

THE Servant of India

Editor : S. G. VAZE.—Office : Servants of India Society's Home, Poona (D. G.).

VOL. IX, No. 47. }

POONA—THURSDAY, JANUARY 6, 1927.

} INDIAN SUBSN. Rs. 6.
FOREIGN 10s. 6d.

CONTENTS

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	593
ARTICLES :—	
Political Conferences	595
Trade Unions in India, By N. M. Joshi,	596
Europe After the War.—VII. The Balkans. By Prof. T. G. P. Spear, M.A.	598
OUR PARIS LETTER.	599
REVIEWS :—	
Christianity in India. By Manilal C. Parekh, B.A.	601
American Politics, By M. V. Subrahmanyam, M. A., L. T.	602
Indian Revolutionism. By V. M. Bhat, M.B.B.S.	603
S. I. S. Fire Relief Fund.	604

TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

OUR annual round of conferences is over. We have been treated to an orgy of addresses and a plethora of long winding resolutions. But the country, we fear, is left practically where it was. It is very doubtful if the cumulative effect of all these conferences to the solution of problems now vexing the nation's mind is anything proportionate to the noise they have made. There has been much talk all round of constructive, ameliorative organising work among the masses. The Congress programme is, as usual, an ambitious one and aims at "the education of the people in their political rights and training them to acquire the necessary strength and power of resistance to win those rights." This object it seeks to achieve through the promotion of inter-communal unity, removal of untouchability, elevation of the suppressed classes, removal of the drink evil, capture of local boards, organisation of villages, national education, labour organisation—both industrial and agricultural—adjustment of relations between employers and workers, landlords and tenants and "the general advancement of the national, economic, industrial and commercial interests of the country". No item of work is left out of the programme; the enumeration is exhaustive. The Liberal Federation also has passed a resolution regarding the improvement of the condition of the

masses by measures of better organisation of the cooperative movement and free and universal education, &c. It is to be seen how much practical work the Congress and the Federation are really going to turn out in the current year. Judged by past performances, such resolutions are more pious wishes, at least so far as many of our politicians are concerned.

* * *

BARRING the National Congress and the Liberal Federation, the remaining Conferences like the Hindu Mahasabha, Muslim League, Non-Brahman Confederation and All India Christian Conference held last week are all of a frankly communal character. Some of them no doubt profess to aim at the achievement of Swaraj or Dominion Status for the country. But that is only in the creed of their constitution, not in the living faith, or actions of their members. The presidential addresses and proceedings of these gatherings betray, no doubt in varying degrees, an amount of communal spirit, and distrust, if not active enmity, towards other communities, a tendency to look with suspicion on the progress—along material lines—made by the latter, combined with an excessive anxiety to safeguard or promote their own sectional interests that ill help the early attainment of our national ideal. It is no doubt possible to trace the cause of much of this output of communalistic thought and fervour to the general awakening among the people. A quicker life impulse is, it may be true, manifesting itself along the age-old channels out by castes and creeds. But the explanation does not help us much to avert the dangers looming ahead. For there is no doubt that unless communalism is curbed in time and the awakened popular energy is directed along healthy channels of nationalism the future cannot but be disconcerting. The need for completely subordinating communalism to nationalism arises not so much from the struggle for Swaraj that we have to wage with a foreign government, as from the more abiding requirements of peaceful national life after our political freedom is attained. We concede it might not be possible absolutely to erase the communal consciousness from the popular mind. That consciousness is sure to persist so long as the differences of caste, creed and religion remain and until a new synthesis of social and spiritual life is evolved. But it should certainly be possible to confine this consciousness to the purely religious plane and educate the people that their interests are in reality absolutely identical on the political, economic and other material affairs of life.

VIEWED from the above standpoint, the proceedings of the Muslim League at Delhi under the presidency of Sheik Abdul Quadir should give room for disappointment to all nationalists. There is no need to be perturbed by the effusions of even educated fanatics like the gentleman who exhorted the members of the Tabligh Conference "to buy all their requirements from Muslims only, take a vow to convert at least three Hindus to Mahomedans in every ten years, increase the numerical strength of Mahomedan India to 15 crores and eventually to convert all Hindus to Islam." The vision of Muslim raj that he raised before his audience and the methods suggested by him, though calculated to provoke the fanatical section of Hindus to similar irresponsible talk, are not, happily, shared by the major body of Indian Muslims who are sane enough to be trusted to reject such strong poisons. But there is a subtler poison to be immediately guarded against. It may be milder in appearance, but is all the more insidious in its working, inasmuch as it is adopted as a cure for the very disease it promotes. That is the poison manifested in the demand for the continuation of separate electorates, which some of our Muslim leaders have grown so fond of. The country has seen enough of the working of these separate electorates and how they help to keep up the communal fire burning. By formulating a demand for continuing them even in the next stage of India's political evolution, the Muslim League has certainly not helped the cause of Nationalism. The President of the League, Sheik Abdul Quadir, and other leaders of the community like Mr. Jinnah and Dr. Kitchlew, are, we fear, only playing into the hands of the more rabid and clamorous elements in their community by supporting such a demand. The President does not consider that separate electorates will be necessary for all time to come, but holds them essential "so long as the present atmosphere of mistrust and suspicion continues" and advocates them "as a practical device for preserving peace between the two communities." Our contention is that the system will only tend to perpetuate the present atmosphere. It will no doubt create a semblance of peace, but only by keeping the two communities apart ready, as it were, for war. It is not an armed neutrality that we want, but a union of hearts, born of the realisation of the identity of our interests in all national matters. Separate electorates cannot bring about this realisation. Mr. Jinnah's position is more dangerous. He propounds the view that nationalism could not be created by mixed electorates. That is a proposition on which many will disagree with Mr. Jinnah. But we are concerned now more with the evils of separate electorates than the benefits of a mixed one. No one can deny that separate electorates directly fan the flame of communal consciousness. They never allow the voter to forget that he is a Hindu, or a Muslim, or a Christian. Communalism will not be cured, as Mr. Jinnah rightly points out, by mere talk and sentiment. But it can be considerably aggravated by giving it a constitutional back-ground, a statutory sanction.

MR. JINNAH'S position pushed to its logical extreme can be made to support the perpetuation of the system. It is some consolation to find that the President of the League is less dogmatic and more guarded in his advocacy. The All-India Christian Conference has set a noble example

for other communal bodies to follow by declaring that a separate electorate is not desirable so far as that community is concerned. This and other important questions of inter-communal relationship cannot be solved by isolated or unilateral discussions. They demand the joint attention of the trusted representatives of all the communities. The plea put forward by the President of the Muslim League for a Round Table Conference to come to a common understanding on all points of difference deserves to be welcomed in this connection. The League has done well to follow up the President's call by appointing a committee to conduct negotiations with the spokesmen of the other communities. The Congress has entrusted the task of dealing with the communal problem to its Working Committee. It is to be seen what steps that body is going to take to come to actual grips with the realities of the situation. It cannot ignore the Muslim League's move.

