

THE Servant of India

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

VOL. X, No. 45.

POONA—THURSDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1927.

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

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	545
ARTICLES :—	
East African Federation	548
Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyer on Indian States	548
"Father India".—II.	549
OUR SOUTH AFRICAN LETTER	551
REVIEWS :—	
Public Administration. By Prof. V. N. Godbole, M.A.	553
Military Professionalism. By Prof. M. V. Subrah- manyam, M.A., L.T.	554
SHORT NOTICES.	555
CORRESPONDENCE :—	
English Education of Indians. By an Indian	555
BOOKS RECEIVED	556

TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

WE are greatly relieved to find that the long drawn-out struggle between the B. N. Ry. authorities and workers has been ended and an honourable settlement has been arrived at. It is difficult to apportion credit among those that have patiently and wholeheartedly worked to bring about the happy result. On the official side, the credit must be given to Sir George Rainy for his statesmanship and sympathy and his shaking himself free from the trammels of red tape and we are glad to notice that Mr. Giri, President of the Labour Union of the B. N. Ry. gives it unreservedly. On the side of the workers the highest meed of praise is due to Mr. Giri himself, who has continuously led the workers along the right path and kept them within the bounds of constitutional action. Mr. Andrews conducted the negotiations in their last stages with characteristic skill and it would not be too much to say that his good offices with the Government of India have been mainly responsible for the final result. Mr. N. M. Joshi and Diwan Chaman Lal rendered valuable assistance by assisting in the negotiations in the various stages. It is worth emphasizing that the whole mischief was due to the *mala fides* of the railway authorities, who under the cloak of economy were trying to punish the workers who had taken a stand for their rights. The prolongation of the struggle was wholly due to their obstinacy and supercilious contempt for the rights of labour. The lockout has a lesson for the future to all the railway administrations and it is that the days of autocracy and high-handedness are gone by. The labourers have become conscious of their rights and the only path of industrial peace lies along the road of conciliation. It is curious to find that even after an agreement was arrived at between Sir George

Rainy and the Union leaders that if the workers returned to work they should be given full wages for the period of the strike; the Agent of the B. N. Ry. tried to substitute subsistence allowance for full wages, thus setting at naught the authority of the Government of India. In their latest communiqué the Government of India have rectified matters, remarking that there had been a misunderstanding. We hope that the workers will follow the advice of Mr. Giri to be humble in this hour of triumph for trade unionism in India.

* * *

THE Home Member of the Government of India and other lesser officials, in opposing Sir Hari Singh Gour's Bill for abolishing the arbitrary power which Government now possesses to intern people on suspicion, made much play in the Assembly and Council of State with the fact that the Irish Free State had just then passed an Act far more drastic than any in force in India. We pointed out at the time, first, that the conditions in Ireland, where an active military organization was long in existence with the deliberate object of overthrowing the State on the plane of physical force, could not by any stretch of imagination be compared in gravity to those in India, where anarchical conspiracy had never assumed such proportions and, has been at least quiescent for many months; and, secondly, that it was recognised even in ministerial quarters in Ireland that the judgment of the Cosgrave Government had been perverted by the assassination of Kelvin O'Higgins. It is common knowledge that the Ministers themselves were rather shamefaced about this measure and avoided using the powers granted by it. The Opposition, however, kept on hammering, and when last Mr. de Valera made a demand for the repeal of the Public Safety Act, President Cosgrave was glad to give the assurance that the Act would cease to operate next year. Thus, in Ireland, within less than four months since the forging of the instrument of repression, a promise is made that the instrument will be given up. But in India years pass, not only after the enacting of the coercion law, but after the subsidence of the movement which gave it birth, and yet the executive hold tenaciously by it. Will Mr. Crerar, who relied so much upon the Irish precedent in September last, now follow the same precedent? We wonder by the way whether the Howard League for Penal Reform, which is endeavouring to persuade the League of Nations to adopt a Prisoners' Charter, embodying "a schedule of conditions to be observed as a minimum in all civilised countries in the treatment of persons under arrest or in captivity under whatever charge", had not India in mind when in its circular recently published it says that "in one country alone over one hundred persons are known to have been imprisoned for more than a year without trial and without a charge preferred." The draft charter promoted by the Howard League lays down that, "among other things, every

