

Servant of India

Editor : S. G. VAZE

Office : SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY, POONA 4

VOL. XXII, NO. 27 }

POONA.—THURSDAY, JULY 13, 1939

{ INDIAN SUBSN. Rs. 6
FOREIGN 15s.

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	341
ARTICLES :	
The Congress	343
Danzig	345
The International Situation. By an English Correspondent	346
Amendments in the Bombay Tenancy Bill	347
Indians in South Africa. — The Murray Report. By P. Kodanda Rao	349
SHORT NOTICES	352

Topics of the Week.

Temple Entry.

THE opening of the famous centre of orthodoxy, the Meenakshi temple in Madura, to Harijans is an event of more than passing interest. It appears that on the 8th July a party of five Harijans, accompanied by the President and Secretary of the Tamil Nad Harijan Sevak Sangh and the Executive Officer of the temple, entered the temple for the first time in history and marched right up to the point to which only Brahmins were hitherto allowed, and that the priests officiated for them as they would for Brahmins, while a large concourse of people present on the occasion raised no objection. It is reported, however, that the President of the Varnashrama Swaraj Sangh subsequently raised objection to the entry of the Harijans, or rather intimated to the officiating priests that the entry of the Harijans had polluted the temple, and that, therefore, purification ceremonies should be performed before normal worship was resumed. The Executive Officer is reported to have said that, apart from a convention, there was nothing to prevent the Harijans from entering the temple, and that there was no objection raised when the Harijans visited the temple. It is too much to hope that the Sanatanists will quietly acquiesce in the new departure, even if they do not welcome it. Nevertheless, it is highly significant that Harijans were able to enter the Madura temple without any objection or incident. Once the ice is broken, opposition will wear down in course of time. The example of the Madura temple is bound to influence the other greater and lesser temples in South India in ever widening circles. It is a matter of great gratification that, without legislative pressure or even without an unofficial referendum or other semi-coercive device, the Harijan Sevak Sangh of

Tamil Nad was able to secure the entry of Harijans in the Madura temple.

Economic vs. Social Ills.

WHILE there is no need to over-estimate the importance of temple entry for Harijans, it is unwise to under-estimate it either, as Mr. Basudev seemed to do when he spoke on the occasion of the public celebration on the 7th July of the eightieth birthday of Dewan Bahadur R. Srinivasan, the veteran Harijan leader of Madras. Mr. Basudev said that the urgent needs of the Harijans were economic uplift and not temple-entry. To identify the Harijans with the poor and confine economic uplift to Harijans is to do an injustice to millions of non-Harijans who are equally poverty-stricken and who equally need economic uplift. Even if all the Harijans are poor, all the poor are not Harijans. A social group is not necessarily an economic group. Social illis need social remedies and economic illis need economic remedies. To prescribe economic remedies for social illis or vice versa is inappropriate.

UNTOUCHABILITY is a social evil, not an economic one. The poorest Brahmin may enter the *sanctum sanctorum* of the Madura temple but not the richest Harijan. The poor person, whether Brahmin or Harijan, cannot afford expensive luxuries or even necessities. Untouchability can be eliminated only when all social discriminations based on untouchability are removed. And temple entry is the final test and, as such, has supreme significance. The place of temples in the scheme of things is an entirely different question. Nobody need be obliged to enter a temple if he did not want to; but nobody, Harijan or otherwise, should be prevented from entering a temple if he wished to. And Mr. Srinivasan was among those who confessed to his attachment to the temples, and there are many like him.

Of course, temple entry for the Harijans should not be allowed to obscure the economic needs of the poor, Harijan or otherwise.

Regulation of Money-lending in Mysore.

THE Legislative Council of Mysore State passed recently a Bill which has for its object the regulation of money-lending transactions and the giving of relief to debtors. Compared to similar legislation passed recently in British Indian provinces, this is an exceedingly mild measure, but is certainly a step in the right direction. It provides for the institution of a system of registration of moneylenders, upon whom is cast the obligation of keeping regular accounts

of all loans, passing receipts and furnishing statements of accounts to debtors. Wherever registration of moneylenders is enforced, it is usual to provide in the law that no moneylender who is not registered can institute a suit for the recovery of a loan advanced by him. But one misses such a provision in the Mysore Bill.

* * *

THE other part of the Bill relating to grant of relief to debtors lays down the maximum rate of interest to be allowed by a court in a suit in respect of loans advanced after the commencement of the Act to be 9 and 12 per cent. in the case of secured and unsecured loans. Compound interest is not to be abolished, but the maximum rate of compound interest is fixed at 6 per cent. with yearly rests. The maximum amount of allowable interest will be governed by the rule of *damdapat* which will be enforced in respect of arrears of interest on loans advanced either before or after the commencement of the Act. The rule of *damdapat* is made to apply, in many provinces of British India, to paid as well as unpaid but accrued interest. This will show how much more lenient the Mysore Bill is to the creditor class than similar Acts passed or being passed in British India.

* * *

Usufructuary Mortgages in Orissa.

ONE feature of the Orissa Moneylenders Act, of which several portions were brought into operation since the beginning of this month, deserves notice. It relates to usufructuary mortgages and provides that such mortgages executed after the commencement of the Act shall be deemed to be discharged after the expiration of 15 years from the date of the mortgage, and that the mortgagee shall make over to the mortgagor all documents in his possession relating to the mortgaged property and, if required, shall retransfer the property to the mortgagor at his own cost free from the mortgage and from all encumbrances and shall also put the mortgagor in possession of the property. A similar provision obtains in Bengal and Bihar.

* * *

At It Again in Kenya.

SPEAKING on his resolution in the Kenya Legislative Council, recommending the organization of local financial resources for local development independently of London, Major Cavendish Bentinck confessed his political motives which underlay what on the surface seemed to be an innocent economic proposal. He said:

The truth of the matter is that we here have outgrown this type of Colonial Office control, and if we are not given a more effective voice and increased powers in regard to our own affairs, we shall take them sooner or later.

This is the language of threat. The least acquaintance with the politics of Kenya will leave no illusions as to whom the gallant Major had in view when he spoke of "we" in his speech. He was not referring to the people of Kenya, but to the handful of Europeans, who want control over the thousands of Indians and millions of Africans; in fact, his objective is European imperialism in Kenya. With an equally amazing impudence, the Major spoke only of the European needs for finance, while professing that his resolution expressed the opinion of the country as a whole. Mr. J. B. Pandya did well to reiterate the Indian opposi-

tion to the relaxation of the Colonial Office control and indignantly repudiated the claim of the Europeans to speak on behalf of the country. The claim, combined with the threat, was apparently too much even for the otherwise complaisant Government, who, with the help of the Indian votes, defeated the resolution.