MAHATMA GANDHI'S re-entry into public life after a year's break was looked forward to with great interest by all classes of people, and it was generally expected that he would no longer abstain from politics, as he had been doing for some time before he took rest at Ahmedabad, but that he would again take an active part in Congress politics. That hope, however, has been disappointed, for it would appear that he is going to restrict his activities in future to khaddar propaganda and such-like non-political objects. At the last Congress session he was a mere spectator, maintaining a strict silence on all political subjects. Only once did he break his silence—to warn the Subjects Committee against the two mistakes which in his opinion it had committed, in summarily rejecting the currency resolution and espousing the cause of the Maharaja of Nabha. We are not concerned here to examine the merits of the Subjects Committee's action, but we cannot help remarking on the sphynx-like silence which he maintained towards the resolution defining the Swarajist policy in the Legislature. It is widely believed that Gandhiji does not approve of this policy, that in his opinion there is no alternative between abstention from Councils and entry therein with the object of making the most of them, and that obstructionism is, in his judgement, harmful to the best interests of the country. But he does not consider it his business to advise the Congress on the matter; his attitude is one of strict neutrality. This might have been permissible so long as he left all politics alone. But if on two comparatively minor subjects he felt constrained to depart—from the very laudable motive of saving the country from rash decisions—from the self-denying ordinance he has passed on himself, it is certainly incumbent upon him, when such a capital issue as constitutionalism or otherwise is at stake, to speak out his mind and try to influence the Congress in the direction which he considers to be beneficial. We do not think that by his silence he can absolve himself from the responsibility from any injurious results which may flow from the pursuit of the Swarajist policy. What is happening at present is that all orthodox non-co-operators, with the single exception of Mahatma Gandhi, throw all their influence into the scale on the side of the Swarajists at the elections. Having thus actively helped the Swarajists to be returned to the Legislatures, they cannot but share in the responsibility for Swarajist misdeeds in these bodies. If the so-called co-operators participate in the guilt of the Government's evil deeds, though

they condemn these, it follows that Mahatma Gandhi cannot escape from the responsibility for the evil consequences of the Swarajists' policy, against which he considers himself bound not to lift his voice.

* * *
THE All-India Spinners' Association seems to be making steady, though slow, progress in the organisation of khadi work. Though it owes much to the personality of its president and his devotion to the wheel, the secret of its success largely lies in the fact that the organisation is "unaffected and uncontrolled by politics." Many other items of constructive work in the country will, we dare say, progress better than they do now if they could also be carried on by similar expert organisations "unaffected and uncontrolled by politics." For there is nothing more dangerous to constructive work than the incessant excitement and distraction caused by politics, not to speak of the fluctuation of political currents to suit the exigencies of parties and fresh developments in the political field. Mahatmaji will be giving a great fillip to the campaigns against untouchability, drink evil and communalism if he is able to wean these movements also from the control of politicians and place them on an independent footing. That will also greatly help members of the different political groups in the country to unite in the advancement of such work in spite of party squabbles in the Councils.

The report shows that khadi worth Rs. 23,76,670 was produced last year the sales amounting to Rs. 28,99,143. Whatever may be the advance marked by these figures over those of the previous year, we are more impressed by the utter inadequacy of the output and sale to achieve any effective boycott of foreign cloth—which is put forth as one of the objects of the khadi movement. There is more satisfaction for those who are attracted to the movement by its human or humanitarian side. We are told that the production activities of the organisation reach more than 1500 villages and that 42,959 spinners, 3407 weavers and 110 carders are supported by the production centres. This is no negligible record. These figures, however, show how the movement has only touched the bare fringe, an infinitesimal portion of the vast millions it seeks to serve. We would have been in a better position than at present to judge about the economics of the khadi cult and its claim to cure the chronic poverty of the people if we had been told how many of these spinners and weavers are unemployed agriculturists, and what addition to their ordinary income the wheel has been able to bring to them. Many of the spinners in the Bardoli taluka of Gujerat, it is said, are agriculturists, who have been able to spin enough yarn to meet their family's clothing needs and in some cases even sell some surplus khadi. The evaluation of these gains in money would have been more informing. Similar details regarding the spinners in other parts should also have been provided. We are glad to note that "the introduction of the charkha and propaganda in connection therewith have here, (Bardoli) as in many other places, paved the way for beneficial results, the disappearance of drink followed by more thrifty habits of life." We think much more could be achieved in this and other directions among the masses, particularly in the rural centres, if the movement is still further broadened so as to comprise a full fledged programme of rural reconstruction.

POLITICAL CONFERENCES.

WHEN the Swarajist members walked out of the Assembly in protest against the Government's unresponsive attitude to the National Demand, their leader Pandit Motilal Nehru declared that they were going back to the country to prepare for sanctions for the enforcement of that demand. When again the Responsivists broke away from the Swarajists, Pandit Nehru held out the threat that he would seek from the next session of the Congress a mandate for a more drastic programme of non-co-operation than was then in force. Judged in the light of these utterances, the resolutions passed by the Congress last week should cause disappointment to all to whom Swarajism means an honest line of action to be pursued in right earnest. For, the policy now adopted by the Congress does not take the Swarajists even an inch farther on the road to obstructivism or civil disobedience. All the former loopholes are there, and the attempt made by no-changers like Dr. Pattabhisitaramayya to close them came to naught. Indiscriminate obstruction has been definitively given up, whereas discriminating opposition is common ground to all political parties. The only distinguishing feature of Swarajists' policy is that they are committed to non-acceptance of ministerships. But this is no longer a live issue, except in Bihar and Orissa, where alone office could now be offered to the Swarajists. The Responsivists were, for this very reason, indifferent to Congress proceedings this year, and they were conspicuous by their absence at the Gauhati session, Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya and Messrs. Aney and Moonje alone having attended. There is only one item in the Swarajist policy which will affect other parties, and it is their determination, as expressed in the Congress resolution, to oppose the formation of Ministries by other parties. It is understood, however, that they will interpret this provision in a such a way as not to prevent them from giving active support to the Ministers, if they so choose; that is to say, when a proposal for the voting of Ministers' salaries is placed before them, they will either vote against it or refrain from voting in its favour, but this will be the full extent of their opposition to the Ministry. As in no province the Swarajists are numerically so strong as to dislodge the Ministers from office by their vote alone, this show of opposition will not disconcert the Ministry overmuch, provided that the Swarajists, after trying in this way to vote them out of office, support them in all reasonable measures. Pandit Malaviya pointed to the inconsistency involved in the Swarajists refusing the demand for the grant of Ministers' salaries, without regard to the merits of individual Ministers concerned, and yet supporting the latter's policy later on, and he urged the Congress to remove this inconsistency from its programme by relieving the Swarajists from the necessity of opposing the formation of Ministries. His plea, however, fell on deaf ears; and the inconsistency remains. It need

not, nevertheless, occasion much anxiety if the clause does not demand from the Swarajists anything more than a pretence of opposition. The gulf between the factions of the Swarajists has been widened still further by requiring Congressmen to wear khaddar not only at all public meetings and on all ceremonial occasions, but on all occasions and at all times. For our own part, we do not quarrel with this requirement. If there is any virtue in khaddar-wearing, if there is any sense in confining active work within the Congress to khaddar-wearers, it is but reasonable that Congress workers should always appear in khaddar. That, at any rate, makes for honesty. The net result of the Congress proceedings will be that the Responsivists will move still further away from the Swarajists and toward the Constitutionalists, while the Swarajists will continue to play with obstructionism in the old feeble way, even the spectacular walk-out not being contemplated by them.

