

The Servant of India

Editor: S. G. VAZE.

Office: SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY, POONA 4.

VOL. XXI, No. 50. } POONA—THURSDAY, DECEMBER 22, 1938. { INDIAN SUBSN. Rs. 6.
FOREIGN SUBSN. 15s.

CONTENTS

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK ...	625
ARTICLES:	
States and Paramount Power. ...	628
Zamindaris in Madras: Rents. ...	630
Indebtedness of cultivators ...	631
Repression again in Travancore ...	633
REVIEWS:	
Tariffs. By Y. V. Kolhatkar ...	634
Horrors of War. By T. K. Krishna Menon. ...	635
SHORT NOTICES. ...	635
BOOKS RECEIVED. ...	636

Topics of the Week.

The Viceroy on Indian Unity.

THE Viceroy devoted the bulk of his speech to the Associated Chamber of Commerce, Calcutta, to a plea for Indian unity through federation. He pleaded for India's unity, postulated that there was no better scheme than the federation contemplated by the Government of India Act of 1935 to achieve that unity and appealed to British India and the Indian States to give a trial to the federation. With the best goodwill it is hard to believe that the British Government, whom the Viceroy represents, is keen on India's unity. It has done everything and stopped at nothing to prevent the development of such unity: it has even destroyed its own, though unpremeditated, achievement of India's unity. The Government of India, a unitary body, has exercised these many decades direct rule over British India and paramountcy over the Indian States. Neither power was subject to any limitation, other than the discretion of the Government itself. In consequence, British India became practically a unitary state, and even between British India and the Indian States an appreciable measure of unity was achieved. There was nothing to prevent the completion of the process, if the British Government had so willed it. But since the beginning of this century it willed otherwise. It counteracted the growing unity of British India by isolating the Muslims from non-Muslims in the first instance. It followed up that disintegrating policy by subsequently dividing British Indians into over ten separate and mutually exclusive political groups. It created a hierarchy of political privilege, which naturally caused jealousies between the communities and drove them asunder. It then broke up the constitutional unity of British India which it

had itself built up; it conferred autonomy on the provinces. Then it compelled them to federate! It then broke up the unity of Indian States and British India, which was achieved by the same Government of India exercising direct rule over British India and unlimited paramountcy over the Indian States. It invented a new-fangled theory of direct relations between the Indian Princes and the Crown of England and split up the unitary Government of India into a Crown Representative and the Governor-General. Even the Governor-General it split into two: Governor-General as the Government in charge of defence and external affairs, etc., and Governor-General as head of the fantastic Federal Government—a kind of triarchy in government. It gave differential privileges as between British Indian and the Indian States and as between Indian States themselves and created mutual jealousies and antipathies. Having thus done everything to break up the growing political unity of India which the accidents of history, the administrative conveniences of the British Government and the political aspirations of the Indian nationalists had helped to build up, the British Government now pretends to be the protagonist and knight-errand of Indian unity, accuses *Indians* of being opponents thereof and appeals to them to assist its efforts to achieve Indian unity! Hypocrisy cannot be more sickening.

The Devil Quotes Scripture.

THE Under Secretary of State for India scored but a debating point when he quoted an utterance of Mahatma Gandhi at the Round Table Conference in 1931 in justification of the British Government's current policy. In reply to an interpellation of Mr. Sorensen on Dec. 19., Col. Llewellyn replied that the British Government would neither urge the Indian Princes to promote constitutional advance in their States, nor hinder them if they did. In doing so he claimed that the British Government was following the policy advocated by Mahatma Gandhi at the Round Table Conference when he said that in his humble opinion it was not open to others to say to the States what they should do and should not do.

WHATEVER might have been the view urged by Mahatma Gandhi in 1931, the British Government was not unaware when the Under Secretary of State replied to Mr. Sorensen, that the Mahatma had changed his opinion pretty radically. In fact, it would seem that the Congress Working Committee's resolution is milder than the attitude taken up by the Mahatma in his recent article in the *Harizan*. Apparently, developments since 1931, which have brought about a radical change in the Mahatma's

attitude, have made no impression on the British Government; it stands where it stood in 1931.

* * *

SECONDLY, even when he discouraged the intervention of outside bodies in the internal affairs of the States, the Mahatma never concealed his ardent desire for constitutional reform in the States, and he himself encouraged movements to that effect. The British Government, on the other hand, took up a neutral attitude openly, only to conceal its secret hostility to constitutional advance in the States. The Viceroy said that it would be left to the free will of the Princes to join the federation or not and that he would put no pressure on them. Nevertheless, he urged them to join the federation. Similarly, the Viceroy might, while refraining from putting pressure on the Princes, have urged with equal zeal that they should advance their political constitutions. He finds it consistent with neutrality to urge federation but not constitutional advance. Furthermore, neutrality of the Mahatma was based partly on the hope that the Princes would themselves advance their constitutions, and partly on the ground that the Congress was not powerful enough to give battle successfully to the Princes and the Paramount Power at once. But his desire for advance was undoubted. The British Government, as the Paramount Power, did not lack the power to persuade the Princes to advance their constitutions: it lacked the desire. While the Mahatma had the will but lacked the power, the British Government had the power but lacked the will. The neutrality of the Mahatma was benevolent, while that of the British Government was otherwise. There is all the difference in the world between the two kinds of neutrality. In any event, the Mahatma has changed his earlier attitude of neutrality; the British Government has stood pat.

Assam's Achievement.

* * *

THE Assam Ministry can very well be proud of its performance in ordering the unconditional release of the nine political prisoners which was within the jurisdiction of the ministry's discretion. We understand that there are two more political prisoners still in the Assam Province. But these prisoners belong to the "excluded areas" of Assam over which the ministry has no control. This may give our readers an idea of the systems of administration prevailing in the "excluded" and the "normally administered" areas. We do not think it necessary to comment on them.

