehood, and communal conflicts. All these things are regarded as equally culpable and so deserving suppression from Congress Governments. We have nothing to say in

defence of the advocacy of murder, arson, looting and things of the kind. But to place in the same list the advocacy of class struggle and falsehood (whatever that may mean) is, we shall not say foolish, but positively mischievous. The theory of class struggle is an economic doctrine. There may be Congressmen who may not believe in class struggle as a matter of fact, but that does not entitle the Congress Governments to suppress by force the activities of those who do believe in class struggle, who hold that in a capitalist society "class struggle is an ugly reality which cannot be avoided by simply ignoring it." Without discussing the theory of class struggle on its merits, we may point out that, no Government has a right to put down by force endeavours on the part of the people to advocate doctrines with which the Government may not be in agreement. Such a tendency is the surest indication of the fascist inclinations of the Congress Governments. To quote Prof. Laski on the point:

A man may say that England or America will never be genuinely democratic unless equality of income is established there; that equality of income will never be established except by force; that, accordingly, the way to a genuine democracy lies through a bloody revolution.... To most of us these views may seem utterly abhorrent. Yet they represent the generalisations of an experience that someone has felt. They point to needs which seek satisfaction, and the society gains nothing by prohibiting their expression.

Further to seek to prohibit by law speeches and writings which promulgate 'falsehoods' is the

very height of folly and intolerance. Truth and falsehood are in themselves very slippery terms. They are used in different senses by different men and by the same men at different times. Legal enforcement of the official version of such elusive ethical or philosophical notions is very undesirable. The idea is so foolish that we may not further dilate upon it. We must, however, protest against the employment of philosophical notions for the purposes of trampling over the civil liberties of the people.

The second part of the resolution is more mischievous than the first. As usual, it protests that the Congress policy regarding civil liberties is unchanged even now. But it proceeds to say that in spite of such a policy the Congress will give its support to all that the Congress Governments do to defend life and property. There is a hidden meaning to the effect that defence of life and property may be inconsistent with the maintenance of civil liberty and that in that case the latter will have to be suppressed. In this connection we may point out that if defence of life and property becomes inconsistent with the maintenance of civil liberty there must be something wrong with the government which has to face such a dilemma. Congress Governments, therefore, would do well to get at the root of the matter rather than destroy the liberties of the people under the pretext that it is necessary to do so in order to protect their lives and properties.

The resolution does not come as a surprise to us though it has evidently shocked many people, including Congressmen—people who fervently cherish the fond belief that the Congress is a revolutionary organization of the Indian masses meant to fight British Imperialism out of India. The resolution, to us, represents the logical culmination of the policy regarding civil liberties adopted by the Congress in provinces under its control. Immediately on the advent of provincial autonomy the Congress Governments made a dramatic gesture of at least partially restoring the civil liberties of the people which were hemmed in on all sides before. It was said on behalf of the Congress Governments that they were doing their very best to give to their people full measure of civil liberties and their inability to do certain things was not due to any lack of desire on their part to do them but to extraneous considerations such as pressure from the Government of India. The mettle of the Congress Governments, however, was soon put to test and their patience exhausted. They began to use the usual bureaucratic weapons of curtailing civil liberty with unusual readiness and force. They made use of the notorious Criminal Law (Amendment) Act and the Indian Press (Emergency Powers) Act. Not only that, in Bombay they actively and immensely extended the powers of the Police to deport "undesirable" persons. They refused to release political prisoners by the ingenious device

of refusing to recognize the political nature of their crime. They opened fire on gatherings of workers and even refused to institute public enquiries into the firing demanded by the people and also the Civil Liberties Union. All this they did in the name of non-violence and truth. They persuaded themselves that even Congress Governments had to govern and, at all costs, "law and order" have to be maintained. Little did they care to remember that this 'law' was imposed upon the Indian people even against their expressed wishes by an alien Government and this 'order' consisted in enforcing obedience to this inflicted law.