We should not regret the further step the Swarajists have taken in alienating the Responsivists, if it would draw the latter and other Constitutionalists closer together. Of the Constitutionalists, the Liberals alone felt it necessary to meet in conference in order to take stock of their present position and to concert measures for improving it. Ill-organized as the Liberals are, the other Constitutional groups are in a still worse case in respect of organization, so much so that the Independents or Responsivists could not or would not even meet with a view to counteracting the evil propaganda of the Swarajists. The Liberals had no desire to have a gathering exclusively composed of men belonging to their party. They issued cordial invitations to the leaders of other parties, including the Responsivist party, to attend their conference if not as delegates as visitors. These invitations, however, were of no avail and the Liberals were compelled to have their own party conference. They have been condemned in certain quarters for having held this gathering under the auspices of the Liberal party instead of under those of the Indian National party, which was meant to comprehend all the Constitutional groups within its fold. The Liberals, however, are entirely free from blame in this respect. They alone of all the parties which combined to form the National party gave it an undivided allegiance, all the rest extending to the party only a nominal support. The Liberals lent to the National party the services of their whole-time General Secretary, who, as Provisional Secretary of the newly formed party, did his level best to hold a meeting of its executive committee and place the new body on a satisfactory footing. Such, however, was the apathy and indifference of the other groups that no meeting of the executive committee could be held even to frame a constitution and to elect permanent office-bearers. The Indian National party has had, therefore, but a nominal existence for the past five or six months. The Liberal party was quite prepared to merge itself into the National party, if such a merger would

strengthen the Constitutionalists' position to an appreciable degree, and maintained their separate existence solely with the object of seeing how the new organization would shape. They gave it their loyal support all these months, and in fact placed all their resources, such as they are, at its service. But they found that other parties gave it the cold shoulder and the new party would be composed almost wholly of themselves, though under a different name. If in these circumstances, when the question was between holding a conference of their party, or going without it altogether, they, decided in favour of the former alternative, no fair-minded person will be disposed to blame them. They, in fact, deserve the cordial appreciation of all who have constitutionalism at heart. The conference performed a very useful function in discussing the outstanding problems from the constitutionalists' view-point and formulating their own solutions. This discussion will be of help in directing the energies of liberal members of the Legislatures in a fruitful channel.

TRADE UNIONS IN INDIA.

A TRADE UNION, as it is popularly understood, is an organization of wage-earners for maintaining or improving their standards of life and the conditions under which they work. It is essentially an organization of employees, not of employers, nor of co-partners, nor of independent workers. Under the English law, and similarly under the recently enacted Indian law, even the employers' organizations may be called Trade Unions, and some of them are also registered under the Trade Union Act in England. But, popularly, the word is confined only to Associations of wage-earning employees.

In spite of what some good-natured and well-meaning people may say, or at least may desire, about the interests of the employers and the employees being identical, there is absolutely no doubt that, under the present industrial system of free competition and of capitalist control, there is a clear conflict between the interest of the employers and the employees as regards the conditions of service of the latter. Nobody has yet succeeded in discovering a standard by which the earnings from the products of an industry can be fairly divided between capital and labour. If labour's share is to be determined by competition, on the principle of demand and supply, a conflict for the determination of the market value is presupposed. But the Treaty of Versailles in its Labour Charter has clearly laid down that labour is no longer to be treated as a commodity. The International Labour Organization has not yet succeeded, in spite of the good work which it has so far done, in discovering a standard to determine labour's fair share of the products of an industry and there is no near prospect of that discovery being made. When such a standard acceptable to both employers and the employees is discovered, it will have to be seen how far competition remains free and the capitalist control of industry remains unrestricted. Till this discovery is made, we must presume that the interests of the two parties do not coincide, and each party is justified in organising itself for the protection of its interests.

The main object of a Trade Union is to protect the interest of the employes when they come into opposition to those of the employers. Besides performing this chief function, Trade Unions all over the world have also acted as mutual benefit societies. The necessity for such work was forced upon them on account of the industrial revolution which cut off the workers from their old surroundings. Till very recently, the State did not accept the responsibility of insuring its citizens against the risks of sickness, old age, and unemployment, a provision the need for which became intensified after industrial development. The need for the organization of workers in separate associations is keenly felt when a country develops large-sized and organized industries, and when the division between the capitalists and the employers and the wage-earning employes becomes clear-cut and permanent. Before the industrial revolution, employers and employees could come together for mutual benefit in common organizations called 'guilds'. Such guilds exist even today in China, especially in those parts which are not yet industrially developed. The guilds also used to undertake mutual benefit work. In India, the guilds as industrial or trade organizations did not come into existence as caste in its secular aspect was itself an occupational guild. Moreover, well-built village organizations also served a very useful purpose in protecting the common interests of all, and protecting the individuals as members of a family.

India has been, and still is, mainly an agricultural country. Out of the total population, 230 millions are supported by agriculture. About 100 millions of these are said to be actual workers. But the number includes cultivating landlords and tenants and also mere wage-earners. The wage-earning agricultural workers number 21.6 millions and they support a total population of 37.9 millions. Besides these there are 52 millions of actual workers including those who work on their own account and those who work for wages in allied occupations, maintaining a total population of over 8 millions. Thus, it is safe to estimate that there are about 25 millions of persons who are mere agricultural wage-earners and, therefore, are a suitable field for Trade Unionism. But this vast number of agricultural workers is scattered over a very large area, is illiterate, and is the lowest paid in the country. However desirable it may be to organise them for the protection of their interests, on account of their circumstances being unfavourable for the work of organisation they will come to be organized only last of all. The experience of other countries also endorses this conclusion. We hear sometimes of some Ryot Sabhas or Kisan Sabhas, especially in Northern India. But it is doubtful if they are real trade unions of agricultural wage-earners. From the accounts that we hear, their membership, if at all they have a regular membership, mostly consists of cultivators, owners of land or tenants, who cannot be said to be wage-earning employees under others.

There is only one class of agricultural workers— if they can be so regarded—who may be organised earlier, viz., the workers on the organised tea, coffee, rubber and sugar plantations. Their total number is 800 thousand. Even in their case, the difficulties of organization are many. Most of these come from the aboriginal tribes and have not yet fully come under civilising influences. Moreover, as these workers live on big and extensive plantations, they hardly come into close daily contact

with the surrounding population, and are practically unapproachable by labour organizers. Till very recently, these workers were under the power of the Workmen's Breach of Contract Act, which punished a breach of contract of service as a criminal offence, and even today workers on plantations in the Province of Madras are not yet free from the Madras Planters' Labour Act, which also punishes a breach of contract of service as a criminal offence. These circumstances explain why, although workers on the plantations are the lowest paid, there is still no trace of any organization amongst them.

Leaving agriculture and allied occupations, we may now survey the other occupations for determining the field for Trade Union activity. Industry maintains a total population of 33.1 millions, out of which 15.17 millions are actual workers. The last number consists both of independent workers, who work as their own masters, and of the wage-earning workers. I estimate that out of 15.7 million actual workers in industry, three-fourths, i. e., 11.8 millions, are mere wage-earning employees of others. Transport maintains a population of 4.3 millions, of which 1.9 millions are actual workers; out of these 1.5 millions may be estimated as wage-earning employees. Trade supports a population of 18.1 millions, of which 8 millions are actual workers, out of whom at least 4 millions may be estimated as wage-earning employees. Public administration supports a population of 9.8 millions, out of which 4 millions are actual workers, who are all wage-earning employees. Domestic service maintains a population of 4.5 millions, out of which 2.5 millions are actual workers and wage-earners. Mining supports a population of 540 thousands, of which 347 thousand are actual wage-earning workers. We have thus a total number of 49.1 millions of mere wage-earning employees divided as under:—

Occupation.	Millions.
1. Agriculture	25
2. Industry	11.8
3. Transport	1.5
4. Trade	4
5. Public Administration	4
6. Domestic Service	2.5
8. Mines3
Total	49.1

But this does not exhaust the whole number of wage-earners in India. Out of the total number of 100 millions of actual workers in agriculture, as shown in census figures, at least 30 millions should be working as wage-earners from 4 to 8 months in a year. If their number is taken into account, the total number of wage-earning employees will mount up to 79 millions.