* * *

WITH the release of the Assam "politicals," the question of the release of the Bengal "politicals" naturally comes to the fore. Bengal has a large number of political prisoners who, in spite of their abjuration of violence, are still rotting behind the prison-bars. Many responsible leaders of India, including no less a person than Mahatma Gandhi, have pleaded with the Huq Ministry for the release of these "politicals." But the Huq Ministry has been deaf to all their persuasions. What is more, the Home Minister of Bengal has made it plain that the Bengal "politicals" cannot be released all at once. What "at once" means in Huq Ministry's phraseology, we are really at a loss to understand. The Huq Ministry has been in office for more than eighteen months. Surely, it could have released the "politicals" within this period, if it had the desire to do so. The Huq Ministry plumes

itself on having appointed an Advisory Committee to examine the cases of the political prisoners and to recommend their release where possible. But, we think that this is nothing but a clever dilatory move on the part of the Government. If the Government were keen on appointing an Advisory Committee, they ought to have done so all at once, not after eighteen months of coming to office. The public has long awaited the release of the "politicals" and their patience has reached the breaking point. They cannot rest satisfied with the tardy progress made by the Huq Ministry in this connection. The time has come for the people of Bengal to rise in revolt against the Huq Ministry and to make the release of the "politicals" the live issue of the day. Resolution must be followed up with sincere zeal and strong determination. It is more than a month since the Bengal Provincial Congress Committee passed a resolution to carry on a province-wide propaganda for the release of the "politicals." But we do not think that it has energetically implemented the resolution. "The Hindusthan Standard" accuses the Congress Working Committee of not having espoused the cause of the Bengal "politicals." We think its accusation is perfectly justified. India cannot rest contented so long as political prisoners are rotting in jail; and the energies of the country should be directed towards securing their release in as short a time as possible.

The Proposed Reforms in Kolhapur.

* * *

ANENT the telegram in the *Times of India* of December 19th regarding the Kolhapur State reforms, the statement of the Prime Minister is too vague to convey any idea of the constitution of the proposed Legislative Assembly. It is learnt on reliable information that there will be only one chamber consisting of 41 members, of whom only 15 will be elected by the State and Jahagir subjects, 4 by special constituencies and the remaining 22 members will consist of the State officials, Feudatory Jahagirdars or their nominees and nominated non-officials. The Prime Minister will be the President. The House will be given very meagre powers. It will have no control whatsoever over the State budget, which will not be presented to the Assembly even for discussion. The only powers that are proposed to be given to the Legislative Assembly are to introduce bills, to ask questions and to move resolutions on matters of public interests; but the bills are subject to the veto of His Highness the Maharajasaheb and the resolutions to be passed are only recommendatory. No bill or resolution affecting the revenue of the State is to be moved without the previous sanction of His Highness. There will be a decided minority of the elected members who, all told, will represent only 47% of the whole strength of the legislature and the meagre powers that are proposed to be given to the Assembly are hemmed in by a number of restrictions to perpetuate the present irresponsible system of Government. In short the much-talked-of State Reforms are going to be a miniature copy of the Advisory Council of the Morley-Minto Reforms scheme, which in the present condition of the political awakening and the strong agitation of the State subjects for responsible government are hardly sufficient to satisfy the legitimate, minimum demands of the State subjects. The Darbar, it is learnt, also wants to include all its Feudatories in this Reform Scheme without their consent.

This has naturally evoked protests from a major portion of the Feudatories who have approached the higher authorities for redress.

Poll-tax in French India.

It is understood that the French Indian Government has proposed to levy a poll-tax on all foreigners who reside within the limits of its administration. We must concede the right of the French Government to tax its citizens, provided no discrimination is observed between the foreigners residing in French India and the natives of the soil. But we understand that the foreigners in French India enjoy no rights with regard to franchise and admission into the services. Therefore, they cannot be regarded, properly speaking, as citizens of French India. Secondly, we understand that the rate of taxation prevailing in French India averages to only eleven rupees per head, whereas the proposed poll-tax will be levied at the rate of twenty rupees per head. This, to say the least, is grossly unfair. If the foreigners are to be taxed at all, they should be taxed at a rate much lighter than the rates of taxation levied on the French Indians. British Indians form a substantial minority, nearly thirty per cent of the French India population, and any hardship caused to them will be strongly resented by the Government of India and the Indian people. Further, the British Indians play a very important role in French Indian economy both as traders and labourers. Therefore, it will be suicidal on the part of the French Indian Government to drive these people out of their administration. Having regard to all these considerations, we hope that the French Indian Government will abandon the idea of taxing the British Indians. Poll-tax is a crude and antiquated form of taxation, long since discarded for its regressive character. We do not believe that any progressive state can resort now to this kind of taxation. In this connection, we would also request the Government of India to see that the British Indians in French Indian territory are not discriminated against in any respect. India, after all, is one indivisible whole, and any discrimination practised within its limits should be strongly discountenanced both by the people and the Government of India.

Anglo-Indians.

IN his presidential address to the Anglo-Indian and Domiciled European Association at Calcutta on December 16, Mr. K. E. Wallace referred to the re-orientation of the outlook of Anglo-Indians in India. "The Anglo-Indian attitude towards the Indian has undergone and is undergoing a radical change. We are in an increasing number of ways at one with the Indian—a people of the country." The contrast between the past and the present attitude is well epitomised in Mr. Wallace's statement regarding Anglo-Indians in the army: "To-day Anglo-Indian bayonets are not turned against the Indian."

MR. WALLACE regretted that in some ways the Anglo-Indian was more European than the European! He pleaded for a radical change. He urged that in educational matters Anglo-Indians should approximate to Indian environment. He would discourage Anglo-Indians appearing for Cambridge examinations and encourage their learning Indian

languages; he would discourage hill schools for Anglo-Indians and cheapen education for them by lowering the present very high school-fees.

WITH reference to the status of Anglo-Indians in the economic field, however, Mr. Wallace was not equally explicit. He said that in no department of service had the Anglo-Indian a monopoly. "In all grades of services he was on absolutely equal terms with the Indians," except that he was better represented in certain subordinate grades of the railway, customs and telegraph services, which was partly due he said, to many of the callings in the country being closed to Anglo-Indians. He posited that "we do not seek preferential treatment." He immediately followed it up by saying: "Differential treatment does not connote preference or injustice to others." The significance of the distinction he drew between "preferential" and "differential" treatment is not clear. It is furnished by the speeches in England of Sir Henry Gidney, the substantive President of the Association. Speaking at the London Branch of the Anglo-Indian Association recently, Sir Henry complained that the Government of India was offering the Anglo-Indian the same pay as the Indian, which he contended was against the Government of India Act. He maintained that it was impossible for Anglo-Indians to start on the Indian scale of pay, and held out the threat that if that pay was offered to Anglo-Indians, they would refuse it point blank. Professions of a change in the attitude of the Anglo-Indians will carry no conviction as long as they claim preferential economic status, albeit they call it by another name.

THE fact that Anglo-Indians are to-day a privileged class is borne out by the proposal of the Association to certify Anglo-Indians. Persons who are not Anglo-Indians have been attempting to pass off for such, because of the privileges conferred on them as such. And the Association is anxious that the privileges should be reserved to statutory Anglo-Indians. As long, then, as Anglo-Indians claim a privileged position in Indian economy and polity and seek it from the British, all talk of equality and fraternity is meaningless.

Over-Crowding in Third-class Compartments.