* * *

Anti-Segregation in the U. S. A.

IN view of the steps that are being taken by all Governments in this country, and particularly the Congress Governments, to eliminate the anti-social incidents of untouchability, it is very interesting to note a significant parallel movement in the U. S. A., which is in striking contrast with the policies advocated and imposed in South Africa. The Washington correspondent of the *Madras Mail* reported as follows:

No more significant social change has taken place in the United States since the Civil War of three quarters of a century ago than that now being promoted by legislation in many of the most populous States. The most radical of all has just passed the New York legislature and comes in force on July 15. It imposes a penalty of both fine and imprisonment for failure to give equal rights to all persons, of whatever colour or race, in hotels, show houses, privately operated buildings for business or residential purposes, restaurants or any enterprise open to the public. With similar but less far-reaching statutes recently enacted in several of the more important States, a profound forward step has been taken to ensure social freedom for the Negroes, who form one out of every nine persons in the nation. The United States constitution long has provided equal status for all citizens, following Lincoln's Gettysburg address, but the Congress never implemented the two amendments by legislation, letting each commonwealth devise its own methods of enforcement. This change has no relation to the prowess of coloured men as college champions in track athletics or in football, their current dominance in three major classes of prize fighting, the fact that a negro woman is the leading mezzo-soprano concert singer of the country or the successes of eloquent Negro preachers, lawyers, playwrights, actors and musicians.

* * *

THE correspondent further says:

The credit for this social advance must be ascribed largely to the coloured people themselves. In their great emigration from the South to the North in the last twenty years they have not sought to edge themselves in where they were not wanted. They accepted patiently the advice of their more gifted leaders that culture should precede demands for their civil rights. So it was that when New York City started two huge residential enterprises for coloured people, equal in every respect to the non-slum homes for low salaried white persons, there was no protest of race discrimination even in districts which elect Negroes to the State legislature, minor judges and members of the City Council. They did not intrude into white public schools where adequate educational facilities were provided in districts predominantly occupied by the black race. The more fortunate in a financial sense avoided the fashionable night clubs, general hotels, high class restaurants and similarly took modest seats in theatres, symphony, concerts and other public performances. They challenged no race question. They mingled promiscuously with their white neighbours only in the transit conveyances, the public parks and the seaside beaches. They provided their own doctors, dentists, hairdressers,

laundries, garages and incidental business outlets. The fact that members of their race passed brilliantly in the West Point examinations for the army and at Annapolis for the navy, insuring them an officer's rank, brought no racial rush for equal recognition, nor did their high rating for many positions in the civil service.

It should be noted, however, that New York is by no means the worst or the typical State with regard to the treatment of the Negroes. It is only when this new enlightened movement spreads to the Southern States that the problem may be said to be well on its way to solution. The significance of the policy of New York is not, however, on that account to be underestimated.

* * *

Jamkhandi.

NOTICING the administration report of Jamkhandi State for 1936-37 last year, we ventured to complain about the lack of information in it about the working of the Representative Assembly. We are glad to find that the report of the State for 1937-38, which has recently reached us, removes that ground of dissatisfaction. It is observed that in a "supplementary report" designed to cover the "four months ending 31st July 1938" is given information about the work of the fifth session of the Assembly which met on August 16, 1938, and the following three days. Apart from the discussion of the State budget, the Assembly had for consideration 95 resolutions on matters of public interest, only 34 of which seem to have been discussed, while as many as 61 were not reached for want of time. This shows the need of allowing more time for non-official business which, we hope, is being done since.

* * *

THE number of educational institutions remained unchanged at 75, but the number of pupils increased by a little over 300 to about 6,200. Both primary and secondary education is free in the State, which is doubtless a feather in its cap. But from the point of view of the goal of universalisation of education, this is not enough. With a population of 1,14,282, the number of school-age children in the State would be over 17,000, all of whom must be brought under instruction sooner or later. In other words, the field so far covered is only about one-half of that which is yet to be covered. And there can be no question of the desirability of this being done within the shortest time possible. The only way of doing so both effectively and economically, if a long-range view of the matter is taken, is by making primary education not only free, which it already is, but also compulsory. We hope the problem will be carefully gone into by the educational authorities of the State at no distant date.

* * *

ON the unduly heavy proportion which the Civil List bears to the income of the State, we have commented in the past more than once. We do not propose to repeat all that was said on former occasions except to point out that our criticism holds good, even in so far as the report under notice is concerned. To spend about Rs. 1½ lakhs out of the total State income of nearly Rs. 9¼ lakhs on the up-keep of the royal family, while nation-building services like education, sanitation, medical relief, etc. are suffering for

want of funds can by no stretch of imagination be looked upon as a fair arrangement. It is noticed that a curtailment of the Raja Saheb's personal and private expenditure by about Rs. 28,000 was announced by him last year. For this he deserves the thanks of his people. We hope the Raja Saheb will scrutinise his Privy Purse with a view to cutting out mercilessly all needless expenditure.

* * *

DURING the year under report a start was made with rural uplift work in the State. The finance for such work is generally provided by voluntary contributions supplemented in some cases by Government grants. In Jamkhandi, however, a novel plan was hit upon for this purpose. It seems that at the time of the World War the villages in the State contributed towards the War Loan. These amounts had not been refunded to the respective contributors. And it was thought they might as well be diverted for purposes of uplift work in the villages. The approval of the contributors to this course was duly obtained and the idea was put into force. About Rs. 6,000 of the War Loan money was spent during the year on village public works like the construction of a road, a temple or a dharamshala or repairs to such buildings, wells or drains. More funds of a like nature, which are available for the purpose, are going to be put to a similar use. Instead of these funds being used for private purposes, it is very creditable that they are being utilised for a public purpose of the highest moment.

Articles.

THE CONGRESS.

