

# THE Servant of India

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

VOL. X, No. 7.

POONA—THURSDAY, MARCH 17, 1927.

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

## CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK ... ..	73
<b>ARTICLES :—</b>	
The Hardy Annual ... ..	75
Bombay Budget Debate ... ..	75
OUR PARLIAMENTARY LETTER ... ..	76
OUR PARIS LETTER ... ..	81
<b>REVIEWS :—</b>	
Indian Politics. By Prof. B. G. Sapre, M.A. ... ..	83
N. V. Tilak's Poems. By M. Patwardhan ... ..	84
SHORT NOTICES ... ..	84
BOOKS RECEIVED ... ..	84

## TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

IN spite of the furious attempts of some croakers to prick holes in the South African Settlement, the country is content to stand by the agreement as an unquestioned advance and the maximum that could be got out of the South African Government in satisfaction of our countrymen's claims. The resolution passed by the South African Indian Congress accepting the agreement as an honest attempt to find a solution of the problem and expressing readiness to work as such is a conclusive answer to those who would see no substantial good in the Settlement or seek to minimise its importance. The wearer knows where the shoe pinches and when the pain is alleviated.

THE situation in China is made more intriguing by reports of a split in the ranks of the Koumintang. It is, in all probability, a case of the wish being father to the thought, the split being only in the brain of those who sedulously spread the rumour. The world knows the Koumintang too well to be deceived by such interested reports. The Cantonese have built up their organisation after heavy sacrifices and sufferings for the great cause they stand for. They should be big fools to fall out in the last and gravest crisis in their struggle and spoil the prospects of their final victory. More in accord with truth must be what is given out by Reuter as an "unconfirmed" report of the secession of the Chinese naval forces near Shanghai to the Southerners. Such secessions are not infrequent in the course of the Chinese Civil wars and have, in fact, been a feature of the series of notable victories snatched by the South in its triumphant march so far. It is too late in the day for any one to seek to cover the imminent doom of the Northern war-lords behind a screen of lying propaganda.

LORD LYTTON should be heaving his final sigh of relief at the firm restoration of Dyarchy in Bengal, on the eve of his departure from the province. Those who wanted to throw out the salaries of ministers were not all inspired by the same motive. The politics of Sir Abdur Rahim is diametrically opposed to that of Mr. Sen-Gupta. But the absurdity of sleeping with strange bed-fellows is not realised when the mind is clouded by gross prejudice and personal rancour. The wreckers, however, got the defeat they deserved. We congratulate the ministers on their coming out unscathed and would impress on them the need for vigilance in continuing to steer clear of all communal shoals and pursuing a well-thought out programme of popular amelioration to which the elected members dare not refuse their support. Lord Lytton can now claim the satisfaction of having undone the work of the late Desabandhu; but he has yet to undo his own work in regard to the Bengal detenus. He cannot lay claim to Bengal's approbation unless he removes this black spot from his administration before he lays down his office.

IF India's military policy is what it is, it is not certainly because Indians have not expressed themselves emphatically against it. They have done so in the past and are repeating their protest in the present. The Assembly did not suffer for want of strong and impassioned argument in denouncing the dangerous policy of the Government last Tuesday. If hard words could serve us, we should have been rid of the burden long ago. The defeat of the Government on Pandit Kunzru's motion was a foregone conclusion. But conditions are bound to be what they are, so long as the Government think that India has to be defended against Indians themselves and the army in India is a part of the Imperial machine of militarist exploitation. The despatch of Indian troops to China without the nation's consent is the latest proof of this policy of imperial dominance. Mr. Jinnah only spoke the plain truth when he said that neither the Commander-in-Chief nor the Home Member were the real masters, but only obedient instruments in the hands of the Home authorities. Indianisation is the only way of not only reducing the present unconscionable expenditure, but also of putting the defence of the country on lasting foundations. India's safety and self-respect as well as Britain's honour demand it. Self-government without the right and power of self-defence is a mockery. The Government are fully aware of it and in the measure in which they carry out Indianisation in the army will they prove their good faith towards the people of this country.

ONE unexpectedly happy outcome of the Assembly debate on the Reforms issue was the exchange of views on the vexed question of music before mosques, and the rights of the minority communities between some of the leaders of the Hindu and Muslim communities. The speech of the Deputy President Mahomed Yakub was marked by a commendable spirit of conciliation and reasonableness which should have come as a surprise to the fire-eaters on either side. His statement that Muhomedans had no right to object to any Hindu music being played near mosques, if it was not deliberately intended to disturb the prayers of the Muslims and insult the Islamic faith, although it provoked some comment from the Don Quixote of the House, deserves to be welcomed by all Hindus as a distinct contribution to the solution of the question. We are happy to note that it was promptly acclaimed as such by no less a leader than Lala Lajpat Rai who added that any one who played music before mosques with the intention of disturbing prayers was not only a lunatic, but a criminal. Concerning political rights and safeguards Lalaji assured the Muslims that they would have much more than what the non-Muslims were given in Turkey, the latter being mentioned by Maulvi Mahomed Yakub as the due of his community in this country. One need not despair of Hindu-Muslim unity being achieved in the near future if this rapprochement continues and further negotiations are conducted in the same spirit of conciliation and reasonableness on all sides.

\* \* \*

THE proceedings of the seventh session of the Trade Union Congress at Delhi show that Indian Labour organisation is steadily making headway. The presidential address depicted the deplorable condition of our workers and the difficulties that have to be contended against in advancing their cause. Mr. Chandrika Prasad rightly drew pointed attention to the question of a living wage and threw the responsibility for the low wages both on the employers and the employees. The remedy for many of labour's ills is better organisation, more education and concerted action. This was emphasised by all the speakers at the Congress. The resolutions passed formulate the immediate demands of Indian Labour for legislation covering all the organised trades and industries, providing for adult franchise, eight hour day, machinery for fixing the minimum wages, sickness and unemployment insurance, old age pensions for widows and orphans, maternity benefit and weekly payment of wages, the programme is ambitious enough for a year of active work. Indian labour leaders will have achieved no mean task if they succeed in getting legislation along the above lines placed on the statute book. The Congress, it is worthy of note, passed a resolution of protest against the despatch of Indian troops to China. The nationalist upheaval in China is not a little due to the awakening and co-operation of the Chinese workers. Indian Labour cannot be a passive spectator of the abuse of Indian troops to shoot down its Chinese brethren. The necessity and importance of a solid stand on the part of Labour all over the Empire was also realised by the Congress which declared its readiness to co-operate with Trade Unions all over the Empire in combating the evils of of capitalistic and imperial exploitation.