And still our revolutionary comrades pathetically clung to their self-imposed belief that the Congress was a revolutionary body and that it was only the Congress Ministries that were reactionary. They perhaps secretly hoped that these rather wild performances of the Congress Governments would not be tolerated by the All-India Congress Committee. Now their hopes have been dashed to the ground. The A. I. C. C. did not only ratify and defend the Congress Governments' policy towards civil liberties; it also gave them a blank cheque and supported in advance "measures that may be undertaken by the Congress Governments for defence of life and property." It need hardly be pointed out that the former avowedly bureaucratic provincial governments also resorted to repression under the pretext of defending life and property. Under the new dispensation, with its violent love of 'non-violence' and its false attachment to 'truth' added to its inherited duty of 'defending life and property' suppression of civil liberties is bound to take a more severe though a somewhat subtle form.

Some of the left wingers walked out of the meeting of the A. I. C. C. as a protest against this resolution. But that is exactly what the 'true' Congressmen want them to do, but only on a larger scale and for all time. Not only that, Mahatma Gandhi, who personifies the official Congress policy, is out to purge the Congress of all its untrue elements. What will then happen to the 'United anti-Imperialist Front'? It has already reduced itself to the level of a haphazard anti-British coalition of a motley crowd. Will it further stand the impending guillotine of truth and non-violence?

HISTORICAL ASPECT OF POLYGAMY UNDER HINDU LAW.

POLYGAMY exists to-day nowhere except among the Hindus and the Mohomedans. Mohomedan law at least restricts the number of wives to four. The Hindu law imposes no restriction at all, and thus appears to possess a lower standard of morality than the Mohomedan law. However proud the Hindus may feel of the marriage Samskara, polygamy cannot but be regarded as a big

blot on their conception of marriage. It is true that polygamy is not practised to a very considerable extent. The allowance made by law is tempered by conventions and is restricted by poverty. Still, individual lapses from the higher social conventions occur every now and then. They are all of short duration however. Tradition, drawing its strength from antiquity and continuity, is always out to condone the practice of polygamy. That it is most unjust and unjustifiable will be evident if we examine the history of the practice of polygamy under the Hindu law.

Scientists are divided in opinion as regards the origin of monogamy. Westermarck refutes the theory that promiscuity gradually gave place to monogamy. Havelock Ellis concludes that in the human species, as among many of the higher animals, a more or less permanent monogamy has, on the whole, tended to prevail. Granting that, as the story of Swetaketu goes to show, the marriage institution itself came into existence to put a check on promiscuity, surely, monogamy must have been advocated as the natural antithesis of promiscuity. The Aryans of Vedic period, living in the cold and comparatively peaceful regions of the north, had developed social conventions of a very high order. Their plain living was ennobled by a highly refined code of morality in which polygamy never found a place. The trouble arose when they left the peaceful regions. When they migrated to the plains, it was only a handful of them that could reach the distant valley of the Indus and the still more distant Gangetic plains, the countries already possessed and populated by the aborigines. Their original problem of food soon yielded place to the problem of survival. Incessant warfare became the feature of life. Physical strength came to be regarded as the most valuable virtue, and the increase of man-power the all absorbing problem of these Aryans. Men, and more men, were needed to fight the aborigines. Social values of men and women were reshuffled. Men became valuable in themselves, while the women, who could not fight, came to be valued for their capacity for running the homes and for producing more and still more sons. A wife, sterile or mother of daughters only, was superseded by another wife. Political necessity prevailed over ethical sense, and the *Taittiriya Samhita* came forward with its irresistible logic to appease the perturbed moral. It said :

यदेकस्मिन् श्रुते द्वे रसाने परिव्ययति तस्मादेको द्वे जाये विन्दते ।

यन्नेका रसानां द्वयोर्यययोः परिव्ययति तस्मादेका द्वौ पती विन्दते ॥

Because there are two strings attached to the sacrificial pole, therefore a man can have two wives but because there are not two poles attached to the string, woman cannot marry more than one husband. This easy and handy explanation emboldened *Aitareya Brahman* to lay down a rule of law एकस्य बहुवो जाया भवन्ति.