RECENT events in the Congress transcend party politics; they raise issues which even non-Congressmen cannot ignore. Under the authority of the Tripuri session, the All-India Congress Committee, at its last session in Bombay, passed two resolutions which have raised a storm of protest from certain Leftist elements. The first of the two contentious resolutions demanded that no Congressmen should offer or organise any form of satyagraha in the administrative Provinces of India without the previous sanction of the Provincial Congress Committee concerned. The second emphasised the need for close co-operation between the Congress Ministry, the Congress party in the legislature and the Provincial Congress Committee concerned, but banned the interference of the P.C.C. with the Ministry in administrative matters, while permitting representations to be privately conveyed to the Ministry with regard to any particular abuse or difficulty. In matters of policy, it banned a public discussion of any differences between the P. C. C. and the Ministry and advocated reference of any differences between the two to the Parliamentary Sub-Committee. When these resolutions were proposed in the A.I.C.C., they were strenuously opposed by the leaders of the Leftists, but they were carried by majorities of 2 to 1. Certain

of the Leftists, led by Babu Subhas Chander Bose, were not reconciled to their defeat and have organised public demonstrations against these resolutions and requested the Working Committee of the Congress to hold them in abeyance pending their reconsideration at the next session of the A.I.C.C. or the Congress itself. Babu Rajendra Prasad, the President of the Congress, considered the action of Mr. Bose, as not only undesirable and unwise, but also a breach of discipline, calling for action under the disciplinary rules of the Congress. In the name of democracy and civil liberty and the more fundamental interests of the Congress and the country Mr. Bose defied the advice.

There is one aspect of the resolutions which should be above criticism and which, it would seem, has not been challenged. And that was the one which forbade the interference of Congress parties in the legislature with the Ministry in administrative matters. It is a wholesome rule in all circumstances.

Controversy has gathered round the other parts of the two resolutions. And unfortunately it has been surcharged with mutual suspicions of ulterior motives. The resolutions, on their merits, seem to be more appropriate to a political party rather than to a national institution embracing a variety of opinions. In so far as the Congress considers itself a national institution rather than a political party, it may not expect that conformity which is appropriate only to a political party.

Granting that the Congress is only a political party, albeit the largest and the most influential one, it would seem that the resolutions are not only appropriate but inevitable. No political party worth its name can permit an open defiance of its considered policies arrived at after full and free discussions. Discipline is essential to a party. Those who are unable to reconcile themselves to the prevailing policy should either convert themselves into a majority or get out of the party if they mean to defy it in action. In the present instance, Mr. Bose asks that Congressmen should be free, while remaining Congressmen, to oppose openly the policies of Congress Ministries and to offer or organise direct action against them. If Mr. Bose's view be accepted, the Congress will cease to be a political party.

The situation is complicated by the fact that Mr. Bose himself and several others who organised the demonstrations against the A.I.C.C. resolutions are office-bearers of subordinate Congress bodies. Mr. Bose himself is the President of the Bengal Provincial Congress Committee, and as such, is expected loyally and even cheerfully to carry out the decisions of superior Congress organisations. The private member has in this respect greater freedom of action than an office-bearer. Mr. Bose and other office-bearers might have re-

signed their offices before they embarked on their campaign to bring about a change.

It must be noted that in challenging the resolutions in question Mr. Bose was not asking formally for the abrogation of party discipline and loyalty, but for what may be feared will lead to it. It is true that so far Mr. Bose or his colleagues have not taken any action in defiance of the resolutions of the A.I.C.C. Mr. Bose has merely claimed and exercised the democratic right to ventilate his views in order to persuade the majority to accept them. He claimed that, while submitting to the resolution of the A.I.C.C., he was entitled to plead that they should be rescinded by a body competent to do so, namely, the A.I.C.C., and in the meanwhile, their operation should be suspended by a body competent to do so, namely the Working Committee. In so far as this is the position, it would seem that there is no case for disciplinary action to be taken against him or his colleagues. If Mr. Bose was free to oppose the resolutions in the A.I.C.C., he is free to oppose them outside and win support for his view. However unwise and suicidal it may be, Mr. Bose should be free to advocate the virtual abrogation of party discipline in the Congress. It is for others who believe in party discipline to oppose his contention and expose its anarchic consequences. It is somewhat unfortunate that the President of the Congress thought it a breach of discipline to advocate breach of discipline and threatened Mr. Bose with disciplinary action. As Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru pointed out in his very clarifying statement, Mr. Bose himself will regret the course of indiscipline he is now advocating, particularly if it is taken by dissentients in his Forward Bloc.

Mr. Bose justified his revolt against discipline because of his revolt against Congress policy. The Congress Ministries and those in command in the Congress had lost their revolutionary urge and had relapsed into mere constitutionalism. And they had passed these two resolutions in order to cover up their retreat from revolution. Mahatma Gandhi had said that there was no atmosphere for non-violent mass action just now. Mr. Bose thought otherwise. It was to save the Congress from sinking into constitutionalism and parliamentarianism and to win it back to its revolutionary and anti-imperialistic crusade that he felt obliged to raise the standard of revolt.

Whatever be the merits of the case, it is most important to realise that the Congress is no longer a united party with one policy but a parliament of parties with different and divergent policies, each trying to capture the institution for its own purpose and by its own methods. Each party, as long as it remains a party, may command discipline from its members, but the Congress can no longer hope to do so.

The development of differences of opinion is not new in the history of the Congress. It has happened before when the so-called Moderates and

Extremists differed in their policies. In the past, however, the dissenting minority, — first the Extremists, and later the Moderates, — seceded from the Congress rather than remain within in revolt. The dissenters of to-day choose a different course.

DANZIG

PEACE and war hang in the balance at the moment over the question of Danzig, and the final outcome will depend upon Herr Hitler's estimate of the readiness of Great Britain and France to give effect to their guarantees to Poland or instead at the critical moment to perpetrate another Munich. Given the will to peace on the part of the parties concerned, the Danzig problem should be easy of an amicable settlement. The Free City is 95 per cent. German but depends for its prosperity on the trade that passes through its port with the Polish hinterland. Nature has thus brought Germany and Poland together at this spot, and they can live together happily if they want to. The architects of Versailles felt that they would and in the arrangements made by them recognised the needs of both countries. They created the Free City giving its citizens full autonomy in all internal matters, and though the Nazis are in power there at present, their ideological development is wholly unhampered. The Versailles Treaty also found it necessary, however, to give Poland an outlet to the sea through this city, and Danzig is thus within the Polish customs frontier. This is in no way detrimental to the interest of the German citizens, for experience has shown that Danzig was economically starved when commerce could not pass through the Vistula to the outside world. The present status of Danzig is thus as much to the advantage of Germany as of Poland, and any minor difficulties that may arise are easily capable of adjustment provided that there is a desire for adjustment. Just as Poland needs access to the sea, so Germany needs access through the Province of Pomorze, or the so-called Corridor, to East Prussia. But in this matter Poland is willing to meet Germany. As the Polish Foreign Minister, Col. Beck, said, "We have given to the German Reich all railway facilities. We have allowed its citizens to travel without customs or passport formalities from the Reich to East Prussia. We have suggested extension of these facilities." But Herr Hitler insists on having a railway line at Germany's own disposal possessing extra-territorial rights, which would naturally infringe on Poland's sovereignty over her own territory. He also insists upon the incorporation of Danzig into the Reich. These are demands which obviously Poland cannot entertain.