The goal of the Trade Union movement in India must be to bring these 79 million workers within its fold. It cannot be accomplished in a day. The work which is more urgent, or which is easier, may be taken up first. Broadly speaking, work in urban areas and in the organised industries and occupations, being both more urgent and easier, it is natural that that should be taken in hand first. It is estimated that 25 millions are living in towns, having a population of 10,000 and over. About 15 millions out of this population may safely be taken as belonging to the wage-earning classes, and about 7 millions to be actual wage-earners. Even this is not a small number to be taken up first by the Trade Union organisers for their activity. If it is necessary to restrict the

field still further, it can be done by confining the work only to the workers in the organised plantations and organised commerce. They number to-day 3·719 millions divided as under:—

I	1.	Plantations	820,000
II	1.	Mines and Quarries	294,000
	2.	Textile and connected industries	773,000
	3.	Leather industries	14,000
	4.	Wood and furniture industries	28,000
	5.	Metal industries	169,000
	6.	Glass and Earthenware	82,000
	7.	Chemical products	109,000
	8.	Food industries	109,000
	9.	Industries of dress	12,000
	10.	Industries connected with buildings	29,000
	11.	Furniture works	7,000

	12.	Gas and Electricity works	15,000
	13.	Miscellaneous	100,000
III	1.	Construction of means of transport	155,000
	2.	Transportation (Railways)	800,000
	3.	do (Shipping)	100,000
IV	1.	Organised commerce	100,000

Total... 3,726,000

To this number we may also add a portion of the 4 million employees of the State and 2½ million domestic servants. I estimate 500,000 for each class. Thus the total number of persons whose organisation may be taken in hand immediately is estimated at 4,727,000.

(To be concluded.)

N. M. JOSHI

EUROPE AFTER THE WAR.

By T. G. P. SPEAR.

VII.—THE BALKANS.

THE Balkan peninsula is the classic region of minorities in Europe, and it is the scene of the latest and most drastic attempt at a solution. The various Balkan people were for centuries under Turkish rule; they lost their native nobility who were replaced by "Phanariot Greeks" in Rumania, and by Turkish landlords in Bulgaria, Serbia and Greece, and, in consequence, the wars of independence took the form of peasant insurrections. All the new States borrowed their kings from abroad, except Serbia, where a dynastic rivalry between the descendants of the peasant leaders, Kara George and Milesch Obrenovitch, distracted the country for a century, and was only ended by the annihilation of the latter House in 1903. During their servitude the Balkan people had lost their culture, but retained their national pride and memories of empire, and this, together with the fact that the different races of the peninsula are as inextricably mixed as in old Austria, provides the key to modern Balkan history.

Rumania and Serbia have already been glanced at; and we shall therefore confine ourselves to Bulgaria, Greece and Turkey. The bone of contention between Bulgaria and Greece has been Macedonia, inhabited until 1912 by Christian peasants with Mussulman landlords, and claimed by the Greeks because of their religion and by the Bulgarians on alleged grounds of race. In 1915 Bulgaria joined the Central Powers, largely in the hope of gaining all Macedonia and recovering the outlet to the Aegean, which she had lost in the second Balkan war. But, for the second time in his reign, King Ferdinand misread the situation, and he paid for his mistake with his throne. On the collapse of the Bulgarian army in September 1918, he abdicated in favour of his young son Boris, and the agrarians, or peasant party, under the vigorous Stambulinsky came into power. By the treaty of Neuilly in 1919, Bulgaria lost but little territory, but that little placed her at the mercy of Greece and Serbia. She was saddled with a heavy indemnity, and her army was reduced to 30,000

men. This was the opportunity of the Bolsheviks and their intrigues among the discontented peasantry have kept the country in a turmoil ever since. The strong hand of Stambulinsky probably saved Bulgaria at the time, his "policy of fulfilment" restored her credit abroad, and gave no opportunity to Serbia for enforcing more "safeguards" and his influence with the peasants prevented a Communist revolution. But his violence towards the bourgeois finally led to a military conspiracy which in 1923 overthrew the Agrarians and caused his death. He was replaced by Professor Tsankoff, under whose régime plots were the order of the day, culminating in the blowing up of half the Cabinet in Sofia Cathedral in 1925. This year a policy of reconciliation has been begun with encouraging results, and the country is growing slowly more tranquil.

The history of Greece since the war has been a tale of triumph and disaster, whose moral is that of Aesop's frog, who wished to be as large as an ox. On the refusal of King Constantine to join the Allies in 1915, his ex-premier Venizelos set up in 1916 a rival government at Salonika, which in 1917, on the King's deposition by the Allies, became the government of his second son Alexander. The Greeks looked back to the stately imperial Byzantium, rather than the brilliance of ancient Athens, and their ambition was to recover Constantinople and restore the Greek empire in Thrace and Asia Minor. At the Peace Conference, the genius of Venizelos seemed about to realise this dream. Thrace in Europe and Smyrna in Asia Minor were obtained and even Constantinople was partially placed under the control of an Allied Commission, and, like ripe fruit, might fall in due time to the power which already surrounded it on two sides. But the brilliance of Venizelos' achievement blinded him to the difficulties which lurked behind. First, Mustafa Kemal and the Nationalists defied the Treaty of Sèvres and established themselves in Angora in 1920. Second, the sudden death of King Alexander reopened the dynastic question, and when Venizelos appealed to the

country to support his candidate to the throne, he found that the administration of less able subordinates during his absence had destroyed his popularity. King Constantine returned in triumph and Venizelos left the country taking with him the confidence of the Allies. To conciliate the Allies the Royalists now undertook to suppress the Nationalists, but their army after a fierce campaign halted exhausted only half way to Angora. The third blow now fell on the Greeks, when France, anxious for her position in Syria, concluded the Franklin-Bouillon Pact in 1921 with the Turks, by which 80,000 men were set free for the Greek war, and arms supplied for 40,000 more. But still supported by Great Britain, the Greeks continued the war until, in 1922, they made the blunder of transferring part of their army to Thrace in the hope of occupying Constantinople. In August the Turks attacked, and the exhausted Greeks were driven headlong into the sea. Once again the Turks defied all Europe at Lausanne, and by the Treaty of 1923 recovered Thrace, Adrianople, the full sovereignty of Constantinople and the ceded territories in Asia Minor. The tide of Greek conquest had ebbed; since then the current of Greek history has been "bound in shallows and in miseries." The chief events have been the second abdication of King Constantine in 1922, the deposition of his son in 1924, the establishment of a Republic and the buckram dictatorship of General Pangalos.