A man can have many wives but not the woman many husbands. The original permission given by *Taittiriya* for possessing two wives was enlarged indefinitely. What else can one expect when analogies from the rituals supplied the ethical principle and legalised vulgar usages? Still other factors accelerated the process. Victorious Aryans captured the women of the aborigines and assimilated them into their families as wives or mistresses. Increasing mass-contact of the Aryans with the savages of the land and a more or less tacit acceptance of the non-Aryan ideas of unrestricted polygamy and Niyoga laid the axe deep at the root of the Aryan ideal of monogamous marriage. A man was allowed to take as many wives and keep as many "dasis" as he pleased. The eight forms of marriage were recognized, ranging from marriage by rape, capture, purchase, deception and so on to the true union of the two souls, and promiscuity was legalised as polygamy. The recognition in Hindu law of the ten kinds of sonship and the right of illegitimate children to maintenance, put the bastards on a par with the legitimate children. The degeneration of Aryan marriage at this stage may be regarded as having touched the lowest level possible. Polygamy, made easy by the various forms of marriage, reduced the marriage institution to the status of legalised promiscuity. The contending co-wives were further embarrassed by the harlots and the "dasis" who openly lived in the houses and were given equal status. Homes became harems filled with a number of wives and mistresses. Illegitimate children robbed the legitimate ones of their inheritance. Women, once the owners, and ornaments of the house, were themselves regarded as chattels and objects of enjoyment belonging to the men who possessed them.

The Smrtikars, in their endeavours to bring order out of this chaos and to put a check to the practice of polygamy, formulated the conditions under which a man was allowed to marry another woman. Yajnavalkya says :

सुरापी व्याधिता धूर्ता वन्व्याथ्यन्व्या प्रियंवदा ।

स्त्रिसूताश्चाधिवेतव्या पुरुषद्विणी तथा ॥

A man may marry another woman if his first wife is addicted to drink, is deceased, cunning, sterile, profligate, a shrew, mother of daughters only, or an enemy of her husband. Manu confirms the same view when he lays down :

मयपा साधुवृत्ताच्च प्रतिकूलाच वा भवेत् ।

व्याधिता व्याधिवेतव्या हिंसार्थघ्नीच सर्वदा ॥

A wife who is addicted to drink, is profligate, opposed in interest, deceased or cruel can ever be superseded. Manu further lays down that a man desiring to marry again should wait for eight years if his wife is barren, for ten years if she gives birth to still-born children, for eleven years if she gives birth to daughters only, but he should marry another woman if his wife be a barren shrew.

वंध्याएमैऽधिआब्दे दशमेतु मृतप्रजा ।

एकादशे स्त्रीजननी सयस्वप्रियवादिनी ॥

Apart from these causes, a man was not allowed to marry another woman, and as Sage Narada puts it, the man who deserts his wife who is dutiful, virtuous, competent and mother of sons, should be brought to book by the king by heavy punishment.

अनुकूलामवाद्दुष्टां दक्षां सार्ध्वीं प्रजावतीम् ।

त्यजन्भार्यामवस्थाप्यो राजा दण्डेन भूयसा ॥

Vyavahara Mayukh mentions that punishment is ordained to the man who deserts his first wife. Smriti Chandrika emphasises the corrective aspect of the punishment for desertion, when it says :

इहलोकैऽपि तस्य राज्ञा चोरवद्दण्डनं कायम् ।

त्यागहेतुभूतदोषरहिता भार्या परित्यजन्नापि चोरवद्दण्ड्य इत्यर्थः ।

गुणवतीं पुनः परित्यजन्महना दण्डेन वशीकृत्य तस्मादेव

भार्यायामवस्थायाः ।

The king should punish the husband who deserts his wife as if he were guilty of theft. He should be overpowered by heavy penalties and made to stay with his virtuous wife. The Smritikars not only made desertion by husband a penal offence punishable with heavy penalties, but they also evolved a rule of compensation in favour of the superseded wife. Yajnavalkya states that the husband who deserts his virtuous wife and marries another, should be compelled to pay one third share of his property to the first wife and only maintenance if he has no property.

आज्ञासंपादिनीं दक्षां वीरसूत्र प्रियवादिनीम् ।

त्यजन्दाप्यस्तृतीयाराशमदृष्यो मरणं स्त्रियाः ॥

He further states that the first wife should be maintained in dignity.

अधिविभातु भर्तव्या महद्देवोऽन्यथा भवेत् ।

Compensation in the form of wealth, in the opinion of Yajnavalkya, was required to be given to the superseded wife.