\* \* \*

ABDUL RASHID, the murderer of Swami Sraddha-Abdul Rashid. hand, has been sentenced to death. Mr. Johnstone, the Judge who pronounced the sentence, has meted out justice according to law. But there are higher considerations than law and justice on which we would like to plead for the life of Abdul Rashid. The plea of insanity has, no doubt, been dismissed and the accused found to have committed the murder "deliberately and ruthlessly on a victim whom the accused sought out and found seriously lying ill in bed". We would, nevertheless, urge Abdul to be treated as a diseased soul and saved the gallows. Lunacy is not the only malady of the mind which requires its victim to be exempted from the clutches of capital punishment. Nor does that affliction manifest itself in the only form certified by medical experts. If there is any soul which requires spiritual ministrations and stands sorely in need of the reformatory purge Abdul Rashid's is undoubtedly one. Along with him we would also mention for such treatment the names of all those propagandists of fanaticism, of whatever religion, who are really instrumental in producing criminals of this class. We who are against capital punishment as such in all cases have additional grounds to offer in favour of our plea in this particular instance. Hinduism has never stood for the vindictive doctrine of an eye for an eye, a life for a life. Love of the enemy, forgiveness, mercy and the return of good for evil has ever been the highest virtues preached in its greatest gospels. Hindus have everything to gain and Muslims much to learn by the former magnanimously discarding the ideal of blood for blood and both marching together along the path of brotherhood and love.

\* \* \*

THE decision to transfer the political and military control of Aden from the Government of India to the Colonial office has come upon the public as a disagreeable surprise. Under the new arrangement "the sole authority for administration will rest with a single authority who will either be Governor or Political Resident appointed by the Imperial Government with the concurrence of the Government of India. This official will be responsible to the Government of India for internal municipal administration alone and in all other matters to the Imperial Government." The subject has been before the Indian public for over seven years, during which time they lost no opportunity of making it clear that the contemplated transfer would not meet with their approval. So far back as Sept. 1921 the Council of State, than which there is no more sober-minded body in the whole country, carried a resolution requesting that "a representation be made to the Secretary of State for India that the administration of Aden be continued under the Government of India and not be transferred to the Colonial Office." This resolution reflected Indian opinion on the subject. The Government of India had also promised to the Assembly opportunity for a discussion of the subject before any decision was reached; and yet by a stroke of the pen the transfer has been effected. Though the control of Aden goes out of India's hands from the beginning of the next month, she is not to be relieved of her monetary obligations in regard thereto, being expected to contribute £250,000 a year towards the military and political charges for three years and thenceforward one-third of those charges subject to a maximum of £150,000 yearly!

\* \* \*

### THE HARDY ANNUAL.

THE Assembly made last week its constitutional gesture of protest against the unrelenting attitude of the Government in regard to the Reforms question. It was a reminder to our rulers of the irrepressible demand of the nation for self-government, a sign of the still burning fire within the heart of all patriotic Indians which refuses to be quenched till the full measure of freedom is realised. The popular side had, naturally, an easy victory over the Government forces in the lobby, many of the Muslim members voting along with the Nationalist parties in the House. It would have been a disgrace if it had been otherwise. But, in spite of the victory, the debate suffered from all the defects of a hardy annual. Every one was more or less conscious of the futility of the performance. The discussion was therefore marked by an air of unreality and effeminate eloquence from the outset. Mr. Jayakar traced the humiliating story of the climb-down of the Swarajists, made in the vain hope of an honourable response from the Government. His anger at the disappointment caused, he himself described as "the anger of a weak man." Nothing would have been lost if he had stopped with the needless narration of his pathetic story. But he thought it also necessary to give the superfluous warning to the Government that "other things will happen in this country" if they did not change their ways. The Swarajist leaders, it is noteworthy, did not partake in the debate. They must have felt somewhat satisfied that their favourite role was being played—though feebly—by the Responsivist leaders. May be, there was also a dawn of disillusion in their minds as to the utility of such talk. They had themselves raised the reforms issue in a more direct and clearer form on previous occasions and hurled more thundering speeches and defiant threats at the official benches—all in vain. They, therefore, should have thought it wise to save their breath. Considering the desultory and perfunctory nature of the debate, we feel that the Assembly could have better utilised the day in making constructive criticisms on administrative policy than in a comparatively feeble manifestation of a "weak man's anger." A weak man gains nothing by exposing his weakness to his adversaries. If he is wise he will not also display his anger before them in season and out. For they will only be amused at his impotent fury. He will produce a different result if he seriously sets himself to the task of strengthening his mind and body by sublimating his anger into silent determination to win his freedom.

The demoralising effect of such hardy annuals on the official mind was clearly reflected in the Home Member's attitude. His speech was not a serious performance and was marked by much levity of thought. The certainty of defeat, combined with the security of the Viceroy's certifying powers, on the one hand, and the still greater

security of the Commander-in-Chief's forces, on the other, probably led him to view the question with comparative unconcern. He gave expression to the philosophic truth that it was not possible for any Government to confer self-government on any other people. Freedom must come from the people themselves. We wonder when he made these profound discoveries. If the Home Member had only cared to consider the full implication of these words, he would not have lightly indulged in them. For they logically lead to the line of political thought pursued by those who have no faith in the good intentions of the British Parliament in its professions towards India and who would therefore work to attain the goal of self-government quite independent of any alien body's aid or consent. The Home Member does not evidently share the view, which the Viceroy seeks so often to impress on the Indian mind, that it is Great Britain's national genius and high mission to lead the people whom they come into contact with to the goal of self-government.

Coming to the more sensible and serious portions of the Home Member's speech, we wholly endorse his observation that no constitution could be run when the Legislature is frequently in conflict with the Executive. The excessive use of residuary powers is, we admit, a grave danger which cuts at the very root of the constitution. But before proceeding further, we should like to point out that the phenomenon casts discredit on the Executive no less than on the Legislature, if the latter is at all to blame. An impartial study of the situation in India will further reveal the fact that such constitutional conflicts arise here more often out of the irresponsibility and autocracy of the government than the unreasonableness and irresponsibility of the popular representatives. The way out of the difficulty, according to all canons of democracy, is to make the Executive constitutionally subordinate and responsible to the Legislature. Half-way houses in the path of self-government are always unsatisfactory and productive of the troubles that have attended the working of our constitution. It is high time therefore to make a bold advance to the final goal. In taking such a bold march there is, we may point out, full scope for the play of the Christian virtues of love, hope, faith and charity for which Sir Basil Blackett pleaded. Sir Alexander Muddiman no doubt bluntly told the Assembly that the restrictions on its powers were there because they were thought to be necessary by the British Parliament. The opinions of the Parliament are neither infallible nor unalterable. The Assembly is entitled to say that it resents such restrictions keenly and would not rest till it is invested with the full powers that belong to it as the Parliament of the Indian people.

### BOMBAY BUDGET DEBATE.

THE voting of demands for grants in the Bombay Legislative Council was free from any exciting incidents. There was a somewhat heated debate

on Bombay Development and the fact that a cut of 20 lakhs was moved by a European member bears testimony to the unanimity of feeling on the subject. This sum represented the provision for the reclamation work on block 6 which the Council did not wish to be started. None of the committees that considered the question have recommended the reclamation of this block and the Council, by the decisive vote of 68 to 26, expressed itself strongly against it. The Government having already expressed its intention to abide by its decision, the reclamation of block 6 will not be proceeded with. But the inclusion of the provision in the budget when Lord Lloyd's blunders have already involved the presidency in huge losses shows in what slight regard Government hold the interests of the taxpayer and how slow it is to learn from past experience. A vote of censure was also moved with regard to the scheme of industrial housing and though it was defeated, full expression was given during the discussion to non-official resentment on the subject. If, as admitted by the General Member, there was 85 lakhs of sq. yards open space already available for building purposes in Bombay, we are surprised that the costly scheme of Development was started at all without any compelling need.