Danzig is her lifeline. As Henry C. Wolfe has said: "If Hitler can obtain Danzig, he can

seriously threaten Poland's slender hold on the Corridor. Only fifteen miles of the Corridor separate the Danzig district from the main body of the Reich. Once in control of Danzig, the Nazis could rake the Corridor with their artillery from both sides. They could bombard Gdynia, Poland's miracle city on the Bay of Puck, less than a dozen miles north of Danzig. And the Germans could cut Poland's main railway, which runs from Warsaw via Danzig to Gdynia. Many military observers believe, indeed, that if Hitler can get hold of Danzig, he can drive the Poles out of the Corridor. Once shut off from the Baltic, Poland would be at the economic, and to a large extent the military, mercy of the Reich. For these reasons the Poles are determined to hold the Free City." With naval bases established at Koenigsberg, Memel and Danzig, Germany would have Poland completely under her control, and there can be no question that if Poland could feel certain that the guarantee given to her would be made effective she will resist Hitler's aggressive demands to the uttermost. Britain and France too show in their recent pronouncements that they are in no mood for appeasement any longer and that if Poland considers her vital interests to be threatened and resists German aggression she could depend upon all the support which it is within their power to give. It is difficult to believe that Hitler would dare challenge these Powers together with Russia which seems about to conclude a defensive alliance, if he were convinced that Britain and France would not hang back at the last minute, advising Poland too to abstain from resistance. And he is pursuing the same methods as he used so successfully last September. He would not himself forcibly bring about an Anschluss. The Fuehrer of the Nazi Danzigers, Herr Forster, will see to it that the population of Danzig itself expresses a desire for union. The Germans in Danzig are no more enamoured of going under the Reich flag than were the Sudeten Germans of Czechoslovakia. But they are terrorised into asking for "a return to the homeland." The principle of self-determination which was carried out at Munich will then have to be carried out here, and Hitler will come in only to remove any impediments that may arise in the way of its execution. Poland has declared that if the status of Danzig is altered by force, it would constitute aggression, which she would resist. Great Britain and France have declared that if Poland resists they would follow suit. But the question that haunts people is whether these Powers would not have the same result brought about by negotiation, with force at the back of course, as at Munich.

INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

(BY AN ENGLISH CORRESPONDENT)

SINCE September last the international situation has changed its colour. A number of new forces and considerations have come into play and in the light of these the chances of peace and war have now to be differently assessed.

The hope widely held last autumn that Hitler, having achieved his successes, would, like Bismarck before him, go on the defensive and try to consolidate his gains has now been more or less given up. There is little doubt that he aims at dominating Europe, and through this at imposing, in association with Japan, a Fascist order on the rest of the world. If he cannot achieve this by bloodless means as in the past, he will make war.

The only thing with which the Nazi movement is really comparable is the Mohammedan outburst in the seventh century. There are striking similarities between the two. They are both essentially military; both appeal to the 'plain man'; both repudiate the traditional civilisation.

With the growing understanding among the English public of the true nature of Nazism there has come a remarkable stiffening of opinion. Whereas last year the main interest of the public was the maintenance of peace, at almost any cost, to-day it is the checking of the spread of Fascist ideas and Fascist order. Public opinion made essential the Polish and other guarantees and the profound changes which these imply in British policy.

Thus it seems that we stand before an almost inevitable conflict and an ideological one. There is no denying that, even though the issue may be confused by the presence of dictatorial Russia on our side, in the last analysis the conflict is between the democratic way of life and the Fascist way of life. It is only because the British public feels that the social and constitutional ideas for which it stands are vitally threatened that it has reacted so powerfully in the last few months—to the extent, for example, of accepting peace-time conscription. Had it been more far-sighted the reaction would have come earlier, but democracies are proverbially slow to see when their democracy is threatened.

In view of the tremendous consequences of war, efforts will continue to be made on the British side to reach a negotiated settlement with Germany. In return for real guarantees for peace (e. g. disarmament) we should be prepared to go a long way in a colonial and economic settlement. Also there is no possibility that the British Government, deciding that war is inevitable, will force a war on Germany; war will come only as the result of a great aggressive move by Germany.

But one thing is certain: attempts by Germany at expansion *by force* will henceforward be met by force. That is the meaning of the Peace Front.

The full efficacy of this is at the moment gravely affected by the slow progress of the Russian negotiations, and there is a great deal of perplexity in the West to interpret the Russian attitude. Admittedly in the past the Western democracies have been unwilling to enter into too close association with Russia. For this there were a number of reasons—conservative prejudice, a scepticism about Russia's military effectiveness after the purge, or her intention in the event of war to exert its power to the full, fear that, once assured of British support, Russia might launch a preventive war against Germany. On the British side these difficulties exist no longer, and we are seeking an alliance on the basis of complete reciprocity. Russia is, however, asking us to guarantee the Baltic states—against their will. This is a very difficult thing for us to do as it comes rather near to establishing a kind of protectorate over them.

Whether the Russian alliance goes through or not, the Peace Front policy, in its basic conception, is likely to dominate British foreign policy during the whole of the next period.

In the meanwhile changes have been taking place on the Axis side. As a result of the Peace Front negotiations, German propaganda has succeeded in convincing the German people that they are being 'encircled'. Thus there has taken place a rally to the support of the Nazi government—another vital factor in setting the stage for war.

It would be foolish to comfort oneself with the delusion that when the struggle comes it will be over quickly. Left-wing propagandists make a great error when they underrate German military power and morale. The democracies will have to develop a unity hitherto lacking if they are to be the ultimate victors. But if they can in fact act together and have the resolution to sustain the first shock their superior economic resources will in the end tell.

In conclusion, it is as well to take note of some of the more comforting factors. Very slowly balance does seem to be moving in our favour. Our armaments programme is now getting into its swing, the air-defences of London are much improved, our aircraft production is said to equal or surpass that of Germany. The U. S. A. moves slowly but distinctly towards closer co-operation; the pro-British demonstrations during the Royal visit were of considerable significance. The agreement with Turkey was a bad blow to Mussolini and is an interesting sign that Turkey does not doubt the result if war comes. China continues to engage the main attention of Japan.