अधिविभास्त्रियै दद्यादाधिवेदिकं धनम् ।

While Deval further lays down the quantum of compensation. He says :

एकामुकम्य कामार्थमन्यां लब्धुं यदिच्छति ।

समर्थस्तोषयित्वाऽर्थैः पूर्वोऽहामपरावहेत् ॥

If a man wants to desert one and take another wife out of lust, let him please his first wife by giving her wealth.

Their efforts proved unsuccessful and polygamy flourished unchecked, uncondemned. If such was the state of morality while the Hindus were a conquering race, what then must have been the state of affairs when they themselves became the conquered people? Impact with lower cultures of the invaders from outside in no small degree lowered the standard of morality. In the chaos that followed the repeated invasions of the foreigners, Hindu Dharmashastra in

the form of divergent texts and the accretions of barbarous usages remained as the only hope and solace to the bewildered Hindu community. A new cult of Kulinism came into existence. A second wife became the luxury of the rich as she is now the fancy of the educated, and not the vicious but the virtuous wife came to be superseded. Parents, anxious to get bridegrooms from respectable families offered their daughters to men already married.

Treated historically, polygamy was later in date than monogamy; it came into existence as a political necessity and flourished in the degenerated condition of the society. Whatever justification it once had, polygamy has no place to-day.

V. V. JOSHI.

Reviews.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT

BETTER VILLAGES. By F. L. BRAYNE. (Oxford University Press.) 1937. 19cm. 304p. Rs. 2.

MR. BRAYNE is a pioneer in the field; his practical work and his books on the subject have won for him great distinction. In this, his latest, the author tries to throw more light on the methods of work of rural reconstruction. The village, the home, the farm, the cattle, health, women's work, village organisation, co-operation, village school, rural finance, publicity, erosion, crime and faction are all treated in separate chapters. In another chapter he dwells on the scope for some subsidiary industries and other suggestions for rural improvement. Mr. Brayne writes, "It must not be thought that in stressing the non-material objective of rural reconstruction, I wish to deny the existence or the urgency of the problem of poverty. Poverty is there, and plenty of it, and its removal is a vital necessity. But the removal of poverty as an end in itself is bound to fail... Work must go on among all classes but the real objective of better living must never be lost sight of and it must be realised that, urgent though the removal of poverty is, work devoted to this end, unless combined with work for the raising of the standard of living, can only be a temporary palliative which in the end may lead even to greater poverty." This makes Mr. Brayne's view-point clear. He himself admits that poverty is itself a great stumbling block arresting progress, but he wants to set up a higher standard of life before giving them the means to achieve it. The rural problem is the appalling poverty, and the low standard of life is a consequence of it. It is not the mere lack of desire for a higher life, or the lack of effort to attain it, that is responsible for the low state of village life. Self-help should anywhere be the starting point, but by itself it cannot go far. The rural problem is also the national problem, and it needs a comprehensive

solution. Can agriculture assure a decent living for all the rural dwellers depending on land? Or can the subsidiary industries—mainly cottage ones, face the competition of machine manufactures and give the workers a living wage for a decent life? Are these problems such as to be solved by the villagers or by district organisations? Slavish reliance on government is bad, but should it not provide the necessary facilities needed for the rehabilitation of the villages? Exploitation of the worst type exists in the villages, exploitation by Government, zemindars, traders, money-lenders and a host of others. Governmental legislation alone can check it. Mr. Brayne shelves the main problem—the economic problem—and plans out a scheme of work. If villagers are enabled to earn and to retain what is needed for a decent life, there need not be any effort to teach them to change their mode of life. Human nature longs for ease and happiness, and rural dwellers will never fail to make use of enlarged opportunities. Teaching better life will be effective only when the taught have the economic means to lead such a life; otherwise it will be simply mocking them. Education in better life should begin when economic sufficiency is assured.

N. S. S.

SOCIALIST INTERPRETATION OF INDIAN HISTORY

THE EMPIRE OF THE NABOBS. A Short History of British India. By LESTER HUTCHINSON. (Allen and Unwin) 1937 20cm. 277p. 2/6.

MANY books have been written on the British period of Indian history, but we think that Lester Hutchinson's "The Empire of the Nabobs" is the first book which gives a new interpretation of this history, explaining how the events of the period have been determined by economic forces. The learned author of the book is frank enough to admit that he is a socialist, and by giving a socialistic interpretation of the history of the British in India, he hopes that his book would serve the purpose of an antidote to the orthodox writings which appear from time to time.