When the Land Revenue demand was under consideration the opportunity was taken advantage of to draw pointed attention to the famine situation in parts of the presidency. There was, of course, the usual official quibbling about "scarcity" and "famine." Whatever may be the technical word used by officials in describing present conditions, there is no doubt that in some parts there has been a failure of crops; and though Government has already done something to relieve the suffering, the situation demands more extensive relief measures and that too as soon as possible. A cut which represented the provision for salaries of four divisional superintendents of Land Records was moved, but not passed. It was pointed out during the debate that the posts were superfluous, the work now entrusted to them having been previously done by Deputy Collectors with equal efficiency.

The conduct of the work on Lloyd Barrage also came in for severe criticism on the ground that the expenditure was rapidly exceeding the estimates, the net increase so far being 60 lakhs. Close watch on the Barrage expenditure was demanded and the association of an advisory committee with the officials in charge of the work asked for. We are not sure how far such a committee will help in checking extravagance; at any rate the experience of a similar committee attached to the Bombay Development Department is far from reassuring. What is therefore needed is a committee with something more than an advisory status, invested with well defined powers of control and supervision.

The excise debate revealed the disappointing attitude of the Government. There was no

doubt the usual talk of prohibition being the goal of the Government; but no suggestion was put forth by the Minister in charge of definite action to hasten its advent. Indeed, the Government instead of going forward seem to be moving in the opposite direction. If only they commit themselves to pursuing the rationing policy to its logical conclusion, there would be some hope of reaching the goal in a measurable distance of time. But apparently even this they do not wish to do. The rate of decrease has been reduced in Bombay city from 10 p. c. to 5 p. c.; and what is more, further rationing has been suspended in Khandesh and Panch Mahals! Over the rest of the presidency, rationing of liquor is to continue for another year. According to the Excise Minister, "the object of the policy must be to minimise temptation to those who do not drink and to discourage excess among those who do, and to the furtherance of this policy all considerations of revenue must be subordinated." This reads well on paper; but every one knows how much practice differs from profession. While the Minister desires here to subordinate revenue considerations to the furtherance of the policy enunciated by or for him, other portions of his speech seem to us to betray his anxiety for the Government revenue. Similarly, his reply to the criticism that rationing is reduced to a farce when the ration is in excess of consumption was anything but convincing. The Excise Minister's task, we admit, is no easy one. But there is no good in deceiving the people that we are marching towards prohibition, while we are only marking time and going back in certain directions. Sir Chunilal Mehta, the originator of the rationing policy, and now the Finance Member, made the admission that if local option were granted, the popular vote would be against drink. If so, it behoves him to see that the evil is not forced on the poor people, but is removed from their midst as soon as possible.

The discussion on the demand for Education was profitable in so far as it brought to light the defects in the working of the Primary Education Act and the need for a more vigorous prosecution of the policy underlying it. Dr. Ambekar, a member of the depressed classes, drew attention to the slow progress of education in the Presidency and observed how at the present rate it would take them 45 years for boys and 300 years for girls to come under the Education Act! There were also some valuable criticisms on the working of the present educational machinery.

### OUR PARLIAMENTARY LETTER.

(SPECIAL TO THE SERVANT OF INDIA AND THE WEEK.)

Delhi, 13th March.

#### CONSTITUTIONAL ADVANCE.

IT has become the practice in recent years to raise in the Assembly the question of further constitu-

tional advance on a motion to omit the grant for the Executive Council, and though there were special reasons for making a departure from that practice this year, a debate was raised on the constitutional issue this year too. Early in the session, notice had been given of a resolution asking for the extension of the present constitution, and the member who desired to move it was fortunate enough to secure a high place for it in the ballot. But no sooner was it tabled than a demand came from a prominent Muslim member for adding to and strengthening the safeguards provided in the Government of India Act for the protection of the interests of the Muslim and other minority communities. Similar demands from other interests were also expected. It was found in consequence that to move a resolution for the enlargement of the present reforms was but to invite dogs which were happily sleeping, to wake up, and the Swaraj party, one of whom had given notice of the Swaraj resolution, decided, with the concurrence of other parties, to withdraw it from the agenda in order to keep a sort of united front amongst elected Indian members. Nothing had happened between them and now to justify a reversal of this decision, and yet, strangely enough, on the occasion of the Budget debate, the Swarajist and Nationalist parties vied with each other in raising a debate on the question of the revision of the constitution. The only result was that a rambling discussion followed, the Home Member making no serious contribution to it, but only remarking that issues of such moment had better be raised in specific recommendations in the form of substantive resolutions.

Happily for the motion, it fell to Mr. Jayakar to move it. But if one is to leave aside the language of convention, it must be confessed that Mr. Jayakar did not do justice to his undoubted ability in moving this motion. Apart from certain inaccuracies and even lapses from urbanity and good taste, into which he was betrayed by the sheer force of his eloquence, the whole speech went on a wrong track and was very provocative to the Swarajists. In one word, Mr. Jayakar tried to show that the Swarajist policy had undergone a progressive come-down from one of obstruction to co-operation in response to the desire expressed by Lord Birkenhead and that therefore there should be no bar to the acceleration of the revision of the constitution. In 1924 the Swaraj party's leader in the Assembly demanded a Round Table Conference for the purpose of framing a scheme for full self-government; but next year, Mr. Jayakar pointed out, the self-same leader of the Swaraj party watered down this demand by adopting the Liberal Party's scheme for a further instalment of constitutional reforms and practically abandoned his demand for a Round Table Conference by accepting the alternative of "a convention" or "other suitable agency." Mr. Jayakar was careful to remark that the scheme of reforms then put forward by Mr. Nehru differed in important respects from

the kind of self-government which the Congress desired. The next gesture on the part of the Swaraj party was the late Mr. Das's Faridpur speech, in which all that Mr. Das asked for was that "some real responsibility should be transferred to the Ministers." Could there be a steeper lowering of the National Demand than that? The Government, however, were not satisfied, and required still further surrender. Well, did not we thereupon formally separate ourselves from the Swaraj party, (asked Mr. Jayakar,) in order to form an avowedly co-operation party by name the party of Responsive Co-operation, and had we not to go through an amount of ridicule and persecution in making this cleavage? A section of obstructionists openly adopted the policy of responsive co-operation in consonance with the Government's wishes and yet we have had no response from Government. All that we have received in return is added insults on our heads. The other section also has changed in the same direction. The resolution of the Gauhati Congress is a distinct move towards co-operation. True, one can pick a hole here and a hole there in that resolution (and, after all, you do not expect people to change all at once and to avow the change), but the resolution certainly registers a further break from the policy of obstruction originally adopted by the Swarajists. And yet the Government remains unmoved! As a result of the Muddilan Committee's report, we in Bombay have only the Boiler and Gas added to the list of transferred subjects, as if already there is not enough simmering of public discontent and not enough gas among non-official benches (a singularly infelicitous expression this last one, isn't it?).