The real significance of this record of adventure, intrigue and incompetence lies not in the possibility of a new Greek empire, in the revival of a defeated Turkey, or in the fate of imperial Constantinople, but in the drastic solution of the minorities problem which it has involved. By 1922 racial friction had grown so acute that the Greeks of Asia Minor refused any longer to live under the Turks or the Turks to tolerate the Greeks. The Greek population of Asia Minor fled or was expelled, and, by the Treaty of Lausanne, an exchange of population between Macedonia and Asia Minor was arranged which was carried out by Dr. Nansen under the auspices of the League of Nations. Two million Greeks emigrated from Asia Minor or Thrace, and have finally made Macedonia a Greek province, while Thrace and Smyrna have become correspondingly Turkish.

Such a consummation, with all its suffering, its loss and its legacy of bitterness, is the logical result of a rampant nationalism. It has a sombre implication for India, and it contains a warning to all those countries where communities, whether racial or religious, are closely mixed together. In Eastern Europe, all possible solutions have now been tried, and this is the only one which has been completely successful, because it is the only one which avoids the daily irritation of neighbouring and rival communities. The Bismarokian system of nationalisation failed because the process was too slow to be complete before a change in the balance of power undid the work; the late Austrian

system of "live and let live," and the Hungarian system of mere subjection failed because of the growing national consciousness of their various subject provinces; the Versailles solution of Treaty safeguards is failing because the safeguards are not regarded by the majority, and the minority looks for deliverance to its mother-state; and the only solution, apart from transference of populations, which has apparently had any success seems to be in Polish Silesia, where the Poles have allowed the Germans provincial autonomy.

Transference of populations is after all a confession of failure rather than a solution. The alternative is perhaps a central government, too strong to be questioned, giving a local autonomy too wide to leave discontent; but even this requires common sense and good-will in both majority and minority. Without that, as Hobbes would certainly have pointed out, every self-conscious minority in Europe and Asia must prepare for the fate of the Asia Minor Greeks and the Macedonian Mussulmans.

OUR PARIS LETTER.

Paris, : 15th December.

WAR CLOUDS.

IT is winter time here and Paris has been lately having some fogs which one would have thought possible only in London town. And a fog still hangs over the French foreign office at the Quai d'Orsay. Rumours of war are abundant, and in trams and suburban trains people weary with labour and with excitement talk of the horrors of a prospective war with Italy, but seem to behave as though they thought that, after all, not to have it might be worse than having it. Word has gone forth that both France and Italy hold themselves in readiness for a conflict which is being freely discussed by the press in England. The satisfaction of Geneva, great as it is, suffers a little diminution in the present situation, like the winter sun.

'Fate is temperament' is one of Voltaire's grim sayings, and the political temperament of Europe seems capable of attaining only such peace and stability as the dexterous process of tense balancing on perilous precipices may yield. While there is no warrant to anticipate any deliberate provocation from any quarter, no one can deny that the situation is tense, and the documents which the various governments concerned have been publishing lately regarding the origin of the great war would seem to be unanimous in leading to the conclusion that what matters in an European conflagration is not so much any single act of provocation as the general preparedness and anticipation of a situation. When the magazine is full a match is the merest accident, any stick serves the purpose. On the very eve of Geneva's seeking to complete and carry out Locarno came the announcement of an Italian-Albanian alliance, which is the generating centre of all the present trouble. The *Quotidien* declares: "The crisis which has arisen in Belgrade

will have its repercussions not only in the Balkans but in all Europe" and is generally supported in this opinion by the French press. That the interpretation of Italy's new treaty as virtually the establishment of an Italian protectorate over Albania is not confined to Yugo-slavia is evident from English comment. The *Daily Telegraph* says: "At this moment when feeling is rather high in Belgrade, Athens is anxious, Sofia maintains a silence that augurs ill, and Hungary holds herself on guard. In military circles in Britain the situation is regarded with some apprehension." The *Times* confirms this view and the *Morning Post's* anticipation that Yugo-Slavia is seeking stable support in other directions than Italy, which probably means France, has been amply confirmed. As if to make the teams equal, Roumania inclines towards Italy and there is the treaty of arbitration and friendship with Germany negotiated by the Duce though, for the moment, inconclusively.

There is little doubt that for the moment the *rapprochement* between France and Germany is more complete than it ever was. Germany's manifestation of anxiety not to give reasons to offend Paris by a too ready acceptance of the Duce's proposal, and even more than that the German foreign minister's avowal of the plans and projects of Italy, which has been interpreted here as a timely warning to be wary against eventualities, have temporarily, at any rate, influenced France's habitual attitude towards Germany considerably; while M. Briand's ultimate success in the matter of the French foreign policy and his prevalence over M. Poincaré's cautions and hesitations have been hailed in Germany. Thus the Italian episode has not been without its utility in simplifying the tangles of Geneva, but it is yet too soon to conclude that, behind all these ministerial smiles and hand-shakes, there is solid contentment on either side. It is said that M. Poincaré is extremely reluctant to submit the two points relating to German fortresses and the exportation of war material, left unsettled in Geneva to Hague, and Germany is aware of it; and while Germany's gestures towards the Duce's advances are all quite well, the critical-Frenchman will never accept it as the last word in the matter. He is too intelligent not to see that Germany will not be fool enough to let go a chance, when it really comes in her way.

The recent Fascist activities in the frontier, the Duce's temperament and his ways, the presence of large masses of Italian workmen in France, specially in Riviera—large numbers of them fanatical followers of Mussolini—and last of all the Italian—German negotiations are factors which make the annoyance and alarm that prevails in France regarding the Italian sphinx comprehensible. And what is it that the Italian sphinx is looking for? There are many who consider that the essence of the foreign situation is, as the *London Observer* suggests, "a diplomatic struggle which is now proceeding between France and Italy for the [French North African colonies and

Syria." And Mr. Garvin remarks in the editorial that Turkey also is convinced that Signor Mussolini's eye is fixed on Asia Minor as a field for annexation and colonisation, and as the basis of a future Mediterranean supremacy.

But what is the genesis of this land lust on the part of Italy? There are two important and clear reasons; one is psychological and the other is physical, so to speak. The first of these is the high tide of Italian nationalism which the Duce has engendered, and the ambitions he has evoked and provided; and secondly, the necessity for fresh fields and pastures new for the increasing numbers of Italian emigrants, who have suffered a serious check in the United States of America. To turn to Mr. Garvin's admirable analysis: "The tone and method of domestic Dictatorship is fatal when imported into the field of foreign policy; yet, it is exceedingly difficult to keep the graver sphere cool when the other is hot and national aspirations are inflamed... There is a real problem. Germany and Italy together will press for colonial outlets, whether we like it or not. It will become a serious issue. There will be extreme difficulty in satisfying them both. By their simultaneous and equal claims—the possibilities of redistribution being limited—they must tend to disappoint each other. Without war, and world wide war, neither can hope to hoist its flag over a real field of settlement, either in Asia or in South America. Africa remains. The council at Geneva will have to spread out the whole map of that continent some day, and to consider whether more scope can or cannot be provided peacefully for Germany and Italy by the co-operation of Britain, France, Belgium and Portugal. New systems of mandate and lease will have to be considered, no less than claims to nationalist annexation in the old style, if there is to be any chance of a bloodless settlement." Thus, in dealing with European problems, we always go out by the same door as by which we went in; the colonies will yet be the doom of Europe.