If war comes the main danger to the democracies will be disunion. Their potential strength, economic, military and moral, surpasses that of the dictatorships; the issue will be decided by whether they are able to make this strength

actual. But the prospects of German victory to all countries and parties concerned for the liberal and democratic way of life would be so catastrophic that, unless reason fails entirely, they may

be expected to sink their differences and achieve a unity of purpose corresponding to their unity of interests.

Oxford

AMENDMENTS IN THE BOMBAY TENANCY BILL

THE Select Committee which sat on the Bombay Tenancy Bill has, it must be acknowledged, introduced considerable improvements in the Bill. The personal sympathies of the Revenue Minister, Mr. Morarjee Desai, in favour of such improvements were never in doubt. It redounds very much to the credit of Mr. Desai that he has been able to overcome by his own insistence the opposition coming from influential quarters and to extend the scope of the measure in the interest of the tenant class.

The greatest improvement that the Select Committee has made consists in very largely increasing security of tenure for the tenant body. For one thing, the arbitrary limit of 33½ acres of wet and 100 acres of dry land has been done away with. There was no sense in making the protection to be afforded to tenants dependent on the size of their landlords' holdings. The real reason for imposing the limit was one of political expediency, and it is well that it has ultimately given way. There is only one restriction now left in the Bill, viz., that the tenant should be on the land continuously for six years at the least. This restriction too might as well have been removed; it has no justification. In recent tenancy laws passed in British India occupancy right is not made to depend upon prescription or lapse of time; and the Bombay Government need not have copied the Bengal Tenancy Act in this respect. For another thing, those tenants who will not obtain protected status, of which permanent occupancy right is the chief incident, will obtain limited security, i. e. for ten years, it being provided that no lease shall be for less than this period.

The area of protection will thus, as we have said, be greatly extended. But the extension is still not adequate. There is no scope in the Bill for the future growth in the number of protected tenants. The class may diminish in the course of years, owing to the power of re-entry most unreasonably allowed to the landlords under the Bill and for other reasons; but it cannot possibly increase. Other tenants will all be liable to be ousted at the end of ten years, and no provision is made for their obtaining occupancy right afterwards. Even if the Bill had conferred the status of a protected tenant on those who had remained on the same land for six years thereafter, the landlords would easily have defeated the purpose of the clause by moving their

tenants, as has been the experience in provinces in which occupancy right was thus regulated, from the land before the expiry of six years. But the Bill does not make this kind of provision; it mentions a definite date, 1st January 1938, before which the tenant should have been in continuous occupation of the land for not less than six years if he is to be regarded as a protected tenant. This makes it clear that the size of the protected tenant class will be determined finally now and cannot hereafter be expanded on any account.

No Bill which does not provide for extension of occupancy right in future can at all be regarded as satisfactory. The Bombay Government should have adopted, and we are still in hopes that it will adopt, a provision analogous to sec. 40 of the C. P. Tenancy Act, which is now proposed to be strengthened still further, laying down that whenever a tenant can prove to the satisfaction of a Revenue Officer that his landlord is a mere rent-receiver, he will be entitled to permanent occupancy right. Mr. Parulekar made this suggestion in the Select Committee, but did not receive support from Government whose supporters were in a majority in the Committee, with the right of independent vote being previously taken away from them. This would be by far the best solution of the grave problem of land passing from the hands of the cultivating into those of the commercial classes. But if this is considered too radical a solution—and there is no reason why a Congress Government should be less radical than what a bureaucratic Government was more than forty years ago—the Bombay Ministry may adopt the solution of awarding compensation for disturbance to those tenants whose tenancy is terminated by their landlords without reason. The classical example of this form of protection against arbitrary ejection is to be found in the Irish Land Laws, from which it has been copied in other countries. At one time this form of protection was adopted in the Central Provinces as something inferior to permanent occupancy right and was later discarded when occupancy right became almost universal. In Ireland the scale of compensation for disturbance that was first provided by the Landlord and Tenant Act of 1870 was rather meagre and thus it failed to give sufficient protection to tenants. The Act of 1881, therefore, drastically increased the scale, making it seven times the rent in the case of rents of £30 and under. Thus, "if an Irish

tenant sitting at a rent of £10 refuses to agree to an enhancement of £1 and is ejected in consequence, his landlord has to pay him a sum not exceeding £70 as compensation for disturbance,"—a provision which would hardly induce any landlord to oust a tenant unnecessarily. Further, a tenant in Ireland received under this Act a statutory lease for 15 years at a rent fixed by a court of law. At the end of that period the rent could only be raised upon cause being shown by the landlord to the court, in which case the tenant would get a fresh statutory lease for another term of 15 years, and so on for ever. In Bombay under the present Bill no tenant outside the ranks of protected tenants has any protection against an excessive enhancement of rent or against arbitrary ejection after the expiration of the term of the lease. And no tenant who remains unprotected will ever attain to the status of a protected tenant.

The most glaring defect in the Bill consists in the power which the Bill gives to the landlord of resuming the land from a protected tenant if he wants it either for personal cultivation or for any other agricultural or any non-agricultural purpose. This clause, if retained, will go far to defeat the main purpose of the Bill of giving security to the tenant. Mr. Desai has taken up a wholly unreasonable attitude on this question. He pays no attention to the fact that such a provision is unheard-of in any tenancy law. He agrees that in a large part of the Province conditions have grown up in regard to tenancy which are little different from those prevailing in the zamindari provinces, and if in no zamindari province is power given to the landlords to re-enter on the land in respect of which occupancy right has accrued, why should this novel feature be introduced in Bombay Presidency alone? In the rayatwari province of Burma, too, a Bill for giving occupancy rights to tenants was turned down by the Government of Burma and the Government of India when the Select Committee on the Bill incorporated a provision for resumption of land by the landowner, similar to the one that finds place in the Bombay Bill. These facts were brought to the notice of the Minister, but he was deaf to all argument. He consistently took up a strictly legalistic view of the question, as is clear from what he said in the Assembly on 9th February: "I do not see why a landlord should be deprived of the right of cultivating his own land personally if he wants to cultivate it in a *bona fide* manner. Simply because one happens to be an owner one should not be deprived of his right and another who is not the owner given the right of cultivating the land perpetually." No owner would really be deprived of any right that belongs to him if he is cultivating the land at present or would be prepared to cultivate it within a period of time that may be allowed. All that he would be deprived of would be the

right of himself or any purchaser of the land or any of his successors choosing to cultivate the land themselves after the specified period is over, and such a restriction becomes necessary because to allow such a right to be enforced for an indefinite period would result in depriving the tenant of fixity of tenure and in making him and the whole line of his successors insecure. From the point of view of legal rights the Minister's contention is valid, but from that of public policy it is utterly unsound. And if the legal view is to prevail, why should the proprietor be deprived of his right of changing his tenants at will? The same reasons which justify interference with this right also require interference with his other right of retaining to himself without any time limit freedom to take to personal cultivation after being a rent-receiver. He must be compelled once for all to make a choice either of using the land himself or letting it to tenants, the choice being made within a certain specified period of time.