prisoner would be entitled to a public trial within six months of arrest, to be defended by a lawyer if he so desires, to have private interviews with his lawyer, and the right to call witnesses for the defence." This represents, in the opinion of the League, "the irreducible minimum of decency and humanity" and it is in hopes that an international convention on these lines will be adopted by the League of Nations.

THE exclusion of Indians from the Statutory Commission is sought to be justified on the ground that Indians, being already committed to a constitutional advance of a drastic kind, render themselves unfit for an open-minded examination of all the relevant facts such as is contemplated by the Government of India Act. For this task British Parliamentarians having no previous contact with India are, it is said, eminently qualified. This argument however ignores the obvious retort that British Parliamentarians too are as much parties to the dispute as Indian leaders of public opinion; only the former represent Britain while the latter represent India. British politicians are naturally very loath to confess to their partiality; it is therefore very refreshing to find such a respectable journal as the *Statesman* in its leader of the 4th inst. frankly admitting as much. It recognises that, in determining either the extent or the direction of the reforms that should now be introduced into the constitution, neither English nor Indian opinion should be the sole judge; but that both ought to contribute to the discussion so as to hammer out a scheme acceptable to either side. The suggestion that the *Statesman* makes is that the Indian Legislature be invited to appoint a commission just as the British Parliament has already done in the shape of the Statutory Commission; and the two commissions be plainly told to produce an agreed scheme. The consent of the two bodies should be a condition precedent to any scheme being submitted to Parliament, responsibility for the final recommendations being thus shared by the Legislatures of the two countries on an equal footing. This is real equality, but there is no trace of it even in Mr. MacDonald's suggestions, not to speak of Lord Birkenhead's or Mr. Baldwin's proposals. What we are however concerned to point out at the present moment is that the *Statesman* knows that the Parliamentary Commission is not, and cannot claim to be, an impartial body. Says our contemporary: "We wish to see it (a joint Committee of the Assembly and Council of State) told by the Parliamentary Commission that if it can produce an agreed report in session with the Commission that report will go forward. On the joint committee all parties, Hindus, Mussulmans, European business men, and Indian business men can be represented, and the Parliamentary Commission will be there to represent Parliament and Britain and tell the committee at each stage whether they, too, are prepared to agree." Yes, the Commission does represent Britain as the Indian Committees would represent India, and the former is as little unbiased and entitled to be a judge as the latter.

If in some quarters there is yet a disposition to hang back from the boycott movement it is due to the hope, however faint, that the Committees of the Indian Legislature will be raised to a position of equality with the Commission. Since a change in the actual personnel of the Commission is declared to be absolutely out of the question, obviously this is the only means of retreat, open to the British Government, from the impasse now reached. But is there a reasonable chance of the Committees being placed on a par with the Commission, not only in having access to

all documents and in examining witnesses, but in deliberating on and framing the recommendations? Till the Commission arrives in India and announces its procedure, such a thing must of course be held possible, but it is, to use an Aristotelian expression, an improbable possibility. And for this reason, that the one thing Lord Birkenhead wants to be sure about is a unanimous report by the Commission. The personnel of the Commission chosen, "a most discreetly selected" Commission as the *New Statesman* calls it, ensures this. Not that any of the members of the Commission are committed in advance to support the recommendation which Sir John Simon, who rises head and shoulders above others in intellectual power, would desire to make. On the contrary we are assured that the Labour members are quite independent-minded men, who would not consciously do any injustice to India. Just for this reason, however, we think the Indian Committees are almost certain to be forbidden to share with the Commission the task of discussing and formulating the contents of the report to be submitted to Parliament. If the association of the Committees were extended to a participation in the decisions, it would be possible for a part of the Commission, say, the Labour members to join with a part or the whole of the Indian Legislature's Committees and present a report differing widely from the report of the other part of the Commission, and this the present Indian Secretary is bound to prevent on any account. If however the unexpected should happen, it would not be too late for Indians to modify their policy later, but at the present moment they are none too previous in deciding on a boycott.