And that brings us to the point with regard to which the League encounters the stoutest criticism in India and the East in general. It is the obligation on the part of the League—as stated in the articles of its constitution—to accept the present territorial divisions as final and, one may almost say, to protect their integrity without regard to economic or ethical theory, and obviously without regard to changing world conditions necessitating a change in distribution of territories. But even that criticism is only apparently formidable, for it should be clear that it is impossible to provide in an *a priori* manner in a constitution for empirical changes which may arise, and it is equally impossible to arrive at some permanent form of organisation if we do not accept the reality of a situation which calls for the organisation. Similarly, the question whether the League should come first, or the change of heart in Europe should come first—stands on a par with the question whether an institution breeds its own appropriate

type, or a type creates its own appropriate institution. The solution would depend on the point emphasised and the truth lies in the recognition that in the reality, which is concrete, institution and type interact and develop *pari passu*. Everybody knows that, in practice, the League serves to-day as little more than a final and full dress performance for rehearsals carefully planned before. But if the preliminary Briand-Chamberlain talks and the diplomatic wire-pulling and intriguing have shown that Geneva is just the ceremonious seal-setting for premeditated policies, Geneva has also shown that even as a final ceremony it has its value, for there is little doubt that the foreign ministers of France, Britain and Germany were a great deal pressed to agree and come to some conclusion, as there was nothing else to do for them at Geneva, and they had to do it within a given time.

But, when Mr. Garvin enthusiastically talks of mandates and leases, it is impossible to forget that it was not so long ago that the British Government intimidated—rather intimidated—the Secretary-General of the League that they would not tolerate any interference, in their administration of mandated territories by the Mandates Commission, no doubt strengthened by the support of France. And the question then arises whether, when Mr. Garvin speaks of leases and mandates and colonies in the old style he is not making a distinction without difference? If it is so, if colonies in the old style are still the obsession of Europe, the horoscope of post-war Europe may well be cast in the pre-war mould with Mars a little more active. And America would be right in treating Europe almost as a leper.

The air is full of rumbling but there is little likelihood of a Franco-Italian war, in the immediate future at any rate. Poincaré and Mussolini would make admirable enemies, but the moment is not meet for their meeting. France need scarcely doubt the issue in such an eventuality, but, as in the last war, it is the victor who will be worse off than the vanquished, and France groaning under the burden of her victories cannot afford to buy another. It takes two to fight, whether nations or individuals, and we may trust to the Nobel prize to keep M. Briand resourceful enough to avoid clash, and to France's necessity for recovery to keep M. Poincaré steady. Says the editor of the *Quotidien*, in a signed article, alluding to the differences between M. Poincaré and M. Briand: "At other times it is possible that France would have stuck to her claims at the risk of seeing the German representative refuse agreement, or be blamed by his government and disavowed. It is even possible that she should have risked an internal crisis. . . . There was threat of a diplomatic conflict. Was it right to let it burst out? Was it not better to have a compromise and arrive at measures such as every government may subscribe to? Constraint and graciousness pull on the same side, and it would need considerable provocation even from the Duce to change the present foreign policy of France."

REVIEWS.

CHRISTIANITY IN INDIA.

THE INDIAN OUTLOOK. By W. E. S. HOLLAND.
(Edinburgh House Press, London.) 1926.
7½ × 4¾. pp. 256. 2s. 6d.

MR. HOLLAND has rendered a real service to the Christian cause in India by writing this book. It is one of the most honest works we have known written by any missionary in the land on the present situation; and that is because the author brings with him the true Christian outlook. What a sad commentary it is on the missionary life and work in India that books like these are so rare as to form exceptions! Also what a different kind of situation we would have been facing in Hindustan to-day if the missionaries had understood the people with that sympathy which was the least thing expected of them as servants of Christ, and had tried to interpret the situation to the people of England during the last century and quarter? Alas, it was rather the other way. Usually, it was the civilian who understood the people and their institutions better, and some of the best things written about the Hindus are by civilians, whereas some of the worst things have been written and said by the missionaries. Unfortunately, even those among the missionaries who have tried to understand Hinduism sympathetically have been guilty of these things. We well remember one of the foremost of these, a man who knew more about Indian religions than most, showing in war-time (the year 1918) the worst pictures of Indian religious life to English soldiers. In view of all this, we welcome a book of this kind, and earnestly recommend it to the most careful study of every missionary in the land. We recommend it also to the Indian disciples of Christ, the so-called Indian Christians, for the simple reason that many of them do not know their own country as they should, and that, unfortunate as it is, they would take these things sooner from a missionary than from their own people. It will do them good to know that it is a missionary who calls his people, the Hindus, "a philosopher nation," and from start to finish her philosophy is religious, the quest for God. If this is not the Christ-nation of the world, we wonder what else it is. Sometimes exception is taken to the use of the word "Christ-nation" by the present reviewer, but he is glad that there is at least one among the missionaries who agrees with him.

Mr. Holland's treatment of Gandhi as "a prophet" is fine. There are, however, one or two things which we would like to say in regard to some of the statements made in that chapter. Expediency may have and has ruled Gandhi's politics in more than one place, but it certainly was not the ruling motive in his advocacy of the Khilafat. Very likely, it was in South Africa that he came to feel with the Moslems that the protection of the Khilafat was a Moslem duty, and that all should help them in the fulfilment thereof. If anything was wrong in this advocacy, it was the head and not the heart. Another thing that our author says is this, "Mr. Gandhi missed or forgot the central truth that only regenerate men and women can usher in God's Kingdom. He was in a hurry. Swaraj was to be realized within one year. He forgot, except at moments when vicarious penitence gave true vision, the crudity of the material with which he had to build. He forgot that, before the India of his dreams could come to be, there must be a

changed manhood and a changed womanhood, right through India's villages." This is confounding Swaraj with Swargaraj. Gandhi's aim was modest, and was confined to the attainment of the former. In regard to this, what Mr. Holland says here, time and again, has been said by many, but surely those who say this have to prove that we are so sub-human as to require to be ruled by others, and also that the English people are so superhuman as to be in a position to rule others—a claim which, thank God, no one in his senses will make.

As for the remedy that the author proposes for the strained situation between England and Hindustan, viz. one of genuine co-operation on the part of the British—and he is quite right in emphasizing it from that side—one only wonders if this is not a cry in the wilderness. Our author, again and again, says that it is the lack of imagination that is at fault in British statesmanship, and not the intention. Surely, we do not agree with Mr. Holland and, we are afraid, very few in this land, if any, will agree with him. As he says again and again, the people of India have lost all faith in the British people and their promises, and it should be one of the first duties of every Englishman, whether here or in England, to do his utmost to recover this faith if he wants England to play any important rôle in the future reconstruction of the world. The present reviewer has again and again said that the bringing together of England and India was providential, and for a higher purpose than the good of either, or even both, viz. the union in Christ of the East and the West. But so far, very little has been done by British statesmen to achieve this end, and one sometimes wonders if such an aim would have to be realized, after all, through some other agencies. One of the greatest opportunities that presented itself just now at the last Imperial Conference for this purpose has been allowed to pass altogether unutilized, and all thoughtful Indians are beginning to ask seriously, and rightly, whether the Empire is of any use to them.