The book is divided into two parts. In the first part, the author narrates in a very interesting manner how a company of merchants was able to take advantage of the political confusion in India and carved out a magnificent empire. He points out how it was the need of controlling the eastern trade that led to the foundation of the wealthy confederation of merchants, and how after the loss of the American colonies British capitalism became definitely aggressive and concentrated its attention on India so as to make ample compensation for the loss of American colonies with the result that the whole of India became British territory.

The most interesting part of the book is the second part dealing with the history of the Indian national struggle against British Imperialism. The author rightly points out that the British conquest had created a bourgeois, who was now no longer content to act as the middleman of British Imperialism, but was determined to build up a competitive industry. Hence the interests of Indian capitalism and British capitalism began to conflict, and the fight for freedom was begun by the bourgeois leaders. The author takes us through the history of the Indian struggle for freedom and independence, and in a delightfully pleasing style narrates how the Congress was a bourgeois organisation in the beginning and how it was only after the advent of Mahatmaji that mass contact was established. He regards Gandhiji as an astute politician, and proves, by quoting a number of examples, how he is really bourgeois-minded. The reader can easily see that the author being a socialist, prefers Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru to Gandhiji, but that does not prevent him from rightly estimating the great part that Mahatmaji has played in Indian politics. The book closes with a brief description of the Indian Constitution Act of 1935 which he rightly characterises in the words of Jawaharlal as a "Charter of Slavery."

Into 262 pages the learned author has compressed all the relevant facts of the rise of British Power in India and the history of the Indian national struggle. Hardly any fact of importance has been omitted. The reader is carried on from the beginning to the end without an effort of his own. The author possesses that lightness of touch which is the secret of a literary genius. His criticism of men and things not only show his grasp of the subject but his sense of fairness.

A noteworthy feature of the book is the author's good humour, which is appreciative of the comic and lively but which is never spiteful. We give below a few samples of the author's spicy humour:

(1) "Indians were quick to realise the blessing of British impartial justice; a few years previously Clive had cheated by a forgery a Hindu banker of £ 200,000 and was rewarded with a peerage; Nandkumar alleged to have forged a will was executed as a felon." (p. 98)

(2) "The ease with which Japan vanguarded Russia was in marked contrast to the panic shown by British officials in India at the very mention of Russia." (p. 194)

(3) "Occasionally Princes who have shown signs of independent thinking or who have sympathised with nationalist feeling in British India have been deposed by a virtuous British government on the ground of immoral behaviour." (p. 148)

(4) "Mr. Gandhi hurried back from London to become a leading recruiting agent, forgetting his doctrine of Ahimsa in the necessity of killing Germans and Turks for the glory and security of the British Empire." (p. 204)

(5) "Gandhi was to give several different definitions of Swaraj in the years which were to follow." (p. 218)

(6) "It was much more difficult to persuade lawyers with lucrative practices to give them up. Here Mr. Gandhi could not give an example to them as he had no practice to give up." (p. 122)

The book is full of such interesting remarks. No one, we are sure, can close this book without feeling sincere respect for the vast erudition of the author, his resolute uprightness of thought, his impartiality and his good humour.

There is one mistake on page 76. "Hostilities between the French and English in India opened with the War of Austrian Succession which, precipitated by Louis XIV's European ambitions, broke out in Europe in 1744." Louis XIV died in 1717. If Louis XIV is a misprint for Louis XV, the latter had no European ambitions.

M. V. SUBRAHMANYAM.

SHORT NOTICES.

A SCHEME TO END UNEMPLOYMENT; PROGRESS OF THE COLONIZATION SCHEME TO END UNEMPLOYMENT.

By DEWAN KHEM CHAND. (The Author, Model Town, Lahore.) 1938. 22cm. 13, 18pp.