A judgment of material importance to the third-class passengers was delivered recently by Mr. Nadkarni in the Small Causes Court, Bombay, in connection with the case of a passenger claiming damages from the G. I. P. Railway for over-crowding. The plaintiff deposed that while he was travelling by the Madras Mail in a third-class compartment, his compartment got over-crowded. The Railway officials, though repeatedly requested, did nothing to prevent over-crowding. Consequently, he was put to both inconvenience and mental worry and therefore should get damages from the Railway Company. The Railway Company contended, on other hand, that the compartment was not over-crowded, which was proved to be false. Secondly, it contended that its duty lay in enabling the passenger to reach his destination. It was not concerned whether the passenger reached his destination comfortably or otherwise. It is this latter contention of the Railway Company

that deservedly received severe stricture from the judge.

He said :

"I cannot accept the contention of the defendant that they owed no duty to the plaintiff beyond safely carrying him to his destination, if they mean thereby that their duty begins and ends with mere carrying the passenger alive to his destination irrespective of any physical discomfort or inconvenience caused to him by any negligent act of over-crowding on their part. Such an argument needs no refutation."

FOR the one case of over-crowding that has been brought to the notice of the Court, there are hundreds of thousands of such cases which go

un-noticed. The third-class travellers are generally poor and they cannot afford the expensive luxury of bringing every case of over-crowding to the notice of the Court. It is strange that the G. I. P. Railway thought it fit to contest the case and to put forth the absurd plea that it undertook no responsibility for the comfort and the convenience of the passengers. We hope that this case will open the eyes of the Railway Member to the numerous acts of commission and omissions perpetrated by the railways in India. The Railway Member is keen on seeing that ticket-less travelling shall be made a cognisable offence. But what does he propose to do with regard to those Railway officials who not only neglect their duty, but plead in a Court that the duty is not binding on them!

STATES AND PARAMOUNT POWER.

SPEAKING on the motion of Mr. K. Aiyappan asking the Cochin Government to declare that it was its aim to establish at an early date complete responsible government in Cochin, Sir Shanmukham Chetty, the Dewan, made an important statement in the Cochin Legislative Council on December 8th regarding the significance of the Winterton statement, about which doubts have been expressed in certain influential quarters. His own personal opinion, which he had publicly expressed as long ago as 1936, was that the obligations of Indian Rulers to the Paramount Power were no serious obstacle to the establishment of responsible government in the States. In his official capacity as Dewan of Cochin, however, he could not take up such a categorical position. To the Dewan it was a "problem which has to be thought out as to how far a ruler of a State can reconcile that position of responsibility to the Paramount Power, when once he divests himself of that responsibility with regard to the internal administration of the State." But whatever doubts he, as Dewan, entertained, were removed by the statement of Earl Winterton in the House of Commons, which he accepted at its face value. He suggested that those who preferred to doubt the validity of the Winterton statement and fought shy of seeking clarification from the Paramount Power, did so because they were themselves unwilling to go forward towards responsible government and wanted an excuse to cover their conservative attitude!

Whatever doubts may have been entertained by anybody regarding the binding value of the Winterton statement have since been most authoritatively removed by the written answer which the Under Secretary of State for India gave in the House of Commons on December 16. He said :

"His Majesty's Government adhere fully to the statement made by my noble friend, the member for Horsham, in his reply on February 21 last on this subject. The Paramount Power will not obstruct proposals for constitutional advance initiated by rulers. But His Majesty's Government have no inte-

ntion of bringing any form of pressure to bear upon them to initiate constitutional changes. It rests with the rulers themselves to decide what form of Government they should adopt in the diverse conditions of Indian States.

With regard to the second part of the question, the obligations of the Paramount Power to the States extend to protecting rulers against violence and disorder and to advising and assisting rulers in remedying such legitimate grievances of their subjects as may be found to exist."

It will be noticed that in one respect the present statement is an advance on the earlier Winterton statement. The latter referred to full-powered States, while the latter makes no such reservation.

Sir Shanmukham contended, however, that it was not possible to have full responsible government in the Indian States. He said :

There is no doubt that the treaty obligations will remain. My view of the treaty obligations is that so long as the treaty obligations remain, it will be the duty of the ruler in devising a scheme of responsible government to make such reservations, so that in the last resort he will have the power of carrying out those obligations in case the responsible ministers refuse to carry them out. I hope that even the greatest advocates of responsible government in this State will not deny to His Highness that power and duty of making these necessary reservations.

The Winterton statement, which Sir Shanmukham accepts at its face value, sets no limits to the constitutional advance in the States. The Paramount Power will not obstruct proposals for constitutional advance initiated by the rulers. It will not even volunteer advice; it will tender advice only when consulted. There is nothing in the Winterton statement, then, which stands in the way of full responsible government being granted in the States.

Sir Shanmukham seems to think that the obligations arising out of treaties and conventions are personal to the India Rulers and not to the Governments of the States. There is no warrant for such a view. It is the Government of a State that has obligations towards the

Paramount Power and not the Prince in his personal capacity. The Government of a State may be personal and autocratic or constitutional and democratic. As we have repeatedly contended, the mutual obligations are between the Paramount Power and the Governments of the States. It is true that the Paramount Power has an obligation to sustain an Indian Ruler on his *gadi* if that is threatened, but the Paramount Power has no obligation to retain the autocracy of the Indian Ruler. Nor will it prevent him from passing on to his people all his rights and obligations. The obligations of the Government of a State, which now rest on the autocratic ruler, will rest on the responsible ministers when the constitution is changed. If the ministers refuse to carry out the obligations, they will face the consequences, and the Paramount Power will not hold the Princes any longer responsible.

The view expressed above has since received confirmation from no less an authority than Prof. A. B. Keith. In a letter to Srimati Vengadamma of Bangalore, published in the *Hindu* of the 13th inst., he said:

"I think, however, that you exaggerate somewhat the difficulties in the way of responsible government presented by the existence of Paramountty. After all, the issue reduces itself to the fact that over Mysore the British Crown exercises certain rights, and if it decides to enforce them, the Government must give effect to the Royal instructions. But it is not necessary that the sovereign should retain for this purpose autocratic power. All that is requisite is to express as part of the constitutional law of the State, the duty of obedience to the instructions of the Paramount Power and to require the ministers and courts to give effect thereto. If they fail, then the Paramount Power may intervene and compel obedience. But it is possible that if the action impugned were that of a responsible ministry and if intervention were necessary to override their action, the Crown would be much less inclined to insist on the acceptance of its view than if the sovereign alone were concerned. The maintenance of a wide power to the sovereign may well be advocated at present, but the argument from Paramountty, though specious, will not, in my opinion, resist detailed consideration.