As regards the treatment of the subject of the Church of Christ in Hindustan, our author has allowed to let his imagination run with him, especially in his description of the mission compound. We have known at least as many of such places as the author, perhaps far more, and that from within—for we can know what is in the view of the people living in them much better than European missionaries can ever know—and we can draw a picture quite the reverse of the idealistic one of Mr. Holland, and ours will be far truer to facts. These compounds are reeking with an atmosphere which is entirely foreign to the genius of either Christianity or of Hindustan, and they have done more to make the religion of Christ entirely artificial. Moreover, Mr. Holland has fallen an easy prey to the temptation, common to almost every missionary, to abuse the caste-system for the way in which the mission-work has miscarried in India. We can prove to the hilt with facts and figures that it was the proselytising way in which Christianity came in this land, not only refusing to tolerate anything in Hinduism or Hindu society, but even denouncing everything belonging to it as of the very devil, that is ultimately responsible for this miscarriage. We have written some of the worst things against the caste-system, but it was only when we saw how Christian missions had worked for the disintegration of the Hindu society and the nation, that we began to appreciate the good in the caste-system and came to understand that a conquered nation has no

other protection against social, cultural and religious conquest by its conquerors than some such thing as the caste-system.

Another thing that Mr. Holland has said while criticising the Christianity that has been brought to us as being largely one of words, and that this will not do in a land where "words are cheap", requires to be refuted. It may be true that our educated men have to do a lot with words, and, as Mr. Holland has said, that is our only defence against our conquerors. But so far as religion is concerned, Hindustan will never be satisfied with anything less than the highest realization of any religion from its professed believers, and if the Hindus are not attracted to the preaching of Christianity, it is not because words are cheap, but because they have seen, as even the Western people have not seen so far, the great discrepancy between the preaching and practice of so called Christians and even missionaries. The real cause of such a failure on the part of Christian preachers lies in the fact that the majority of them have taken the religion of Christ too lightly. The divorce between the precepts of Christ and much of orthodox and even liberal Christianity is far more complete among Christians than that between morals and orthodoxy in Hinduism, which Mr. Holland points out.

One wishes that the author had discussed the problem of the Christian Church at much greater length in a book that professedly has been written for missionaries, and "to order" from a group of missionary societies. Rightly does the book, at its end, mention the name of Mr. C. F. Andrews as the one man who has shown "the way of service"—which also the present book is meant for—and who "has, by the path of lowly service, achieved such a position of reverence and leadership as has seldom been attained by any foreigner in any country". In the new Hindustan that is coming to be, there is no room for any missionary who does not come in the spirit of a real brother. Any other is a traitor to the Kingdom of Christ, and an enemy to this country in the disguise of a friend.

We welcome this book as one which shows the way of true service, and thus is helpful in bringing together the East and the West as co-partners in the Kingdom of God.

MANILAL C. PAREKH.

AMERICAN POLITICS.

AMERICAN GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS.

BY CHARLES A. BEARD. (Macmillan Company, New York) 1925. Pages 820. 8½ × 5½.

OUT of the abundance of literature on American Government, if we are asked to choose the best works, we would declare that Bryce's *American Commonwealth* and Professor Charles A. Beard's *American Government and Politics*, are the best and authoritative works on the subject. The merits of Bryce's work are too well-known to need recapitulation. But since Bryce wrote his monumental work, many changes have taken place, especially in State and City Municipal governments, so much so that some of his remarks on them need revision in the light of present day practice. Professor Beard's work, on the contrary, having been written only last year, is up to-date.

Professor Charles A. Beard, is a citizen of the American Commonwealth, but that does not in any way blind him to the defects of the American government. He is a student of history, and therefore his account of the American government is unbiased. We will give a few instances to show how

true and unbiased is his account of the American government. When he speaks of the theory of the separation of powers, he is alive to its pit falls. This is what he says "It is evidently a philosophy of negation, rather than of action. Only the President, in time of war, can assume something like dictatorial power over life and property. In actual operation, the theory is open to many objections and is constantly being criticised by publicists and men of affairs. It certainly makes for delays, obstruction and irresponsibility." The Professor points out how the theory was formulated deliberately by the fathers of the American Constitution to prevent the misuse of authority. But he observes very pertinently "The chief check upon tyranny and abuse of authority in government is not the separation of powers, for they can be welded together in the hands of the political party which has possession of all branches of the government. The one secure check is the right of the people to discuss freely the measures and policies of the government and to unite peaceably in opposing them."

The author recognises the place of parties in American government. "The influence of party" says he "runs throughout the entire government from the capital to the township Indeed, the very process of government is set in motion and kept going by the political parties" He therefore concurs in the dictum of Bryce that the study of party politics in America is as important as the study of the framework of government. After giving an historical account of parties, Professor Beard assigns reasons why party feeling is stronger in America than elsewhere. In the first place, there are more offices thrown open to popular election in America than in any other country. Secondly the co-ordination of the Legislature and the Executive must be secured outside the written law and it is the party system which makes it possible. Prof. Beard also recognises the malevolent influence of party organisations. The notorious part that is played by Tammany Hall and 'Bosses' is amply borne out in his pages.

Take again the following passage from his book (p. 732), "It is a shame to us, that the record of crime against persons and property in America make a black page in our history In flagrant and open robberies, we lead the world, as far as statistics reveal the facts. In daring brutality, and ingenuity, our criminals are not equalled anywhere on the surface of the earth—one superlative of which we are not proud." Can admission of one's own country's defects go any further? It is therefore, our opinion that the author has given a plain, unvarnished account of the American government.

Another excellence of the work is that it is exhaustive. The author devotes the first 60 pages of his book to an examination of the larger aspects of government. He points out how, as a result of modern civilisation, the governmental functions have increased considerably, and how, as a consequence of the largeness of population, democracy has become synonymous with representative government. The second part of the book contains an historical introduction to the American constitution, and a description of the organs of national government. The last part of the volume is devoted to an examination of the functions and powers of the State and Local government.

The learned professor has also pointed out the various schemes of reform that have been suggested by politicians and publicists in order to make the American government function efficiently. The author discusses the pros and cons of the suggested reforms. In a short review like

this it is impossible to note them seriatim. They are dispersed throughout the book and are worth a careful perusal by thoughtful students of American government.

The author believes that the American constitution is not a *written* constitution, pure and simple; it is also considerably affected by conventions. He has taken care to point out some constitutional conventions—the election of President by party caucus, the existence of the Cabinet, the third term doctrine, the 'Resident Congressman' and so on and so forth.

Though we regard the book as an illuminating treatise on American government, we would like to draw the attention of the author to a statement which is not justified by historical facts. Speaking about the President's power of appointing Cabinet members, that is, heads of departments, Professor Beard says thus in p. 196; "At all events, the Senate, even when it is in the hands of an opposition party, does not seek to control the appointments to these offices. It usually ratifies the President's nominations promptly and without objections." How can Professor Beard reconcile the foregoing statement with the refusal of the Senate to confirm the nomination for the Attorney Generalship sent in by President Johnson in 1868? Again in 1869, President Grant withdrew his nomination of Mr. A. T. Stewart as Secretary of the Treasury on receiving an intimation that it would not be confirmed by the Senate. Finally, in 1925, the Senate rejected the nomination of Charles B. Warren for the post of Attorney General made by President Coolidge. Instances such as these prove that the American President has not got that absolute right of appointment suggested by Professor Beard. The statement of the author needs therefore to be qualified.

But the above is only a small flaw—if it be so called—in an otherwise excellent book. Professor Beard is well-equipped for the work he has placed before us. He is a specialist, and a specialist in a number of subjects. He has specialised not only in politics, but also in economics, ethics and other allied sciences. Buckle said somewhere "No one can have a firm grasp of any science if, by confining himself to it, he shuts out the light of analogy For the philosophy of every department depends upon its connection with other departments and must therefore be sought at their points of contact." We may say that Professor Beard very nearly approaches this ideal of Buckle.