The Minister, however, proved adamant, and he could only be persuaded to agree to make the conditions of resumption more stringent than before. In the Bill, as amended by the Select Committee, it is now provided "that the landlord must use the land as required within one year from the recovery of possession; . . . also that the landlord's use as required must extend at least to 12 continuous years from the date of his recovery of possession." Else the tenant will obtain the right of going back to the land as a protected tenant. Even these stricter conditions leave a number of loopholes. Personal cultivation is so loosely defined as to make it possible for a landlord really to let the land to tenants, who will, of course, be unprotected, say, on a crop-sharing system and yet to pretend that he employs only hired labour. After twelve years, of course, the pretence may be openly dropped, and no tenants that a proprietor may then employ on whatever system he pleases, can ever hope to enjoy protected status. Moreover, few tenants who are evicted can afford to wait for twelve years with a view to watching whether they can get back their land. As Mr. Jamnadas Mehta says, "they cannot possibly be expected to be prowling about the village for that long period intent on re-entering the land." It is quite possible that this clause "will lead to wholesale evictions," and "many hundreds who may be cultivating lands to-day as tenants will become landless labourers." Again, the Bill allows the landlords to take land from protected tenants not only for personal cultivation, but for any other agricultural purpose in which the question of the landlords' personal toil does not arise, and even for non-agricultural purposes. This is a very strange provision. In zamindari provinces if a landlord wants to use rayati land, say, for building a factory, he cannot do so without the Government's express permission, and the Government gives permission, even

when the landlord can acquire the land, only after paying compensation, unless such acquisition is, in its opinion, decidedly in the public interest. In the U. P. Tenancy Bill even this limited right is proposed to be taken away. The landlord interest naturally resents it. A dissenting minute appended to the Select Committee's report on this Bill by two landlord representatives says: "Though valuable rights are being taken away from us without compensation, yet, when we wish to resume our lands, our right to do so after paying compensation to the tenant is not acceptable to the majority. We cannot see what possible hardship is caused to the tenant if the land is restored to the landlord and the tenant is given compensation for something for the acquisition of which he paid nothing at all." This reasoning would appear to Mr. Desai to be eminently reasonable, but to the U. P. Ministry, although of the same political persuasion as himself, it appears to be unreasonable inasmuch as a provision to this effect would, in its opinion, be injurious to the interests of the peasantry. And the provision in the Bombay Bill in this behalf is very much more favourable to the landlords than what the landlords themselves in the U. P. ask for and what the Ministry refuses to agree to. For in Bombay no permission of Government would be required, but the landlord can at once proceed to erect a factory, ousting the tenants who may have been on the land for generations at his sole pleasure. This clause giving an unlimited right to proprietors to resume land really takes away from the tenants with one hand what is to be given to them with the other.

The clause relating to the determination of reasonable rent has not undergone any considerable improvement in the Select Committee. One improvement is that, under clause 15, power will be taken by Government to fix the maximum rate of rent in any area by notification, more than which no landlord will be permitted to recover from his tenants. But, subject to this, the old criteria of reasonable rent are maintained intact, with the addition of one more criterion, viz. "the assessment payable in respect of the land." There is no doubt that in practice the determining factor will be "the rental values of lands used for

similar purposes in the locality," and in areas where the rents are already excessive the tenants will get little relief. The profits of agriculture, which is no doubt mentioned in the Bill as a factor also to be taken into consideration, will generally be left out of account, for the simple reason that the profits are hard to compute, though in reality it is the only factor on which rents should be based. Land assessment may to a certain extent be used to lower rent; but little reliance can be placed on it, particularly because the assessment itself varies considerably from tract to tract. There will have to be undertaken a general settlement of rents in the whole Presidency with a distinct relation to the profits of agriculture, and unless this is done fixity of tenure of itself will be of little value. The more serious defect of the Bill is that even this inadequate protection against excessive rents is to be confined to protected tenants. But, as the Minister himself said in his speech winding up the debate on the first reading, "no landlord ought to be able to charge more than the reasonable rent," whether to a protected or to an unprotected tenant. But, under the Bill, unprotected tenants are left without any defence against enhancements of rent, except that Government may fix in certain areas the highest rates of rent that landlords may recover from tenants. The clause about reasonable rents ought to be generalised and made applicable to all tenants. So also the clause concerning compensation for improvements effected by the tenants.

Among the changes for the better introduced in the Bill are the following: (1) protected status is accorded to ex-proprietary tenants—cl. 3 (this is a change of major importance); (2) the provision made for the recovery of arrears of rent for past years as a condition of the accrual of occupancy right is done away with—cl. 5; (3) provision is made for temporary sub-letting in the case of minors—cl. 5; (4) the Collector instead of the landlord is given the power of selecting the successor to a deceased protected tenant when his heirs do not agree among themselves to select one—cl. 9; (5) in the old cl. 15, intended to insure the maintenance of the existing rights and privileges of tenants, the limitation that was wrongly embodied is deleted—cl. 25.

INDIANS IN SOUTH AFRICA THE MURRAY REPORT

IT was pointed out last week that the Murray Commission was specifically precluded from considering the question of Indian penetration of European areas, and yet the Minister of the Interior and the anti-Asiatics relied on it for justification of legislation to control such penetration. It may now be considered what the

Commission was asked to do and what its findings were.

The Commission was asked to enquire "whether, and if so, to what extent, the letter and spirit of any law restricting or prohibiting the ownership, use or occupation by Asiatics of land is being evaded and to make recommendations in

regard thereto." It will be noticed that the terms of reference do not oblige the Commission to recommend measures to stop evasions, if any; it was free to make any recommendations its investigations justified, even if they favoured the relaxation of the restrictions.