This was, in brief, the purport of Mr. Jayakar's speech. It is no doubt true that the Swarajists have abandoned a large part of their obstructionist policy and have moved towards the right. But was not this the surest way of provoking an indignant disclaimer from the Swaraj party, with whose help alone Mr. Jayakar could hope to carry the motion? The speech seemed to court a repudiation by the Swaraj party, and if it did not quite receive its deserts at the hands of prominent Swarajists, it was only because they did not deem it worth while. But a back-bencher, and one hailing from Maharashtra to boot, dealt with it pretty severely. Mr. Belvi, who rarely takes part in the debate, was moved by Mr. Jayakar's speech to declare that the belief of the Swarajists in the policy of obstruction was firm and unshakable and to condemn the policy of responsive co-operation which Mr. Jayakar had latterly adopted. "Why, mince matters," he said, "let us plainly tell the Government that we are here for the sole purpose of offering as much obstruction as possible." Happily, Pandit Nehru and Mr. S. Srinivasa Aiyengar did not think it necessary to go further on the same line. It is clear, however, that Mr. Jayakar's speech was not in the best vein and his appeal for the world's commiseration with the Responsivists, because

they had broken loose from the Swaraj party, was not in the best of tastes. Mr. Jayakar concluded on this note: "We know we are helpless, we are impotent; but even so we give a warning that we shall cease to co-operate and think of something else"!

A Muslim spokesman then came forward to plead for the protection of Muslim interests, and that brought the Assembly a sharp reminder of the difficulties in the way of the attainment of Swaraj. Mr. Mahomed Yakub, it must be gladly acknowledged, put his case in a reasonable and persuasive manner. By the way, he said, in opposition to several other Muslims in the Assembly, that the Mahomedans had no right to object to any Hindu music being played near the mosques, unless it was deliberately intended to disturb the prayers of the Mahomedans and insult the Islamic faith. The Quran does not proscribe music before mosques, and even if it did, Mr. Mahomed Yakub said, such proscription could not and should not be carried into effect in a country like India where Mahomedan mosques jostled with Hindu temples. It was certainly a very bold utterance on his part, displaying as it did a liberalism which, alas! is only too rare even among educated Muslims. For the rest, he reiterated the demand of the Muslim League for special representation, which he said he was prepared to extend to Hindus in provinces where they are in a minority. Then, for a time, the debate turned upon the Hindu-Muslim question, in which naturally Lala Lajpat Rai took a prominent part. Later Mr. Ruthnaswami, in whom the Assembly has now discovered a really good speaker, enlarged on the weaknesses of the social organization of the country and thus brought the Assembly face to face with another aspect of the question which mere politicians are apt to ignore. It is a pity that Mr. Arthur Moore, whose contributions to the debate are of the best, could not catch the eye of the President although he rose twice to speak; the same thing happened to Mr. Kunzru; and then a closure was applied. Sir A. Muddiman really did not attempt seriously to deal with the issue raised, and the whole debate was thus utterly infructuous. The motion was carried against the Government, but a whole day out of the five days allotted to the discussion of demands for grants, was wasted on a very desultory and perfunctory debate.

#### THE BATTLE OF THE RATIOS

THE battle of ratios which has been raging in the country for the last seven months was fought on the floor of the Assembly on Monday and Tuesday last and ended in a victory for the higher rupee. Even the most perfervid advocates of the 16d. ratio did not expect that, if the Assembly voted for the lower rate, it would find its way to the statute book. They knew that the Government would call its unrestricted powers of certification into use, or abandon its intention to stabilise the rupee, continuing to maintain the existing ratio by exe-

cutive action. All that they had hoped to secure by inflicting a defeat on the Government was to deprive it of its moral right to manipulate the currency contrary to the wishes of the people, and of this they were quite confident. Not only they, but the protagonists of the eighteen-penny rupee too felt that the defeat of the Government's proposals in the Assembly was certain, and the more reasonable of them entertained grave misgivings as to the desirability of proceeding further to fix the rupee by statute at 18d. in spite of the Assembly's vote. They knew that however beneficial it might be to implement the recommendations of the Royal Commission, to do so by the process of certification was to court a disaster. And, indeed, several champions of the higher rate had exhorted Government to avoid resort to extraordinary powers at all costs. They would far rather prefer a compromise ratio if the *de facto* ratio, which on merits they would themselves have, did not meet with the support of the popular Chamber. Or they would prefer to wait for stabilization hoping that in the meanwhile world prices would fall, making it possible for Government to put the lower ratio fancied by the people on the statute book. Uncertainty would result in the meanwhile, but the evils flowing from this course would be less mischievous than the evils issuing from the exercise of autocracy in such a matter as a permanent fixation of the standard of payment. Some of these more thoughtful partisans of the high rupee had hoped—and that was the limit of their hopes—that Government would be able to obtain such a fair-sized majority in the Council of State as would enable it to carry its proposals in a Joint Session of both the Chambers, which is provided for in the Constitution as a means to resolve differences between the two Houses. But none of the supporters of the appreciated rupee whom I met—and I made it a point to meet as many as possible—ever thought it possible for Government to win the approval of the Assembly to its proposals. Government was able to carry the Assembly with it to the utter discomfiture of the "sixteen-pencers."

Now this result is generally attributed to undue influence exercised by Government. The boot is, however, on the other leg. For though Government canvassed for support, it did not do it more vigorously than its opponents; and if officials were bound by executive order to vote in favour of Government proposals, the Swarajist and Nationalist parties too commandeered the votes of their members. But there is this difference that while, if officials had been left free to vote as they pleased, they would in almost all cases have voted just as they actually did, the same could not be said of the Opposition benches. The news has been published that two members belonging to each of the Swarajist and Nationalist parties were ordered to vote for 16d. though their own convictions rebelled against it. But the extent of the use of force on the part of these groups was really wider.

For it is well known here that the leader of the Swaraj party himself is unconvinced about the soundness of reasoning of the advocates of the low rupee. I do not merely infer this from the fact that it was he who asked for freedom of vote being given to Swarajist members of the Assembly at a meeting of the Working Committee of the Congress, but I know it for a fact. His mind is not made up in favour of 18d. either, but he has certainly grave doubts as to the desirability of adopting the lower ratio. The leader of the Nationalist party too, it is believed, was not clear that 18d. was really in the interests of the poor. That is not all; there are several who feel that they are being stampeded by interested people into voting for 16d. though (not to put it higher) they are not sure that 18d. would not answer better for the masses as a whole. Indeed, one member of the Swaraj party, who will perhaps be behind nobody in speaking in harsh tones of Government, told me quite plainly that he was glad that the Government had succeeded in spite of their opposition, for bitterly as he hated Government, he hated Bombay speculators still more. It is true that the Independent party, of which Mr. Jinnah is Leader and Sir Purshotamdas Thakordas Deputy Leader, did not put on a whip and compel the members to vote one way; but if they had done so, the only result would have been that the Leader and the Deputy Leader themselves would have had to vote for 18d., for all the members of the Party except these two, and a third, (Mr. Fazal Ibrahim) are in favour of 18d. The European group too, naturally enough, was solidly in favour of the higher ratio, except that three were in favour of, and were allowed to vote for the lower ratio. It is thus clear that if all the groups had compelled their members to vote one way the majority on the side of Government would have been greater by at least 6 and if all the groups had left the matter to a free vote, the size of the vote on the side of the Government would have been bigger still. There is no reason to believe that anyone who voted for 18d. voted against his inclination, while there is clear proof to show that several who voted for 16d. did so as a matter of party discipline.