It is clear from this that there is nothing to prevent a ruler of an Indian State from transferring to a responsible ministry all of his, rather his Government's, obligations to the Paramount Power. Retention of power in the hands of the individual ruler is a convenience only to the Paramount Power. It is easier to understand if the Paramount Power, because of its own convenience, resisted the transfer of power from the ruler to a responsible ministry. But the Paramount Power has, by means of the Winterton statement which has since been confirmed, made a declaration that it would not stand in the way of such transfer, though it will not itself take the initiative.

Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar, the Dewan of Travancore, in his interview of December 17th from New Delhi, pretended to be unperturbed by the

statement of the Under Secretary of State confirming the Winterton Statement. It was Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar who was primarily responsible for provoking the British Government to make the Winterton statement, much to his own discomfiture. He it was who argued that responsible government was not possible in Indian States because of the ruler's obligations to the Paramount Power. He got the surprise of his life when Earl Winterton made his statement which let Sir C. P. down very badly. Sir C. P. was apparently one of those whom Sir Shanmukham had in view when he referred to some people who shied from enquiring of the Paramount Power if they stood by the Winterton statement, lest a positive and categorical answer should deprive him of the last shred of excuse for denying responsible government in Travancore. Fate ordained otherwise. Without consulting the convenience of Sir C. P. and without any further provocation from him, the Under Secretary of State confirmed the Winterton statement on December 16th and betrayed Sir C. P.

The unperturbable Sir C. P. has sought to seek some consolation even from his betrayal. In his interview he said that the phrase used in the statements was "constitutional advance" only, the interpretations of which had varied greatly and in some cases included partial and even full responsible government. He had also feared that federation meant uniformity in the constitutional development of all the units. He sought satisfaction that the Winterton statement did not stipulate responsible or partially responsible government, much less uniformity of constitutional development in all the federating units. He professed to be most pleased that the Winterton statement left to the rulers of Indian States to initiate and determine the nature and extent of constitutional changes.

But this is precisely the point which he had hitherto denied and his critics affirmed. We have all along held that the rulers were free, if *they be willing*, to establish full responsible governments in their States, and that the Paramount Power would not, at any rate openly, obstruct the rulers or set limits to the constitutional advance in the States. Sir C. P. had urged the contrary view. Now, after the confirmation of the Winterton statement, it is no longer open to Sir C. P. to pretend that the Paramount Power was cramping his zeal for responsible government in Travancore.

We fear that, like the critics whom he accused of conservative reaction, Sir Shanmukham himself is anxious to set up a bogey in order to cover his own conservatism. He is not willing to concede full responsible government to the people of Cochin and seeks an excuse for it. His protestations of his own progressiveness will be more convincing if he had gone all the length he could, even under the

limitations he conjures up, in the matter of responsible government in Cochin. To plead, as he has repeatedly done, that dyarchy is as far as

is permissible for constitutional advance in the States and yet speak of responsible government in the States is hardly reconcilable and convincing.

ZAMINDARIS IN MADRAS: RENTS.

IN the last two issues of the *Servant of India* we examined very briefly the findings of the Prakasam majority regarding the ownership of the soil and pointed out how it confused the cultivator with the rent-receiving tenant, and how it sought to benefit a rent-receiving middle class at the expense of the zamindar and the cultivator. The confusion between cultivator and rent-receiving tenant was most deplorable if thoughtless, and most mischievous if deliberate. In the present article we shall examine the recommendations regarding rents payable by the ryots to the zamindars.

The Prakasam majority recommended that the rents payable to the zamindars should be what they were in 1801 whether in kind or in money. It takes its stand on the Pattah Regulation of 1802, passed on the same day as the Permanent Settlement Regulation. It argues that if the two Regulations are taken together, it follows that not only were the dues payable by the zamindars to the Government fixed, and fixed in perpetuity, in 1802 but also the dues payable by ryots to the zamindars, and that, in consequence, all actions to the contrary during the last hundred and odd years were a violation of the intentions of the Regulations, and that it was necessary to restore the situation as it stood in 1801 according to its interpretation. It then suggests four alternative ways of discovering what the rents were in 1801.

The interpretations of the Regulations by the Prakasam majority are, to say the least, greatly strained and hardly convincing. To justify its interpretations, the Prakasam majority damn the wording of the Regulations, the actions of the Government, the decisions of the courts and even the impartiality of the judges! For instance, referring to the status of a ryot as a tenant of the zamindar and not an owner, the Prakasam majority observes: "That is how the mistake started in the Regulations XXV and XXX of 1802, at the time of the Permanent Settlement." (p. 24.) Again, "The Government abandoned that scheme when it introduced re-settlement in or about 1860 by which periodical revision of land tax was contemplated (wrongly) in Government land." (*ibid.*) Again, the Prakasam majority regrets that the action of the Government in repealing the Pattah Regulation and enacting the Rent Recovery Act of 1865 "opened up to the zamindars the door for putting forth claims to enhance the rates of rent." (*ibid.*) Holding that the ancient village republics were the foundation of the land system, the Prakasam majority laments:

"If only they had been left intact * * *." (p. 25.) Again, it speaks of the "misdirections given sometimes through the Rent Recovery Act and sometimes through the Estates Land Act, both by the Courts that were called upon to interpret and the Legislatures that were called upon to legislate." (p. 44.) Again, it speaks of the "weak point" in the Regulation in that it left it to the courts to decide disputes regarding rents and rights of occupancy. (p. 45.) Again, it speaks of "a mere over-sight on the part of the Government" in drafting the Regulations of 1802. (*ibid.*) Again, it says: "when once power was given to the Courts to decide disputes, the richer man had always the upper hand." (*ibid.*) A most damaging indictment of the judiciary! Yet again it laments: "If only they (the Regulations) had not given jurisdiction to Courts to decide these disputes but on the other hand declared in unambiguous terms that the permanent right of occupancy and unalterable character of the rate of rent in the same terms in which the peshkush had been done, there would have been no trouble at all. (p. 47.) Nor were the parties to land-rights idle all the while. The Prakasam majority admits that "the rights of occupancy of the cultivators had been disputed in some form or other until it was finally and unequivocally declared in the Estates Land Act of 1908." (p. 44.) It also admits that the permanency of the rents "has been questioned until now." (*ibid.*) Thus, if the legislature, the executive, the judiciary and the landlords had not done what they did during the last hundred years and over, the situation would have been what the Prakasam majority contends it should be! To seek to nullify the changes that have taken place during the last hundred and odd years on the sole ground that the legislature, the executive and the judiciary had all gone wrong these many years is hardly a convincing justification. Mere prescription gives the present zamindars the rights they now have, whatever might have been ancient intentions, though such rights are subject to modification if justice, equity and public policy justify the enlargement of the rights of the cultivators with respect to security and rents.