It will also be noted that the Commission was asked to take into consideration not only the letter of the law but also its spirit. Remedies, both civil and criminal, have been provided in the law against contraventions of its provisions. If, as was pointed out already, neither the police nor the parties affected invoked the law against contraventions, it can only prove that there was no strong enough feeling against such contraventions, and that there was no violation of the spirit of the law. When the Transvaal Indian Congress suggested that there could be no such thing as the evasion of the law, because everything not specifically prohibited by the language of the law, properly construed, was lawful and permissible, the Commission observed that such a narrow legalistic approach was appropriate to a court of law, but not to a commission which should travel beyond the language of the law and discover the intention of the legislature, in other words, the spirit of the law. It is also implicit in such an enquiry that the spirit of the law should prevail over its letter if they be in conflict or if the latter be inadequate for the purpose of the former.

In order to discover the spirit of the law, the Commission had to look behind and beyond Act 35 of 1932, and to dive back into the past, to the year 1885, when the first law, the Law of 1885, was passed by the Transvaal Republic, which is still the basic law on the subject. All subsequent legislation was of an amending character in order to secure more effectively the purposes of that Law. As the Indian Agent-General said:

Any inference as to the spirit of the law can only be drawn from a study of the correspondence and discussions between the Republican Government and His Majesty's Government relating to the Law of 1885, and of the actual administration of the Law with reference to the understanding between the two Governments as to the implications of its provisions.

The restrictions on Asiatics referred to occupation as well as ownership. As regards occupation for trade or residence, the Commission observed:

It is, therefore, difficult to avoid the conclusion that the law recognises and has, for some considerable time past, recognised that, in general, Asiatic occupation of fixed property outside prescribed locations, but not on proclaimed ground, does not constitute an evasion of the letter or the spirit of any existing law.

It is necessary to emphasise that, in the opinion of the Commission, the *occupation* of areas, with which the Commission was concerned, by Indians was not only no evasion of the *letter* of any existing law but of the *spirit* as well. *Penetration by Indians of European areas, even if it*

existed to any appreciable extent, is not, therefore, a violation of the spirit of the law.

The Commission pointed out an exception to this rule. It is illegal for an Indian to occupy land owned by a foreign company or a company issuing bearer share warrants. The Commission admitted that no instance of alleged contravention or evasion under the former category was brought to its notice. The only instance it discovered of what appeared to be a contravention of the law was a technical one, which it was assured would soon be regularised. Under the second category also the Commission discovered a single instance of evasion which was, however, legal. If the spirit of the law is taken into account, according to which occupation is not barred, even this solitary instance is a technical evasion. Thus, on the count of occupation, the Indian community is completely acquitted.

Next comes ownership. Direct ownership, except in areas set apart for the purpose, has always been prohibited, however harsh and unwise the policy is. But indirect ownership through companies or European nominees was not illegal till 1919 and 1932 respectively. Thus, from 1885, when the first law was passed under the Republican regime of President Kruger, till 1932 it was legal for a European nominee to hold land on behalf of an Asiatic. In fact, this expedient was suggested by the Republican Government itself? Sir B. Rama Rao, the Indian Agent-General in South Africa, pointed out in his evidence before the Commission:

The law of 1885 was passed in consequence of a memorial presented to the Volksraad by the Chamber of Commerce and signed by Mr. T. W. Beckett and Mr. E. P. Bourke. As the Commission have no doubt observed, Mr. Beckett himself subsequently functioned as a nominee for Indian purchasers of property.

The Commission itself said:

Reference has already been made to the prevalence of this practice prior to its prohibition in 1932. Certain of the existing nominees under these old holdings are professional men and reputable European companies, and prior to 1932 it was not considered improper for European persons of standing, particularly accountants or attorneys with substantial Asiatic clientele, so to act as nominees.

Again, though the Act of 1885 did not specifically prohibit the ownership of land by Asiatic companies or companies in which Asiatics had controlling interest, the law of 1919 made such ownership illegal and the law of 1932 made the law more stringent.

To understand the spirit of the law against ownership of land by Asiatics it is necessary to go back to the Law of 1885 and its surrounding circumstances. As to the intentions and the operation of the Law, the Indian Agent-General, thus summarised the findings of the Lange Commission of 1921:

The Law of 1885, so far as ownership of property is concerned, was primarily a sanitary measure, but

subsequent events have shown that such a restriction was not necessary.

The so-called evasions of the Law were instigated by the Republican Government who almost immediately after the passing of the Law became a party to the adoption of a course whereby Asiatics were allowed to acquire all the rights attaching to ownership of fixed property.

It must be clear from this that every subsequent law that made the restrictive provisions of the Law of 1885 more stringent in the letter departed to that extent from its spirit. The prohibition of indirect ownership is an infringement of the spirit of the law. Inasmuch as the spirit of the law should prevail over the letter of the law when they are in conflict, the restrictions should be relaxed rather than tightened. To the extent that evasions and contraventions of the letter of the law in the past have been condoned by subsequent legislation, to that extent the spirit of the law was upheld as against the letter.

In spite of its exhaustive enquiry, the Commission was unable to discover more than eight cases of the infringement of the law prohibiting European nominees. Three of the cases became illegal because of the *retrospectivity* of the law. The circumstances of these infringements were such that the Commission itself felt bound to suggest that they should be permitted! It is clear that in these cases at least there was no violation of the spirit of the law.

Four of the other five cases referred to the acquisition of land for the purpose of building mosques. It is true that the law permits the acquisition of land by Asiatics for religious, educational and recreational purposes, or purposes incidental thereto. But this exemption was not availed of because the Indians asked that they should be permitted to rent part of the premises in order to ensure a stable income for the religious institutions, and the Government refused the request. The Commission itself realised the reasonableness of the Indian case and suggested to the Government a method by which the objects of the Government as well as of the Indians would be served, but the Government rejected the suggestion and the Commission was persuaded to drop it. It is clear that in these cases as well the spirit of the law was not violated.

Even with regard to land-owning through companies, the law is stringent enough in all conscience. It throws the onus on the Asiatic to prove that he is not guilty, which is itself a most immoral expedient. It was only with respect to land-owning through companies, that the Commission found that there have been, *comparatively speaking*, extensive evasions. But from the *absolute* point of view, they amounted to but little. Even so, the bulk of the infringements of the Act of 1932 occurred *after* the 1st May 1930, the date prescribed in the Act, and *before* the promulgation of that Act. It is true that such ownership was illegal since 1919, but such

illegalities were proposed to be condoned by the Act of 1932, and the Indians had hoped that condonation would extend right up to the date of passing the Act. They had also hoped that, as a result of the Round Table Conference, some amelioration might be secured. In the event, the Act of 1932 was in this respect made operative from 1930; it was made retrospective. The Commission, however, felt unable to recommend that retrospective effect should not be given to the Act of 1932.