This must, however, be admitted that not a single prominent elected Indian member, except Dr. Hyder, supported the higher ratio by speech or vote. But this is not to say that the opponents made out a convincing case for the lower ratio: on the other hand, their appeal was not so much to reason as to prejudice and sentiment. Sir Victor Sassoon and Mr. Gavan Jones, and to a smaller extent Mr. Jamnadas Mehta and Mr. Birla, did argue and argue well. One wishes one could say the same of Sir Purshotamdas. But he was apparently too excited about the matter to put his points clearly and support his contentions by reasoned arguments. Other speakers on behalf of the 16d. ratio were either futile or seemed concerned to excite strong racial animosities. On the other hand, all the spokesmen of the 18d.—and they were not many

—spoke pointedly, dispassionately and ably. Mr. Arthur Moore again stood out from all the others by his wide knowledge, clear thinking, and remarkable powers of speech. Yet one can hardly say that the subject was adequately dealt with. The Finance Member in his opening speech treated fully of the whole subject, pointing out what possible courses were open to the Assembly and dealing with each one of them on its merits. The opponents, however, were very perfunctory, though no doubt very vehement in answer. To take an instance, one would have felt that since the Government's proposal for the fixation of the rupee at 1s. 6d. is most vulnerable on the ground that a tendency is now in evidence for the world prices to fall, the opponents of the proposal would press that objection home. But no one did as much as even mention it. The opponents are as strongly in favour of stabilization as the Government; only they would substitute 16d. for 18d. But, at any rate, as a matter of tactics, seeing that for some time past commodity prices are showing a downward tendency, it would have been well for them to ask that the ratios should not be fixed immediately, but that some time should be allowed, during which the present prices should be maintained, the ratio being lowered in adjustment with the reduction in world prices. As Sir Basil Blackett himself said in his speech, several witnesses before the Commission had argued for the waiting policy. The objections urged by him to this course are not conclusive. If the ratio were not allowed to go beyond 18d. and the decline in world prices were made to reflect themselves in the fall in exchange, by keeping the rupee prices in India stable, it would perhaps be possible to reach 16d. by a natural process and then to stabilise it at that rate. Uncertainty would remain for a short time, and in any case the rate would, if at all, go down, which is what is generally desired. A ratio sanctified by past usage for a long period would by this means be reached without causing any dislocation. But this alternative was not at all considered by the critics. The Government's contention of course is that complete or almost complete adjustment has been effected in prices on the basis of the 18d. ratio, and further, since "Great Britain and U. S. A. are directing their monetary policy towards stabilising prices", there is no fear of any violent fluctuation now. And Sir Purshotamdas agrees that when such adjustment will be reached stabilisation at that rate will not only be reasonable but inevitable. This admission, however, he takes care not to repeat any more, merely contenting himself with the remark that there is still a good deal of maladjustment left. Mr. Jamnadas Mehta on the other hand in his speech did not quarrel with the proposition that prices had fairly adjusted themselves; but he maintains that such adjustment had not yet been attained in wages, debts and so on. This of course is quite true; no one claims that in these matters adjustment has been reached. Some injustice will undoubtedly result from the

new ratio, but the point is that greater injustice and wider disturbance will result if a sudden change is now made in the ratio and this point the supporters of 1s. 4d. did not try to meet.

After complete adjustment has been achieved a higher or lower rate of exchange does not really matter, but in the period of lag some interests are prejudicially affected by a higher rate and some by a lower. Mr. Arthur Moore frankly admitted that most people are guided by self-interest in preferring one and rejecting the other. It was therefore no wonder, he said, that Englishmen who have to make remittances to England and importers &c. should have a decided predilection for 18d. and if in a similar way exporters would vote in their own interest for 16d. Mr. Moore said he could understand it. But when they professed to speak on behalf of the tolling masses, they were speaking with their tongue in their cheek. For, after all, he said, the battle of ratios was a battle of prices, and labourers and wage-earners certainly did not stand to gain by high prices consequent upon the adoption of the lower ratio. On the contrary, they would be hard hit. It was said that cultivators would benefit by a lower ratio—not permanently, but in the interval in which maladjustment prevailed. But in the first place, a very small proportion of cultivators indeed had surplus produce to sell: those who had a small surplus were for part of the year industrial workmen or domestic servants also, and they lost more than they gained. Again, profit in the case of the most big producers was intercepted by middlemen and it hardly ever reached the producers themselves to an appreciable extent. Mr. Moore thus mercilessly exposed the hollowness of the pretended solicitude on the part of the "sixteen-pencers" for the mass of the population. How, again, he asked, was this lower ratio to be reached? A decrease in prices takes place very slowly and painfully as a consequence of the enhancement of the ratio; but an increase takes effect immediately as a result of a drop in the ratio, and there is no doubt that a sudden advance in the price level to the tune of 11 p. c. will entail much suffering and hardship on the population in general. Pandit Malaviya admitted unreservedly that labourers—both industrial and agricultural—would suffer severely, though temporarily, but he maintained that they must cheerfully undergo such sacrifice in the public interest. He did not pause to inquire how many people would be injuriously affected and how few beneficially affected by a rise in the price. But other advocates of the 16d. rupee would not admit the fact that workers would suffer at all. In fact Sir Purshotamdas did not scruple to hold out the threat that the wages of mill employees would in any case be reduced. It was rather unfortunate that the cause of the wage-earners and consumers was not pleaded by any Indian member. It happened because Mr. Joshi and Dr. Hyder, who rose repeatedly, did not get a chance of speaking. It is a question whether Gov-

ernment could not have held the rupee to 1s. 4d. when after the tremendous rise it fell to that ratio. There are many economists who hold that it was a mistake on the part of Government not to have pegged the rupee at that traditional rate, which they could well have done. That there should be some sanctity about a rate of exchange to which over a long period the people are used may be readily granted. But the practical question before the Assembly was whether after the rupee had been kept at 18d. for over two years and prices had undergone considerable adjustments, by a stroke of the pen 18d. should be replaced by 16d., as Mr. Jamnadas Mehta's amendment sought to do. To such a proposal many who did not altogether sympathise with the past proceedings of the Finance Minister in the matter of currency administration demurred, and they felt that the only practicable alternative to the stabilisation of the rupee at the *de facto* rate was not to fix the permanent rate at all just now, but to leave it to be determined for some time longer by the future course of world prices. But this alternative, as said above, was not pressed by any one, and therefore those whose votes really turned the balance refused to bring about a sudden rise of prices by a depreciation of the currency, which would undoubtedly be injurious to a large mass of the people.