In the second place, the recommendation of the Prakasam majority regarding rates of rents was not urged in evidence by even the most ardent advocate of the ryots. This it attributes to the ignorance of the ryots regarding their rights under the Permanent Settlement and the Pattah Regulations. (p. 257.) Considering that the ryots who pay rents to the zamindars at present

include some professional lawyers, and that the ryots themselves have been awakened to their rights by the recent kisan agitation all over India, it is surprising that none of the witnesses before the Committee claimed the rights which the Prakasam majority postulates for them. It is even more surprising that none of the members of the Committee, not even the Hon. Mr. Prakasam, suggested it to the witnesses and elicited opinion there on.

Thirdly, the Prakasam majority suggests that the rates of land revenue or rents paid by ryots to zamindars in 1801 should be declared fair and equitable. This is both unfair and inequitable. The rates of rent actually paid in 1801 were themselves not uniform or based on any principle. They varied greatly, some being higher than others. In fact, it was because of this variety and uncertainty, as the Preamble to the Pattah Regulation itself admits, that it became necessary to pass that Regulation to make rents certain, though not uniform and fair. Moreover, Sec. 7 of the Regulation allowed to the zamindar not only the rent proper but several other kinds of charges, all of which were permitted to be consolidated. Even with regard to legitimate rent, it was very often fixed at half the gross produce and sometimes more, which is unconscionably high. The Government had a similar basis in the ryotwari areas, but subsequently found it too high and changed it to half the net produce, and reduced subsequently the net produce by making several allowances in favour of the cultivator. To let the zamindars now claim the rents they actually received in 1801, the least of which was half the gross produce, is inequitable.

Thirdly, if the zamindars claim their dues in kind rather than in money and claim even half the gross produce as their share, they cannot be equitably denied it. It is admitted that money

rents were not the most common in 1801. If now they are granted rents in kind, they will be free to profit by the rise in prices since 1801. Thus, the chief benefits which the Prakasam majority proposes to confer on the ryots, namely, reduction in rents and benefit of the rise in prices since 1802, will be lost to the ryots.

Fourthly, the procedure suggested by the Prakasam majority to calculate the rates as in 1801 is most uncertain, ununiform and vexatious. It suggests four alternative methods, the last of which is the least objectionable and it approximates to the settlement in ryotwari areas, except for the price rates.

The best solution of the problem of rents in zamindari areas lies in the adoption of well-known principles governing the determination of fair rents or, in the alternative, in its assimilation with the system in the ryotwari areas, as has been suggested by the representatives of the ryots themselves and advocated in some of the dissenting minutes in the Report. It is true that, as the Zamindar of Mirzapuram elaborated in his dissenting minute, even the ryotwari system of settling rents or revenue is open to many criticisms. But it can be said in its favour that it is the least open to objection. The great point in its favour is that it will be susceptible of enlightened modification at the hands of the legislature. It will also receive much better support than the proposal of the Prakasam majority.

At all events, the benefit of the standardisation of rents should go to the cultivators and not to the rent-receivers. The original intentions of the framers of the Permanent Settlement and the Pattah Regulations as well as the imperative needs of modern social justice and the economic well-being of the people call for this reform: *fixity of tenure and fair rents for the cultivators*, and not for rent-receiving middlemen.

INDEBTEDNESS OF CULTIVATORS.

IT is now almost a year since the Hon. the Premier of the Madras promised to do something radical for wiping off the debts of agricultural labourers. Mr. M. C. Rajah moved in the Legislative Assembly an amendment to the Madras Agriculturists' Relief Bill that its relief should also be extended to agricultural labourers. And in moving it, he asked, 'if the man who holds the plough is not an agriculturist, who else can be?' But he withdrew it. The Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri moved a similar amendment to the Bill in the Legislative Council. He said,

A measure which seeks to improve agriculture without touching this class of people must be considered to be every imperfect... In all measures of amelioration in the world, which purport to improve the condition of agriculture, the condition of the peasant and peasantry is given the main consideration. By this addition to the clause, I bring the peasantry within the protection of

this bill and the two amendments that I propose to clauses 8 or 9 suggest that their debts should be struck off altogether, and they should be declared free men.

The Hon. the Premier replied in the Legislative Assembly in the following terms:—

The only reason why no provision has been made for relieving such classes of people from their debts is that the steps to be taken in connection with such relief are wholly different from the steps that can be taken in respect of burdens on the classes of people contemplated in the present bill. It is not as if they are not in need of relief in the opinion of the Government.

In the Legislative Council he said,

'I hope we will be able to devise and introduce a measure to emancipate these people who may be actually called serfs and in such a measure these people will not be put in a worse position but in a better position. I do hope that the Rt. Hon. member who moved this amendment will then put the weight of all his position and support in respect of that measure.'

Further continuing his speech, the Hon. the Premier said that all free-will tenants have been included under the scope of the Bill. But it is doubtful whether any relief will be forthcoming to that large class of tenants who are called warm tenants. They are produce-sharers, and it is said that the landholders meet part of the cultivation charges. They are kicked up to a higher status as partners in cultivation with the landholders. They are not called tenants. The difficulty in defining free-will tenants, whether they are labourers or tenants, is clearly expressed by the present Chief Secretary of the Madras Government in his report as the chairman of the Madras Banking Enquiry Committee in 1930. He says,

We find it difficult, however, to draw a clear line between cultivation by farm servants and sub-letting. Sub-letting is rarely on a money rental. It is commonly on a sharing system, the landlord getting 40 to 60 or even 80% of the yield and the tenant the rest. The tenant commonly goes on from year to year eking out a precarious living on such terms, borrowing from the landlord, being supplied by him with seed, cattle, and implements. The farm servant, on the other hand, uses the landlord's seed, cattle and implements, gets advances in cash from time to time for petty requirements, and is paid from the harvest either a lump sum of grain or proportion of the yield. The farm servant may in some cases be paid a little cash as well as a fixed amount of grain. The tenant may cultivate with his own stock and implements, but there is, in practice, no very clear line between the two, and when the landlord is an absentee, it is not always obvious whether the actual cultivator is a farm labourer or a sub-tenant.

In consequence of this economic situation, the whole lot of free-will tenants who are produce-sharers will be excluded from the scope of the Act. According to the Census Report of 1931, the following is the distribution of the classes of agricultural population for every thousand engaged in cultivation: agricultural labourer, 429; cultivating owner, 390; cultivating tenant, 120; non-cultivating owner, 34; and non-cultivating tenant, 16. Hence a majority of workers on the land cannot get the relief provided for in the Debt Relief Act, which compulsorily scaled down debts in the case of all landholders, even of those who had big enough holdings to repay their debts, but excluded the jennis of Malabar paying a land revenue of Rs. 500 and over. It was this inclusion of certain landlords, exclusion of certain other landlords of similar status and exclusion of the whole class of tenants who do not hold a 'lease' according to its definition in the Transfer of Property Act, and exclusion of the whole agricultural labour class that were inexplicable. One of the Council members was naturally tempted to question the *bona fides* of the Government, when he said.