There is an appendix at the end of the volume containing the Articles of and Amendments to the Constitution. There is also a bibliography which has been brought quite up to-date.

M. V. SUBRAHMANYAM M. A., L. T.

INDIAN REVOLUTIONISM.

LIFE OF BARRISTER SAVARKAR. By CHITRA GUPTA. (B. G. Paul & Co., Madras.) 1926. 8½ x 5½ pp. 144. Re. 1-8.

THE publishers have themselves admitted in the preface that the book is a mere collection of "fragments of information as to Savarkar's former activities". It is thus not a connected story of all the activities of Mr. Savarkar. We know the time is not yet for the publication of his biography. The readers must wait, perhaps for years, to know all the thrilling adventures of this patriot. But, even from the incomplete account published in this book, one cannot but feel genuine admiration for the many qualities of head, heart, and even muscle, which Mr. Savarkar has evinced throughout his career. One may not agree with him in

political matters, but none can deny him a full meed of praise for his glowing patriotism, rare courage, indefatigable industry, brilliant oratory, and supreme self-sacrifice. Savarkar was admittedly a revolutionist, and the logic of the revolutionary is very lucidly set forth in an article in the *Talwar*, an extract from which is quoted on page 71 of the book. But circumstances have now changed, and perhaps will change further for the better during the next three years, if the British Government is genuinely anxious to grant us at least full provincial autonomy. Then, but not till then, will Savarkar and many a fiery patriot like him, willingly, as shown in the extract referred to above, work on constitutional lines for the betterment of India. If the British Government takes this lesson from the lives of Indian revolutionaries, then one of the purposes of such publications will be fully served. Government must know that, unlike poets, revolutionaries are made, not born: to make or unmake them lies wholly in the hands of 'the powers that be.' We therefore earnestly commend this little book to the notice of the 'Simla Gods' and their advisers here and in England. Arm-chair politicians also will find how one soul can work wonders in the field he has chosen for his activities, if only he pursues his object with transparent sincerity and zeal. One need not imitate Mr. Savarkar in his methods; perhaps, he himself will not follow them now. But for courageous devotion to the ideal, dauntless patriotism, unlimited self-sacrifice, and restless energy, Mr. Savarkar's name will surely be cherished by future generations of patriots.

Some grammatical mistakes and clumsiness of style in some places are avoidable sins one notices in the book. The publishers will, we hope, correct them in the next edition of the book.

V. M. BHAT.

The Servants of India Society's Fire Relief Fund.

(From 2nd November 1926 to 2nd January 1927.)

The Gujarat Prantik Samiti, Ahmedabad	Rs. 3000
The British Indian Association of Oudh	2000
H. H. the Maharaja of Rewa	500
H. H. the Nawab Saheb of Cambay	300
Lt. H. H. Raja Jogindar Sen Bahadur, Mandi	250
Mr. T. V. Dharap, Bantyre (Nyasaland)	101
H. H. Maharaja Vishwanath Singh Bahadur, Chhatarpur	100
Prof. J. P. Trivedi, Poona	75
Mr. Premji D. Mehta, Bombay	51
Mr. R. A. Wilson, Chief Secretary to Government of C. P., Nagour	50
Mr. C. S. Sambamurthi Iyer, Coimbatore	50
Sir George Anderson, Director of Public Instruction, Lahore	50
Mrs. P. K. Ray, Calcutta	50
Dr. K. D. Mugaseth, Calicut	50
Through a Sister, at Amreli	44
The Secretary, St. John's College, Agra	40-13-0
The Chief Controller of Stores, Delhi	35-8-0
Majr D. D. Kamat, I.M.S., Ratnagiri	25
Mr. N. V. Karmarkar, Bombay	25
The Anglo-Indian and Domiciled European Association, Calcutta	25
Khan Saheb Wali Mahammad, Commissioner of Income Tax, Napur...	25
Mr. Jayendrabhai V. Divetia, Pleader, Ahmedabad	25
Mr. T. N. Malvi, Bombay	25
Mrs. Monghibai Hiralal A. Shab, Bombay	25

Dr. K. V. Krishna, Kuching (Sarawak)	25
Mrs. Avantikabai Gokhale, Bombay	25
Mr. Kalyandas Jagmohandas, Bombay	25
Through P. G. Sadasivan, Trivandrum	20
Mr. Labbu Ram, Dharamsala	20
Rai Bahadur Fanindra Lal Day, Calcutta	11
Through Mr. Ratilal M. Gandhi, Bombay	15
Mr. S. K. Raghavendra Rao, Coimbatore	15
Mr. K. R. Ramakrishna Iyer, Coimbatore	15
Mr. M. G. Thekore, D.P.H., Gurgaon	15
Mr. V. Guruswami Sastri, Tirukattupalli	10
Lal Chand Mehra, Juliunder	10
Mr. E. R. Srikanthaswara Iyer, Coimbatore	10
Mr. M. Annappa, Calicut	10
Mr. Bishun Prasad Duara, E.A.C., Jorhat	10
Mr. P. Mubaji, I.S.E., Kasur	10
Prof. R. K. Lagu, Poona	5
Mr. Lanke (in memory of his mother), Poona	5
Mr. C. D. Kavi, Ahmedabad	5
Rao Saheb A. Seturama Aiyer, Nidamangalam	5
Mr. K. V. Sessa Iyengar, Madras	5
Rev. A. Foreman Cox, Madras	5
Mr. N. V. Sarangpani, Sholapur	5
Mr. N. D. Modak, Akola	5
Mr. C. S. Ramaswami Iyer, Coimbatore	5
Mr. M. S. Krishna Rao, Coimbatore	5
Mr. S. Kannuswami Gounder, Coimbatore	5
Mr. K. S. Ardhanareshwara Iyer, Coimbatore	5
Mr. Atma Ram, Ambala	5
Mr. J. L. Raina, Srinagar	5
Mr. G. J. Gadgil	5
Mr. C. K. Nair, Calicut	3
Mr. S. E. Naranier, Coimbatore	3
Mr. S. Srikanthaswara Iyer, Coimbatore	3
Mr. C. R. Balasubramania Aiyer, Coimbatore	3
Khan Saheb Muhammad Ghiasud Din, Delhi	3
Mr. A. R. Upadhye, Poona	2
Mr. M. Subba Rao, Malleswaram	2
Mr. P. C. Dutt, Sylhet	2
Subheddar Ghadge, Poona	1
Mr. S. R. Anantanarayana Aiyer, Vellore	1
Mr. K. R. Venkatasubramania Aiyer, Coimbatore	1
Mr. C. N. Gopalaratnam Iyer, Coimbatore	1
Mr. V. A. Krishnamurthi, Coimbatore	0-4-0

Total... Rs. 7,268-9-0

Total amount realised to date Rs. 1,29,404-0-4

Rs. 1,42,00,000 !

We are sending away this amount of money every year to foreign Countries for import of Soaps. Enlightened Opinion Alone can help to keep this money in the Country. Every educated man who prefers a foreign soap to one of Indian make is helping foreign manufactures and not giving a decent chance to local industries. Every patriot buys only Swadeshi products. The Government Soap Factory, Bangalore manufactures some of the finest soaps in the world. Try a tablet of Mysore Sandal Soap and judge yourself. If you find difficulty to obtain it, let us know. We shall see that you get in your own favorite shop.

**Government Soap Factory,
Bangalore.**