Since I wrote the above, Pandit Motilal Nehru, speaking on the main clause of the Bill on the evening of the 12th inst. declared himself for the waiting policy, which, as I said yesterday, was the only practicable alternative to the fixation of the rupee at 18d. In appealing to the Finance Member to hold his hand for some time longer, he said that personally he was for neither ratio; that he was not convinced by the arguments advanced on either side, and that for that reason and others he was for leaving the members of the Swaraj party in the Assembly to vote in harmony with their own inner convictions. The House had decided against 16d. and that ratio must go. But did it follow that the Government must inscribe 18d. on the statute book? Why not rather wait? If, as the supporters of the 18d. maintained, the prices had really adjusted themselves to the new ratio, Government would have an opportunity of proving to demonstration the soundness of the course they were proposing. If, on the other hand, prices had not adjusted themselves, as the champions on the other side contended, Government would be able to substitute 16d. for 18d. In the meanwhile, 18d. would in any case be maintained by executive action as at present. No harm would come from this, only stabilization would be delayed for some time. This was perfectly sound logic; the only flaw in the argument was that it was put forward after the amendment for stabilizing the rupee at 16d. had been lost and not before. And the Finance Member was not slow to take advantage of it. He said it was too late in the day to make such a proposal. The Assembly had already accepted the principle



of the Bill, viz. that the rupee should be stabilised when it agreed to the motion to take the Bill into consideration. The Royal Commission too was unanimous on that point, and the Assembly itself was unanimous. If the Assembly now went back on its former decision, it would stultify itself. Government did not want to be saddled with the responsibility of manipulating currency any further, as Pandit Nehru's suggestion involved. The House had not only decided for stabilisation, but had also decided against stabilisation at 16d. There was no course open to it now but to vote for 18d. Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya made an eleventh-hour request to Government not to issue a mandate to the official members to vote for 18d.; but in doing so, he did not even offer to release members of his own party from its mandate to vote for 16d. I may add here, by the way, since so much is made of the fact that Government puts on its whips, that yet another member of the Nationalist party—one who holds a high office in the party—avowed to me his private preference for 18d. and yet all along voted for 16d. In face of this Pandit Malaviya's request appeared very unreasonable. The clause for 18d. was passed by 67 to 62 votes.

Mr. Kelkar then moved his amendment throwing on Government the obligation of minting *mohurs* to whoever would tender gold at the mint and offer to pay seignage. I will reserve comments on this for the next occasion.

### OUR PARIS LETTER.

(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)

Paris, February 23.

THE view that 'trade follows the flag' which at one time was a commonplace among economists has of late been subjected to vehement criticism, but the events of the past few months in Mexico and Nicaragua and the Chinese question which now so largely looms in the international horizon have familiarized us with the idea of the flag running breathlessly after trade. The view that politics are little more than phosphorence in the sea of economics is peculiarly American. It is the background of much American thinking and reveals itself in the fashion in which President Coolidge has consistently harnessed the two questions of the funding of European debts and the holding of a Naval Disarmament Conference to a single team in his policy. The idea obviously is that when European Powers have depleted their treasuries, sweet reasonableness about the reduction of armaments, world-peace, and such other projects will have some chance of prevailing. Two years ago he had made it clear that he had two principal aims as regards disarmament: 1. to deal with some of the questions of naval disarmament left unsettled in 1921-22 and, 2. to go over the complex question of chemical warfare and consider land disarmament. This last, however, the American President has always treated as peculiarly European though he has not failed to recognise that it will be difficult to isolate any one of the two allied questions of land and naval disarmament.

#### THE COOLIDGE MEMORANDUM.

To detect the immediate cause of President Coolidge's present proposal which has been the

talk of Europe ever since it was issued, one has to look into what is happening in Great Britain. There, as the *Manchester Guardian* remarks, "senseless competition in the building of cruisers, destroyers, and submarines continues unchecked. The American Government finds its hand forced by the British pace." Great Britain which after the world-war somewhat modified her traditional insistence upon the strongest possible navy, and counted upon the prospect of a long period of peace to enable her to retrench in favour of a treasury depleted by the war has been gradually surging back to the old position. The present British naval programme contemplates an addition of 83 ships of war to the existing fleet at a cost of nearly £90,000,000. Last year's shipbuilding, armaments, works, and miscellaneous services absorbed more than £27,000,000 while the Admiralty Office cost £ 1,220,000. The pay of officers and men and the cost of victualling and clothing and medical, educational and scientific services cost a further £21,000,000—and of course, the new ships which are being completed will require crews. In the face of the present situation in China, that this colossal programme should include some small craft specially designed for action in the Chinese rivers is, I suppose, a tribute to British foresight and optimism. It obviously emanates from the belief that there will always be British citizens and interests in China who will need protection and that it will be the agreeable duty of successive British Governments to protect them with these additional facilities in the same spirit as now.

In Japan, the Imperial Diet has just approved a new programme involving an expenditure of £ 26,000,000 on additional ships during the next five years including four cruisers with three more authorised, and a Bill providing for ten further ships is under consideration. France is making steady progress with her great programme which contemplates a total 600,000 tons of new vessels exclusive of capital ships; and, Italy is working on cruisers and submarines and Signor Mussolini always keeps talking of powers "both great and small which are or may become Mediterranean nations".

Meanwhile, in America itself a Bill to authorise ten more cruisers is even now before the Congress. Economy is a prominent feature of the Coolidge administration and only reluctantly did the President yield to this demand from the Naval experts, for he has made the proviso that the programme be suspended if his efforts at naval disarmament are attended with success. But doubt is expressed in some quarters as to whether this will serve sufficiently as a trump card in America's hands in the event of a new Conference. It is pointed out that the amount of tonnage she has in hand is comparatively insignificant, unlike in 1921, and that if the five-five-three ratio for Great Britain, America, and Japan were to be accepted for all fighting tonnage, it will be necessary either for Great Britain and Japan to apply the axe ruthlessly to their fleets, or for America to make large additions to her own navy.

#### GENEVA AND THE MEMORANDUM.

The Memorandum coming at a time when the League of Nations is particularly busy about the disarmament question in accordance with Article VIII of the Covenant, which makes the limitation of armaments one of the essential duties of the League, may well remind us of the Geneva protocol and the deathblow that Great Britain dealt to it. Then, as now, the idea was to obtain the end aimed

at without adding an inch to the stature of the League. That was what happened when Locarno was substituted for the protocol. While America regards Geneva as a superfluous philanthropic institution—and this habit is passing into tradition in that country,—neither does Great Britain omit a single opportunity of preventing the League from getting the better of her in the matter of prestige. Sir Austen Chamberlain's note to Geneva to say that it could do nothing as regards China and the opportune time for any intervention would be decided by Great Britain, evidently intended to warn the Members from raising the question, is an ingenious device which, if it establishes itself as a precedent, will bring elements of the farcical into that body. For the Continental Powers the League could be a serious affair and if only all the Great Powers concerned would act in accordance with its spirit they would willingly embrace that institution as a real blessing. Much of the cynicism in France in this matter is a resultant of hypocrasies manifested elsewhere. The Swiss *Genevois*, discussing the American proposal from the point of view of the League of Nations, observes: "Mr. Coolidge's proposition has been received with a certain degree of reserve in the League circles for it seems that fear is entertained that the United States may adopt in the new Conference the same intransigent attitude shown during the opium conference in 1925"