'The ryotwari pattadar held greater sway in their party meetings and tried to do something which perhaps they would not have done. They put an upper limit in the case of the Moratorium Bill and that shows they were willing to recognise that principle. Now they have given up that principle.'

The Rt. Hon. Sastri speaking on the third reading of the Bill said:

It was this disparity between the treatment accorded to the peasants and the treatment that is accorded to the big landlords that puzzled our minds. It is a puzzle to all of us."

All these speeches have been made on a *priori* considerations. For if one looks at the facts, the treatment of agricultural labour in the matter of house-sites by the Madras Government is still worse. With very good intentions of giving economic freedom to agricultural labour, the Madras Government embarked on a scheme of granting loans to them for purchase of house-sites. Lands had to be acquired. The costs went high. The High Court enhanced the costs to be paid to landholders whose lands were purchased for being distributed as house-sites. The labourers were formed into co-operative societies, and the latter were held responsible for Government loans. In the first place, these people do not even have a full meal a day. How are they to repay the loans? In the second place, they had to pay penal interest. This has happily been stopped recently. Thirdly, they had to pay for the house-sites which were unoccupied or deserted when some of them left for Ceylon and Malaya. Fourthly, they have to pay a higher rate of interest to provide a margin for the co-operative society. An army of Inspectors has been appointed to collect the loans. Recently they have been given execution powers. The Inspectors have to justify their existence. A department started to regulate the business of money-lending solely on the basis of repaying capacity cannot swallow its principles and admit the inability of agricultural labour to repay the loans. Distraint of moveables was resorted to. Sometimes the Inspector himself made personal advances in order to show good collection in his area! The amount advanced by Government is not large. The salaries and allowances paid to Labour Inspectors might well have been adjusted to these loans. Swami Sahajananda, during his last budget speech, made an appeal in the Madras Assembly to write off these loans. But there was no reply from the Hon. the Premier.

The present Government has no doubt made somewhat easy the terms for purchase of house-sites in future. The Hon. the Premier has even utilised relief funds of voluntary agencies for the purpose. But that does not solve the problem of debts of labourers due to the stringent provisions in the issue of government loans and their application on a co-operative basis to a class of people who are living on or below the poverty line.

An approach to the problem of cancelling the debts of free-will tenants and labourers lies in stiffening the exemptions of saleable properties under the Civil Procedure Code. It should be made obligatory on the courts to exempt tools, plough-cattle and implements of husbandry. The tools and

raw materials of subsidiary industries, the produce necessary for the maintenance of the cultivator till the next harvest, and the materials of husbandry should also be exempt. But restrictions on saleable rights only make it difficult for the cultivator to raise future credit. They should always be followed by an enlargement of rights in land for the cultivator of the soil which will improve his credit position. And such an enlargement of rights, by granting rights of permanent occupancy in the house-sites on which the tenant lives, as tenancy acts have done in other provinces, will solve the problem of house-sites once and for all.

We will now examine the relief granted to another class of peasants who hold small bits of land but who approximate in their status to labourers rather than land-owners. The Hon. the Premier spoke, during the debate, of the peasant-cultivator as one to whom agriculture is not only an occupation but a mode of living and who should be helped to retain his lands from passing to money-lenders. He got an opportunity to protect the peasant proprietor when Mr. Peddi Raju moved an amendment and the Rt. Hon. Sastri seconded it, that an area of 5 acres of wet or 15 acres of dry land should be exempt from sale in execution of decrees by courts in the case of agriculturists. But the Hon. the Premier replied that the result of such a provision would be fragmentation of holdings with a view to evade repayment of debts. No agriculturist would deliberately restrict his credit by dividing his holdings among the sharers. If he did so after incurring debts, a creditor could proceed on all the joint family property, even though the property had been divided. Secondly, "fragmentation" upto a minimum holding must be something which the Hon. the Premier should welcome as it increased the number of peasant proprietors. If the amendment proposed had been accepted, it would have wiped off the debts of those holding 5 acres wet or 15 acres dry or less. The corollary to such an amendment is that the produce also will be exempt in the execution for past debts for the object of exempting land is to save the produce for the subsistence of the cultivator.

As the exemption of a holding in the case of every agriculturist will affect greatly the credit system, it may be restricted to owner-cultivators as proposed by the Tamil Nadu Conference in January 1938. The Faizpur Congress has laid down the programme that debts which are beyond the capacity of peasants to pay, should be liquidated. The Bihar Congress Ministry has given effect to it by exempting in the Money-lending Act of 1938 a small portion of land of small agriculturists from sale in execution of decrees. We hope that the Hon. the Madras Premier will give effect to the mandates of his party organisation.

The indebtedness of artisans and working classes in towns is in no way less, either in its extent or in its severity, than that of agricultural labour.

The Whitley Commission on Labour recommended in 1931 the cancellation of debts which could not be repaid from the surplus of three years by an industrial worker. The Rt. Hon. Sastri was one of the members of the Commission. The C. P. Government have given effect to this recommendation. The Hon. the Madras Premier was very particular during the debate to commit the Rt. Hon. Sastri to a policy of supporting the cancellation of debts of peasants. But such a policy recommended by him as a member of the Whitley Commission in respect of industrial labour has been put into force in another province. During the final debate on the Debt Relief Bill, Mr. Sastri said:

I will pledge my word to-day that he (the Hon. the Premier) will have my support for that bill when he does produce it. I only wish that he would produce it quickly for he has given a subordinate interest to the peasant; the responsibility of bringing the bill now rests with the Hon. the Premier.

It is significant that the plea for protection for the underdog came in Madras, not from the members of the scheduled classes who never pressed for the passing on to the sub-tenants, the relief granted to rent-receivers in the matter of rents in the Debt Relief Act or for wiping off of the debts of their community; nor from the Trade Unionists who have never urged for the liquidation of debts of industrial workers as possibly these champions of labour in the class struggle of to-day have become absorbed in that all-pervasive divinity of the Congress which claims to have the uncommon capacity of representing conflicting interests; but from members nominated by the Governor and from the big land-holders in the Legislative Council!

REPRESSION AGAIN IN TRAVANCORE

IN an earlier issue of our paper, we had congratulated the Travancore Government on their having released the political prisoners on the birth-day celebrations of the Travancore Ruler. We thought that the wise policy then adopted would be carried to a successful conclusion and Travancore would regain its reputation as one of the most progressive States in India. But all our fond expectations have been belied. The demon of repression has reared its head again in the Travancore State and the State people have decided to face it with grim determination.