THE scheme with colonies of 101 square miles, with farms of 75 acres with beautiful basties well formed, with agricultural towns and an industrial centre, with all the amenities of modern life, and with a per capita income of Rs. 200 a year in a country where the average is not a few tens looks at the outset so attractive. The scheme is well spoken of by a Minister of the Punjab Government and the author claims to have received many applications from settlers. We wish all this were possible. An elementary knowledge of the economic conditions of our country will force one to laugh at the optimism of the author. Can such a colony be found anywhere on earth? If with his optimism and his gift to success the author tries to add a few rupees more to the income of the existing agriculturist, rather than hundreds to educated unemployed, it will be a distinct service to the country. Again is it very desirable that the educated should be diverted to land? Is it advisable to add to the strength of the agricultural population of the country which is even now over proportionate? The many press opinions encourage the author and we do not want to cool down his enthusiasm.

N. S. S.

THE ESSENTIALS OF DEMOCRACY

By A. D. LINDSAY. (Oxford University Press.) 1935. 19cm. 82p. 3-6-0

NINE years have elapsed since the lectures embodied in this book were first delivered in the United States of America. Far-reaching events have taken place in the interval. The totalitarian state has emerged with its elaborate technique of mass control as an alternative to the democratic state. It has emerged out of the ruins of a democracy which had no real foundations. But that has not prevented its leaders from harping upon the ruins and ignoring the foundations in a murderous attempt to denounce democracy—not this or that manifestation of it, but democracy as a form of government. It is, however, necessary before one passes judgment on any form of government to know what it implies. The essentials of democracy must be clearly grasped before the success or failure of democracy can be discussed.

To the understanding of those essentials Dr. Lindsay's book is a valuable aid. The Master of Balliol gives, within the compass of less than ninety pages, an admirable and highly instructive exposition of the fundamentals of democracy. He points out how discussion is the soul of democracy, how the purpose of democratic machinery is to bring out differences. The need for toleration emerges directly from that purpose. As the author says in the preface to the second edition, "There can, therefore, be no compromise between the totalitarian state and democracy." If democracy is to succeed in a modern industrial society, the principles of democratic government must be applied to industry. It is in the failure so to extend democracy that Dr. Lindsay discovers the root of the present crisis.

S. V. K.

DISTRIBUTIVE CO-OPERATION IN INDIA.

By V. G. RAMAKRISHNA AYYAR. (Annamalai University, Annamalainagar.) 1938. 22cm. 58p.

THIS is a reprint of a lecture delivered in the University. Of the four sections of the lecture, the first one describes the effects of co-operation on economic theory. Co-operation, it is said, helps to restore the free play of demand and supply and steers competition on right lines. Political economy should base itself on the consumers, view point, and co-operation assists in ascertaining man's needs and rationalising man's economic interests. Co-operation avoids the evils of individualism and is the right method of social adjustment. The second chapter on distributive co-operation enumerates the early attempts of Owen and other pioneers, and describes their ideals and plan of work. The growth of distributive co-operation and of Wholesale Societies in Europe are given in detail. The third

section enumerates the benefits of a store, the advantages of assured demand and the spiritual and the educative values of distributive co-operation. The last section deals with the History of distributive co-operation in India and narrates the failure of several ventures and of the success of the Triplicane Urban Co-operative Stores. The author pleads that the success of the co-operative credit movement in India should inspire the necessary confidence in the spread of distributive co-operation in India. In the towns and the villages of India the author sees a vast field for the spread of distributive co-operation. The bibliography at the end is a comprehensive one.

As an admirer of the co-operative movement the author has built up a strong case for it, but its achievements as proved by time are not very encouraging. The evils of individualism are rampant to-day as they were before the birth of the movement. Co-operation as a factor of social adjustment has not been very effective. If the movement exists to-day, it is by the sufferance of individualism, only because it has not affected individualism seriously. Co-operation as a principle has great value, but it should exist on the basis of socialism, which alone can effectively deal with the economic evils that are crushing humanity under them.

N. S. S.

SEX IN EVERYDAY LIFE. By EDWARD F. GRIFFITH. (Allen & Unwin.) 1938. 22cm. 379p. 10/6.