#### THE FRENCH REPLY.

Great Britain points the finger at the French submarine policy as explanation to the increase in the number of her cruisers and, as submarines hardly suit her purposes, would willingly consider any proposal to their detriment. But France, compelled to divide between two oceans a strength in larger units already limited, depends upon the submarine arm to assure vital communications with a colonial empire. She has taken a leading part in the proceedings of the League of Nations for disarmament since 1921 and now makes that the plea to answer the American proposal. The French reply to the Coolidge Memorandum is a polite but plain "No, thank you" for two reasons, one revealed and one concealed, and recalls as the *Figaro* reminds us, the reply of Alexandre Dumas when he refused an invitation which he did not wish to accept: "I am not coming for two reasons; the second is that I am not at liberty." The ostentatious reason, the second, is that American proposals "risk compromising the success of the work already begun in Geneva with the active aid of the representatives of the American Government." The real reason is the two principles of French action on disarmament: first that all forms of armaments should be considered together, and secondly, that in limitation of naval armaments gross tonnages should be allotted to each of the Powers for apportionment as it pleases the individual power. Both these principles will have to be denied as well as the French principle of absolute equality of nations, if France were to accept Mr. Coolidge's invitation to a conference of the five great Powers alone. In addition, there is the doubt about the procedure now suggested being efficacious, since experience has proved that the smaller Powers and those Powers not consulted in the negotiation of such a disarmament treaty, are highly unlikely to give their approval to it. Concluding, the reply declares that it is the opinion of French Government that the American propositions can best be studied in Geneva, in the preparatory commission with all the Powers in the League co-operating. The chief idea of the French as regards disarmament is that a country's whole fighting,

even its potential, military strength and the economic resources by which it is backed, should be treated as an indivisible whole. Pertinax remarks in the *Echo de Paris*: "the more one examines the American proposition, the more is one forced to recognise that it directly menaces our essential interests" and that four French theses are endangered: potentiality of making war, interdependence of armies and navies, the use of submarines, and the method of obtaining an equitable limitation.

Two suggestions have been freely made as regards the French reply: one is that it and the attitude of Italy, which is much the same, were already anticipated in Washington where the real object is, it is said, to bring about a tripartite accord between America, Great Britain, and Japan, the three principal naval Powers, and the other, that President Coolidge will use the influence that the question of French debt gives him to force the hand of France in the matter of naval disarmament. The fact that Japan has given a more or less favourable answer encourages the former view; but as the *Westminster Gazette* has it, Japan's apparent desire of gaining advantages and concessions in recompense for the construction of the British naval base at Singapore will make any chance of success this tripartite accord may have excessively difficult. As to the second of these suggestions, it has provoked angry retorts all over France. "Let it be understood," writes Pertinax, "that we manage our own affairs as best as we can and international amity will gain by it. . . . Imposing its views as it does in Central America, which it dominates on every hand, what would the United States do in our position on the Rhine and in the Mediterranean? We offer this as a subject for meditation."

#### THE REICHSWEHR.

The French thesis will be comprehensible in the light of the happenings in Germany. The Reichswehr, which is the German army reduced by the Treaty of Versailles to seven divisions of infantry and three divisions of cavalry "to be devoted exclusively to the maintenance of territory and the control of the frontiers", has been since Versailles almost constantly a subject of criticism. The maintenance of the general staff, the training of the *Schutz-polizei*—the political police—to serve as extra-legal skeletons for a larger army, the existence of secret military societies with a membership of millions—all these have proved subjects of controversy between Germany and the Allies. The German navy which now counts four cruisers and twelve destroyers is already the most powerful fleet in the Baltic, and British newspapers have been calling attention to the traffic in arms and ammunition between Germany and China through Russian agencies. Not only have the Allies criticised Reichswehr, but it became the object of grave attacks in Reichstag itself on the occasion of the introduction of the Budget for 1927. According to the Treaty of Versailles, the total number of the Reichswehr was not to exceed 100,000 men; but the German Socialists intimated the Reichswehr was inflating its Budget in order to provide equipment for an army of 300,000 men, and that arms and munitions were being secretly manufactured in Russia for Germany. The Republicans and Socialists attack the army, as they have always been suspicious of its being made a possible instrument for a monarchist *putsch*. The Belgian Minister of National Defence, M. de Broqueville, recently called the attention of the Belgian Chamber to these facts and said that instead of a complete renewal every twelve years, the Reichswehr is discharging one-fourth of its

men every year, thus giving a complete turnover in four years and placing 200,000 trained soldiers on the reserve list. All of which would go to show that Germany is arming herself in a manner which can explain the fears of France and it will be recalled that Herr Stresemann had already said in a notable speech at Hamburg that unless in the true spirit of the Versailles Treaty, German disarmament is followed by general disarmament, Germany in her changed status as a member of the League of Nations would hardly be content to remain with her power shorn in a company of Powers heavily-armed and pretending to be her peers. Unless all the Powers earnestly, frankly, and jointly promote disarmament, the race in armaments will continue and the present state of armed neutrality which prevails among them will lead to increasingly delicate situations. The persistent reports recently that the extreme elements of the Baldwin Cabinet are pressing for rupture with Russia, for instance, have immediately had the effect of militarist and nationalist reactions in the Soviet Republic and now military training is compulsory not only in the universities but even in high schools in Russia. Half-measures are worse than useless here and they become positively evil when the pretence of common good merely shelters a contingency.

## REVIEWS.

### INDIAN POLITICS.

#### INDIAN ADMINISTRATION TO THE DAWN OF RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT. By

B. K. THAKORE, I. E. S. (Taraporewala, Bombay.)  
1926. 7½ x 5. pp. 27 + 498. Rs. 6.

PROF. Thakore, in introducing the new edition, rightly claims that his book, though originally meant for students, has proved more useful to the general reader. There is not that rigidity and colourlessness about it which we associate with a text-book of the ordinary type. On the contrary, the author has freely expressed his views and opinions on every page of the book.

The book is divided into twelve chapters. The first ten are historical, mainly devoted to tracing the development of the East India Company (chapters 1 and 2,) the formation of the Supreme Government (chapter 3), the Provincial Administration (chapter 4) the Legislative Councils (chapter 5). The subsequent five chapters deal with the administration of Law and Justice, Land Revenue, Famines, Railways, Irrigation, Finance and Self-Government. The author is particularly strong on the historical side and the 'Notes' that are appended to each chapter afford to the reader glimpses into that vast ocean of literature, official and non-official, in which Prof. Thakore has dived deep. Chapter 11 deals with the 'Awakening' as a necessary result of which came the 'Dawn' of Responsible Government. The last chapter gives a summary account and criticism of Dyarchy. It is not the object of the author to give a detailed account of the present constitution and the treatment of this part of the subject is much less full than one would wish.