So far as we can gather, this new instalment of repression in the Travancore State is due to the over-strict measures adopted by the Government in connection with the impending visit of the Viceroy to the State. The Travancore State Congress has decided that during the forthcoming visit of the Viceroy it would adopt all peaceful methods to impress on the representative of the Paramount Power the urgency of the demand for responsible government. Of course, the methods it wants to adopt for the purpose will be perfectly peaceful and constitutional in nature. The *modus*

operandi of the methods can be gleaned from a statement issued recently from Bombay by Mr. Kuruvila, a prominent member of the Travancore State Congress. Mr. Kuruvila says:—

In spite of the Dewan's attempt to "smuggle in" Their Excellencies to Trivandrum through an obscure route, the people would line the entire route, holding placards, demanding the immediate grant of responsible government under the aegis of His Highness the Maharaja and the release of the State from the present Dewan. If the Travancore Government do not interfere in the demonstrations, they will be most peaceful and loyal.

we see nothing wrong in this move of the Travancore people to represent their grievances before the Viceroy. After all, the Viceroy is the ultimate authority over all the States and if the grievances of the people are not redressed by the States, they must necessarily approach the Viceroy for suitable action. But the Travancore Government wants to create the wrong impression in the Viceroy that all is well with the Travancore State. It knows that it cannot succeed in doing so, unless it smothers public opinion and puts responsible leaders behind prison-bars. It has, therefore, adopted a repressive policy to put its ideas into execution.

The repressive policy of the Travancore Government has manifested itself in the heavy sentence passed on Miss Mascrene, a redoubtable leader of the Travancore State Congress, in the banning of the Travancore State Congress Conference which is to hold its session in the last week of December, in the banning of the Travancore State Congress Volunteer organisation and in the prosecution on a charge of sedition of the signatories to the memorial against the Dewan. With regard to the heavy sentence passed on Miss Mascrene we have nothing to say except that it is a very heavy and vindictive sentence based on wrong reports, passed on one who was carrying on perfectly constitutional agitation for the establishment of responsible Government in the State. As regards the State Congress Conference, we should like to mention that one of the purposes of convening the Conference was to decide about withdrawing the memorial which had been submitted to the Maharaja against the Dewan. The purpose of the Conference being well-known, The Travancore Government ought to have encouraged the Conference to come to a decision on the matter; for the withdrawal of the memorial would have obviated the necessity of prosecuting a number of influential people and creating further trouble in the State. But the State authorities, curiously enough, have banned the Conference altogether. Secondly, it should be borne in mind that only the the State Congress Conference has been banned. The ban does not apply to any other Conference held under the auspices of the Travancore State Congress. We wonder why the State Congress Conference alone has been singled out for this invidious distinction. Is it because, as the Magistrate anticipates, it will be attended by

about a lakh of people and create a mass awakening the like of which was never seen in Travancore before.? In any case, we cannot but hold that the grounds for banning the Conference are most unconvincing, and no blame can attach to the State Congress for having decided to disobey the ban. Again, the volunteer organisation has been banned on most flimsy pretexts. The Government says that the wearing of badges and uniforms creates the impression that in the promotion of political activities, the volunteers will usurp the functions of the military and the police. This is indeed a very novel argument. Every organisation has its volunteer corps to see that peace and order are maintained within the organisation. The Congress, The Muslim League and the Hindu Mahasabha have each of them a volunteer corps of its own and that too on a much bigger scale. But, we have never heard any body complaining that they ever usurped the functions of the military and the police. The volunteer corps is a perfectly innocuous body resembling the military and the police in nothing else except dress, and we fail to understand how it can become a dangar to the state. The order of the Travancore Government, therefore, smacks of nothing else than unwarranted repression and should be resisted by the state Congress.

Lastly, we come to the prosecution of the memorialists. If the memorial was addressed to the Maharaja against alleged mal-administration by the Dewan, it cannot be called an act of sedition. The Dewan is not the state, and an offence against the Dewan cannot therefore be regarded as an offence against the state. If the Dewan had any grievance against the memorialists, he could have sued them for defamation. But to charge the memorialists with sedition and then to establish a special tribunal to try their case, is hardly meting out justice to them. The memorialists, pressed by Mahatma Gandhi, were about to withdraw the memorial, and if they had been given the chance, they would have done so. It would have been, on the whole, far better for Travancore to settle this matter amicably rather than drag it to the Court. But the Government evidently is not bothered by such considerations. It persists in widening the gulf between itself and the people which every body will admit is not a happy augury for the well-being of any state.

Reviews.

TARIFFS.

TARIFF LEVELS AND THE ECONOMIC UNITY OF EUROPE. BY H. LIEPMANN. (Allen & Unwin.) 1938. 22cm. 424p. 21/-.

THE severity of the world depression of 1929 was attributed among many other factors to the growing tendency among the nations of the world towards the adoption of protectionist policies. The

first attempt at a statistical examination of the tariff levels throughout the world was undertaken by the Economic Section of the League of Nations Secretariat. Its inquiry covered the period between 1913 and 1925 and included all nations in the world. Similar attempts were made later by the English Committee on Industry and Trade and also by the Vienna Section of the International Chamber of Commerce.

Dr. Liepmann's work is in a way a continuation of the work done by the League Secretariat, in that it covers the period between 1927 and 1935 more exhaustively than the years before 1927. He has, however, instituted a comparison between the tendencies visible in the first decade of this century and those that are apparent in the later years. It is worth noting, however, that he confines his analysis to a rather restricted field of fifteen countries in Europe.

Even so, it is quite evident that the task was of extra-ordinary magnitude and required the construction of statistical tools which must have exercised greatly Dr. Liepmann's ingenuity. One such tool deserves mention, namely, the device of 'potential tariff levels' calculated by averaging the actual tariffs. He divides the countries between two groups, viz., agricultural and industrial, and applies this tool to ascertain the effects of tariffs on their foreign trade. His inquiry leads him to the conclusion that the tariffs in Western Europe were higher than in 1913 by about 30 p. c., and that agrarian protection had been more pronounced every where than protection to the manufacturing industries. All this has naturally led to a decline in international trade relative to the trend of secular growth.

Dr. Liepmann's work constitutes a very exhaustive and painstaking research and should always be an excellent book of reference.

Recent tendencies of regulating international trade by quotas, quantitative regulations, exchange controls, etc., could not be taken into account in a book which deals primarily with inquiries into tariffs only. This somewhat mars the results of the inquiry, since the foreign trade of every country is influenced by non-tariff regulations as much as by tariffs. Further research of a complicated character is, therefore, necessary in this field.