THIS book is a straightforward and realistic treatise on matters connected with sex in which all modern adults are interested. Beginning with a simple description of the anatomy and physiology of sex, the author proceeds to discuss at some length not only the need for birth control but also the various methods at present in use. Basing his arguments on the experience and statistics of birth control centres in England and America he draws some instructive conclusions regarding the need for population control. The appendix is especially interesting as it contains discussion on various arguments of the opponents of birth control and effectively demonstrates the worthlessness of these arguments. The pseudo-medical evidence against birth-control is shown to be nothing better than propaganda inspired in most cases by the Catholic Church. The so-called Ogino-Knans "Safe Period" method is shown to be more or less completely ineffective as a method of birth-control. That is perhaps the reason why it is so vehemently sponsored both by the Catholic church and the Japanese nationalists. Various important questions like the need for sterilisation and the desirability of standardisation in the manufacture of birth-control articles etc. are dealt with in a most reasonable manner.

Altogether the book can be described as a sane and rational treatise on matters connected with sex.

IRAWATI KARVE.

INDIA, THE FOUNDATION OF PEACE. (A SOURCE BOOK OF LEADERSHIP FOR THE NEW ERA.) Ed. by N. LAKSHMANAN, (R. S. Puram, Coimbatore.) 1937. 20cm. 168p.

THIS is a compilation of various articles in some influential papers and by revered leaders of the country. The book is divided into various chapters and the articles are assorted under various headings: Greater India, Synthesis of Indian India, The Two Blots of Hinduism, The World's Unborn Soul, Signs and Portents, The Future of Christian Missions, India's Contribution to Human Welfare is a lengthy and an original chapter. The theory of the Aryan invasion of India has also been thoroughly analysed in the chapter on the Aryan Invasion of India. There are some historians who do not accept the theory, but whatever it might be, it is good that theories of scholars are not allowed to set flame to communal prejudices in the country. Another article boldly sets out that it is the ideals of the nation and not the type of climate that matters. The heat of India, instead of enervating the people does good to them, and the ideals of the nation carry the people to their goal more than the climatic conditions. The many prefaces, introductions and the various chapters interspersed with short notes make this a new kind of book. The authorship of many articles in the *Indian Social Reformer* is not given, and whoever might be their author their worth is supreme and the compiler has done well in choosing them. The book provides much for inspirational reading. Let us hope with Dr. P. Natarajan—who has written the preface—that the present volume is but a beginning made in the direction of meeting a long-felt need.

N. S. S.

THE CHURCH TAKES ROOTS IN INDIA. By BASIL MATHEWS. (Edinburgh House Press.) 1938. 20cm. 160p. 2/-.

THE book according to the title is disappointing, for it lacks depth. It is superficial and journey-like and a less ambitious title would have better described the treatment. In his rush through India the author seems to have caught some impressions true, false and indifferent. Some of the true impressions are that India is "no longer patient and receptive, but explosive and expressive", that anyone who wants to lay true foundations must conserve "the habit of interdependent specialised service and mutual responsibilities" and that "the discipline of the individual must make for the service of the community". In fact he goes further and writes "not only should India conserve that rich possession but the West should emulate it by all available means". Further he states that those who are keen on developing "rugged individualism" and "initiative", who throw away this foundation of civilization would be "throwing away the baby with bath water with a vengeance." We will not say more on it.

YESUDAS

**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 wafer."

Available Everywhere.

**GOVERNMENT SOAP FACTORY,
BANGALORE.**

INDIAN AFFAIRS

SPECIAL PUJAH NUMBER

(September 29, 1938)

CONTENTS

Present Chaos and World Order	... By SIR S. RADHAKRISHNAN, Spalding Professor of Eastern Religions, Oxford University.
Leaders and Politics	... " K. R. KRIPALANI, Editor, Viswabharathi Quarterly.
The Sakta Cult and Hindu Religion	... " K. A. NILAKANTA SASTRI, Professor of Indian History and Archaeology, University of Madras.
The Pujas in Bengal	... " BUDDHADEVA BOSE, Editor, "Kavita."
Separatism or Self-expression?	... " DR. P. SITHARAMAYYA, Member, Congress Working Committee.
My Special Article	... " POTHAN JOSEPH, Editor, "Indian Express."
Sanskrit in Indian Universities	... " DR. C. KUNHAN RAJA, Reader in Sanskrit, University of Madras.
Cult of Islam	... " PROF. HUMAYUN KABIR, M.L.C.
A Skit	... " G. L. MEHTA (G. L. M. of Indian Finance).

Price Annas 4

The Manager, "INDIAN AFFAIRS,"
20, British Indian Street, CALCUTTA.