Some compensation for this brevity of treatment is found in the remarks that the author offers on some of our present problems. The problems are the Native States, Communalism, Army Reorganization, Constitutional Advance. For thus exceeding the function of a text-book writer in offering personal suggestions the author gives the following justification: 'After the emo-

tional storm of the Non-Cooperation movement through which the country has passed, parties are in a flux, the firmest principles appear to be tottering and I submit it is no heinous offence at such a moment for an evolutionary nationalist enjoying the perfect freedom of an arm chair spectator (without such entanglements to embarrass him as his party, his following, or even the next elections) to offer a few suggestions to educated Indian politicians at large for what they are worth."

First as to Native States. The author would wish the larger States to adopt progressive and popular constitutions. The smallest chiefs he would pension off. 'Freed from their hereditary bondage to a hollow, unmeaning, misleading and antiquated position they might develop into useful members of society.' (p. 439). It is the class of smaller chiefs that constitutes the problem. This class he would 'mediate'. "The great majority of our Rajas must out of their own free will and accord become enlightened and patriotic enough to perceive that they and their descendants will lose little and the country as a whole will gain immensely by their parting with jurisdictional rights and privileges in return for handsome estates kept together by primogeniture, and a hereditary seat in the Council of State would open to them, according to their capacity, a career such as even Rajas might envy." (p. 443).

Communalism breaks out in riots, insists on separate electorates, and scrambles for the loaves and fishes of office. The author is opposed to separate electorates. He wants patriotic Hindu and Mahomedan leaders "to place before the Statutory Commission as cogent a plea for ending communal electorates as the wit of man can devise. It is also the duty of patriotic representatives of communities, Christians, Anglo-Indians, Sikhs, Parsis, and that most ignorant cat's paw of all anti-Hindus—the Non-Brahmins, to strengthen the hand of the Hindu and Mahomedan patriots." (p. 447). Prof. Thakore is for increasing the facilities for the education of the backward communities; but he would not pamper them with posts and offices for which they have not qualified themselves. 'The qualification which a community wins by its own effort is the only royal road to advance.'

The basis of the present military policy must be radically altered. India must defend herself. We must have a national army. The author expects danger from the N. W. Frontier. We must no longer depend upon a British Army and a denationalised and inferior Indian army. "We are committed to the task of transforming our present army and creating one wholly Indian in its place. However great the obstacles and difficulties, however great the sacrifices required, England is in honour bound to attempt and India is in honour bound to carry it through under the guidance of England." (p. 466).

As for constitutional advance, the author rightly says that it depends upon our ability to produce a body of 10,000 Indians to take the place of the alien bureaucracy that is at present administering the country, an Indian bureaucracy that is inspired by the same high ideals of duty and responsibility that inspired its predecessors in office. There must also be an educated electorate. Both depend upon the spread of the right kind of education among the people.

On the whole, Professor Thakore is to be congratulated upon the publication of the revised edition of his excellent work.

B. G. SAPRE.

## N. V. TILAK'S POEMS.

**SUSILA AND OTHER POEMS.** By N. V. TILAK done into verse by J. C. Winslow. (Association Press, Calcutta). 1926. 5½ x 4¼. pp. 60.

MR. WINSLOW, who has already in his admirable life of Narayan Waman Tilak ('Builders of Modern India' series) introduced him to the English knowing public, has now rendered a further service to Marathi by following it up with a volume of his translations of some of Tilak's poems. The volume includes also renderings of some poems by Dr. Macnicol. These translations have caught the spirit and the freshness of the original and make very delightful reading. The influence of English on Marathi poetic thought and expression has been so decisive that at times the poems in their English garb make a stronger appeal than in the original Marathi. A comparison of *The Poet's Request* and *My Tai* with their original will bear out this statement. But it is no derogation to the poet to make it. For a number of years English language and literature are bound to influence Marathi language and literature and their influence on the whole has been towards freedom of thought and variety of expression.

It is now half a century since modern Marathi poetry was born, and only about thirty years since Keshawsut and Tilak broke through convention and ushered in an era of self-expression. Maharashtra has yet to produce a poet of the first magnitude who should do for Marathi what Tagore and D. L. Roy have done for the Bengali. Keshawsut and Tilak still hold the field in Marathi today. Tilak is less of a revolutionary and more of a tender songster than Keshawsut. Simple, direct and melodious, Tilak could not at times resist a temptation to be didactic. *Susila*, the longest of all Tilak's poems, which Mr. Winslow has at the poet's special desire made accessible to a wider public in an English version, is not, as Mr. Winslow himself admits, 'one of the profounder or best known of his poems.' It is in his short lyrics that Tilak is at his best. That wonderful lyric '*Birdie, wilt thou return?*' seems to gain in charm and depth with every reading. In the volume before us we miss it very much. Tilak's religious lyrics with their psalm-like beauty, simplicity and fervour have kept alive and enriched the tradition of devotional verse. They have not yet received that attention at the hands of his non-Christian countrymen that they deserve. But prejudices are fast dying out; and even if his claim to being called 'the Christian Tukārām of Mahārashtrā' is not admitted, there is no doubt that even today he is on all sides considered as a worthy successor of that King of Marathi devotional poetry.

M. PATWARDHAN.

## SHORT NOTICE.

**ARTHUR NEVE OF KASHMIR.** By A. L. SHEPHERD (Church Missionary Society, London.) Pp. 134. 2s.

THIS book relates to us the life of the great story missionary, that of Dr. Arthur Neve. He left England for India in 1881, and but for the four years' service at home during the great war, gave his whole life for Kashmir and its sufferers till his last moment in 1919. Even these

four years during the war were spent for Indians at the Brighton Hospital. His 38 years of service reveal an adventurous man inspired by love, courage and patience. His was a real uphill fight, "a battle not only against disease but against ignorance and superstition." Dr. Neve won the hearts of the people of Kashmir. He was a friend to all, irrespective of caste or creed, from the Maharajah to the poorest peasant in the village. The sick, the poor, and the helpless were not only healed, but fed, clothed and sheltered; and no wonder in a few years "Neve Sahib" began to be very much loved by the people. He closely followed in the footsteps of his Master Who said "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto Me." The book is fascinating not only because of the life it unfolds, but also for the way in which it is done. It is written in a very vivid and attractive style and makes pleasant reading.

T. N.

## BOOKS RECEIVED.

- INDUSTRIAL FLUCTUATIONS.** By A. C. FIGOU. (Macmillan & Co. Ltd., London.) 1927. 8½ x 5½. pp. 97. 25s.  
**PSYCHOLOGY AND ETHNOLOGY.** By W. H. R. RIVERS. (Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, & Co. Ltd., London.) 1926. 8½ x 5½. pp. 324. 15s.  
**A MODERN HISTORY OF SOUTH AFRICANS.** By ERIC A. WALKER. (Maskew Miller Ltd., Cape Town.) 1926. 7½ x 5. pp. 482. 7s. 6d.  
**THE BELOVED RAJAH.** By A. E. R. CRAIG. (Hodder and Stoughton Ltd., London.) 7½ x 4½. pp. 311. 7s. 6d.  
**EUROPA YEAR BOOK, 1927.** (Europa Publishing Co. Ltd., London.) 1927. 8½ x 5½. pp. 642. 15s.

A market awaits for your goods  
in Bihar and Orissa.

Advertise in the

**SEARCHLIGHT.**

For particulars apply to:—

Messrs. Bihar Journals Ltd., Patna.

**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.