V. Y. KOLHATKAR.

HORRORS OF WAR.

WHAT EVERY MAN SHOULD KNOW ABOUT WAR. By HAROLD ROLAND SHAPIRO. (Allen and Unwin.) 1938. 19cm. 135p. 3/6.

THIS is a book well worth being written; and it is written in the shape of questions and answers, in a realistic way. The answers come from some men that are dead, and others who are living. They come like bullets from the mouths of machine guns, correct in aim, and as irrevocable in result. The book is the outcome of the researches into the medical annals of war time. It is sure to find its way into the heart of every man and woman who glances through it.

Here in India no one cultivates a war mentality. No one can and no one does. Here all are for peace and non-violence. This book will have, must have, one should say, a prominent place in the study of every young man in Europe. For in this book, in objective starkness, is told

what the past war was and what the next is likely to be. Life in trenches, effects of bombs and poison gas, wounds and weapons, work in war hospitals—it is sickening to read the chapters on these; and when one remembers that this is not the narration of an innocent nightmare of an idle dreamer, but of facts from authoritative documents, the agony is terribly enhanced. Here it may be relevant to say that in this book of 118 pages, the references run to 15 pages. It is stated that, on certain occasions, soldiers had to stay motionless in trenches for 2 to 5 days at a time, knee-deep in mud and water, contaminated by all sorts of infectious germs and infested by every sort of conceivable insect. And, after that, when they rest, it is merely a drunken sleep they get that deludes the needs of spent bodies. If we look at the world war from another aspect, we find it cost 30,000,000 lives and more than £ 80,000,000,000 in property. The net money cost of war to all belligerents alone came to £ 38,200,000,000. With those men and that money, could we not have made a heaven of this earth? Let the echo of this question reverberate in the world.

T. K. KRISHNA MENON.

SHORT NOTICES.

THE ALL-INDIA INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL DIRECTORY 1938-39. Ed. by M. G. DESAI AND G. R. S. RAO. (The All-India Industrial Federation, Medows House, Medows Street, Fort, Bombay.) 1938. 31 cm. 51 p. Rs. 2.

THE Directory is a splendid compendium of the Industrial and Commercial activities of the whole of India, including also the Indian States. It begins with learned articles on subjects of industrial and commercial interest penned by such celebrities as Sir M. Visvesvarayya, Messrs. S. P. Mehta, J. C. Kumarappa, Hon'ble Mr. Govindlal Shival Motilal and Professor B. P. Adarkar. It then gives a short history of the most important industrial, banking and insurance concerns of India which are of absorbing interest to the public. The later portion of the Directory is devoted to general information, places of industrial and commercial interest and technical institutions of various kinds. The Directory contains an exhaustive list of all the industrial and commercial concerns of India. The get-up and printing are excellent. We wish the publishers every success.

2. The *Indian World* (Monthly):—The Indian World is a new venture in the field of Indian journalism. The editor of the paper is a well-known publicist of Bombay and we are glad that he is taking very great care to see that the journal excels in the choice and importance of its articles as it does in its get-up and appearance. We wish the journal every success.

S. S. MISRA.

PRIMARY EDUCATION IN INDIA. By DINKAR DESAI—Servants of India Society, Bombay. 1938. 18cm. 128p. Re. 1/4.

IN this book Mr. Desai makes a comprehensive survey of primary education in India to-day. He points out the defects which result in the slow progress that is being made towards mass education. But the value of this study is in the constructive

ideas and suggestions as to how India can provide all children with at least four years of schooling which will result in permanent literacy for all. This four years course is the aim for the immediate future. As soon as this new system is working, steps are to be taken to provide longer and more comprehensive school courses.

The work includes suggestions for courses of study as well as detailed plans for the all important means of financing the proposed effort towards a literate India within a few years.

The suggestions in the study are based in part on the experiences of other countries who, in the not distant past, met and solved problems that face India to-day.

M. C. RAO.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- INDIAN FEUDAL STATES AND NATIONAL LIBERATION STRUGGLE. By AKSHAYAKUMAR R. DESAI. (Author, Varma House, 14th Road, Khar, Bombay.) 18cm. 64p. As. 4.
- HINDU-MUSLIM UNITY. A Challenge to the Communists!!! By N. S. BAPAT. (Author, 1228/1, Deccan Gymkhana, Poona 4.) 18cm. 16p. As. 2.
- THE FAR EAST. AN INTERNATIONAL SURVEY. By HAROLD S. QUIGLEY and GEORGE H. BLAKESLEE. (World Peace Foundation, Boston.) 1938. 20cm. 353p. 75 Cents.
- THE WORLD COURT 1921-1938. A Handbook of the Permanent Court of International Justice. By MANLEY O. HUDSON. (World Peace Foundation, Boston.) 1938. 20cm. 345p. 75 cents.
- THE GANDHI SUTRAS. By D. S. SARMA. (Author, Principal, Pachaiyappa's College, Madras.) 1938. 18cm. 152p. Re. 1-8.
- MODERN MONEY. By MYRA CURTIS AND HUGH TOWNSEND. 1937. 20cm. 320p. 5/-. (George Harrap & Co.; Received through Oxford University Press.)
- FAMILY BUDGETS, 1935-36, OF SIX TENANT-CULTIVATORS IN THE LYALLPUR DISTRICT. By LABH

- SINGH AND AJAIB SINGH. (Board of Economic Inquiry, Punjab, Lahore.) 1938. 24cm. 38p. As. 6.
- URBAN WORKING CLASS COST OF LIVING INDEX NUMBERS (1937) IN THE PUNJAB. By RAM LAL. (Board of Economic Enquiry, Punjab, Lahore.) 1938. 24cm. 10p. As. 8.
- AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS OF THE (BRITISH) PUJAB, 1936-37. By GULSHAN RAI. (Board of Economic Inquiry, Punjab, Lahore.) 1938. 24cm. 14p. As. 4.
- ADMINISTRATION REPORT OF THE NAWANAGAR STATE, 1936-37. (Dewan, Nawanagar State.) 1938. 24cm. 104p.

BHULABHAI DESAI'S SPEECHES

Published in Book Form. Of particular interest to students of Politics, Law, Economics and Commerce.

The Book contains the great leader's lectures on these and other subjects of national interest.

Price:

Rs. 3/8/- India

Sh. 7/6/- Foreign

Postage extra.

Can be had of all leading booksellers,

WHEELERS BOOK STALLS,

or please write to:

G. A. NATESAN & COMPANY,

Publishers, MADRAS.

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.

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

Available Everywhere.

**GOVERNMENT SOAP FACTORY,
BANGALORE.**