Some at least of the alleged violations of the law were not real violations, for the Commission observed that it "could not disregard the possibility of genuine European shareholding even where the company was formed to acquire property for the occupation of the Asiatic shareholder, and the latter, sometimes in addition to minority shareholding of substantial size, had advanced the company the necessary funds." Other evasions had, as the Commission admitted, "praiseworthy purposes, educational and charitable."

The Commission found that the registration of land in the names of European wives was not an evasion of the law at all and that even if it were so, it was insignificant. It said:

The holding of fixed property by European wives of Asiatics has not been shown to your Commissioners' satisfaction to constitute an evasion of the law. If it does, the scale on which it occurs is negligible.

As regards Indo-Malay marriages, the Commission said:

Your Commissioners are not satisfied that, even generally speaking, the object of such unions is the evasion of the law. There is no evidence that the number of such unions has increased disproportionately since 1932. . . . Even so the actual scale upon which this acquisition of fixed property is proceeding is, in your Commissioners' view, insufficient to justify a recommendation at this stage in favour of so drastic a step as to deprive these Cape Malay women of the right to own fixed property.

It will thus be seen that there has been very little of contravention or evasion of even the letter of the law, much less of the spirit of the law. It is true that Mr. Bloemsa signed the report subject to certain reservations. But his reservations proceed on a *priori* ground that every infringement of the letter of the law was also an infringement of its spirit and that the latter should be brought into line with the former. He represents the extreme fanatic anti-Asiatics who set up the cry of Asiatic penetration without pausing for evidence.

As we pointed out at the start, the Commission was not under an obligation to recommend only a tightening of the restrictions, but was free to recommend relaxation thereof, if the evidence suggested such a course. It rightly interpreted that its function was to look to the spirit of the law rather than to its letter. It admitted that Indian occupation of unproclaimed land in the Transvaal was not opposed either to the letter or the spirit of the law. It also ad-

mitted that indirect ownership either through European nominees or companies was not opposed even to the letter of the law till 1932 and 1919 respectively, and that contraventions and evasions of the letter of the law were very few indeed, hardly worth legislating against. Several of the infringements had mitigating circumstances; some were even honourable and praiseworthy. It admitted that most of the Indians it was concerned with were traders who desired ownership of land largely for business purposes. In the words of the Commission, "the acquisition of rights approximating to ownership has been desired by members of the Asiatic community in order to safeguard their rights of occupation of the premises upon which they trade, and in the main reside, and not, in the large majority of instances, as a means of land speculation or investment" (para. 21). To permit occupation but deny ownership is to drive the Indian trader to infringe the letter of the law, besides being a denial of "the elementary right to own fixed property," as the Commission said with reference to Malay women (para. 142). Such a denial is a contradiction of the spirit of the Law of 1885 and of the policy followed in practice by the Republican and subsequent Governments. It is a contradiction of the spirit of the Cape Town Agreement. The spirit of the law is further testified to by the fact that there have been no complaints against or prosecutions of Indians for contraventions of the letter of the law, as was admitted by the Commission. The Act of 1932 itself admitted that it was unwise to prohibit the ownership of land by Asiatics after permitting them to occupy it and provided for certain areas to be thrown open to direct ownership by Asiatics, as a consequence of which the Feetham Commission was appointed. The very spirit of the Law of 1885, which suggested voluntary residential segregation on sanitary grounds, now calls for the reversal of that policy. For the Lange Commission found in 1921 that "in places where they (Indians) are segregated for residential purposes, their sanitary requirements are neglected by the municipal authorities." And the Medical Officer of Health of Johannesburg said to the Feetham Commission that Asiatics "are as amenable to sanitary requirements as the average European of the poor class, and at times are an example to such Europeans." If the Commission had paid due attention to the spirit of the law as against its letter, it would have supported the plea of the Indians, backed by the Indian Agent-General, that the restrictions on Asiatic ownership of land should be eliminated and that the liberal and humane spirit of the law should prevail over its harsh and inhumane letter.

P. KODANDA RAO

SHORT NOTICES.

THE POWER OF NON-VIOLENCE. By RICHARD B. GREGG. (Navajivan Press, Ahmedabad.) 1938. 22cm. 398p. Rs. 2.

THE work under review purports to be a detailed rational discussion of the less subtle elements of the validity and power of the method of non-violence. It is written by an American and issued as a British edition evidently meant for British consumption.

The book opens with modern examples and proceeds to emphasise the moral aspect of the principle in a couple of chapters. It then deals with the now familiar attitude towards mass non-violence. 'An effective substitute for war' is another chapter and explains, according to the author's light, how non-violence is going to build the world on an altogether new 'warless peace' principle. This carries little conviction except to those who are always ready to run with the convenient dictum 'nothing is impossible in the world'. Thus the later chapters are either bombastic, uninteresting or merely quibbling, and the result is that however much one may wish to live under a non-violent order of things one never appreciates a practical way out of the present ills offered by the lovers of non-violence.

The most interesting part of the book is 'notes by chapters' mustering a pretty long array of authorities and is indeed worth reading at least for estimating what wealth of reading and information the author has been able to put together. All sorts of philosophers and thinkers of note, both eastern and western, have been pressed into service. And had it not been for the gradually waning influence of the Gandhian principle itself in the Mahatma's own motherland, the thesis of the book and the manner in which it seems to be supported on so overwhelming a scale would carry some intellectual satisfaction. But that is scarcely enough. Non-violence is not a mere philosophy or a doctrine, and its protagonists in all seriousness want to adopt it as a matter of practical politics. Here one is sure to be disappointed.

D. V. KALE

MANU: A STUDY IN HINDU SOCIAL THEORY. By KEWAL MOTWANI. (Ganesh Co.) 1937. 20cm. 261p. Rs. 3.

THIS book is really a second edition of a work already reviewed in these columns. The description "enlarged edition" is justified by the addition of a chapter containing a brief outline of Sociology, a subject which has greater academical importance in America than in Europe. As a concise resume of Sociology the newly added chapter is excellent. The object of the author in adding this chapter appears to have been to induce his critics to modify some of their views. So far as the present reviewer is concerned, he does not see any reason to depart from the views which have already been expressed in the review of the previous edition.

M. P. S. R.