AT an all-party meeting held in Allahabad on Sunday last to protest against the appointment of the Statutory Commission and to declare its boycott. The main resolution passed on the occasion was as follows, which was moved by Mr. C. Y. Chintamani: "The citizens of Allahabad in public meeting assembled unhesitatingly condemn the exclusion of Indians from the Statutory Commission and declare that the proposed committees of the central and provincial legislatures of India should participate in the deliberations of the Commission itself on a footing of complete equality with the British members thereof. It is the considered opinion of the meeting that the exclusion of Indians is a deliberate insult to the people of India as not only does it definitely assign to them a position of inferiority but, what is worse, it denies them the right to participate in the determination of the constitution of their country and therefore the Indians' only fitting reply to this affront is to resolve to have nothing whatsoever to do with the Commission". We are in agreement with the sentiment expressed at this meeting by Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru who said "that he regarded the non-inclusion of Indians in the Commission not so much as an insult or an affront as a denial of their inviolable right to participate in the framing of the constitution of their country." He ridiculed the idea that in the scheme of the Committee of the Legislature, as announced so far, there was anything like an equality of status.

THOSE who have been sedulously disseminating the mendacious report that the Mahomedans as a body are opposed to boycotting the Statutory Commission have received rather rude shocks this week. In the first place their trump card has failed them; they confidently expected that H. H. the Aga Khan would lead an anti-boycott movement. He has, however, declared that,

opposed as he is to the All-White Commission, he has not yet made up his mind either for or against the boycott. Secondly, the move of some of the Punjab Mahomedans to hold a session of the Muslim League at Lahore, which is at present the hot-bed of reactionaries and communal extremists, has been defeated, for Calcutta has been decided upon as the venue of the League. Sir Mahomed Shafi is the President, but his views will have little influence on the League's decisions. The Anglo-Indian papers will now have little excuse to represent Mahomedans as being in favour of the Commission. The Madras Provincial Muslim League has in fact already declared for a boycott. In the meanwhile Mr. Jinnah has issued an appeal to the Muslim community urging them not to be blinded by their supposed communal interests into taking up an attitude ruinous to national interests. He proves conclusively that, whatever their claims, going before the Commission apart from other communities will not help in their satisfaction. On questions like music before the mosque or cow slaughter, a decision by the Commission is of course out of the question, for such social and religious problems cannot be solved and will not be considered by the Commission. The increased share in superior posts which the Moslems desire is also a matter removed from the Commission's purview. Separate electorates for their community, whatever their inherent merits or demerits are already assured to them till the Moslems themselves are willing give them up. Mr. Jinnah thus shows by taking up one question after another that the Moslems, as a separate community, have little or nothing to gain by appearing before the Commission, if other communities decide to ignore it, while the country's interests are certain to be prejudicially affected thereby. So far the attitude of the Moslems as a whole is very encouraging, when such leaders of the community as Sir Abdur Rahim, Maharaja of Mahmudabad, Mr. Jinnah, Mr. Yakub Khan are staunch boycotters. The appeal of Mr. Jinnah should bring more recruits.

* * *

THE Indians in Kenya are very grateful to the Government of India for sending a delegation of two able and tried officers to that country for helping them in submitting a statement to the Hilton Young Commission on Closer Union. At a meeting held in Mombasa, Kunwar Maharaj Singh and Mr. Ewbank were heartily welcomed and the Government of India profusely thanked by the leaders of Indian opinion. All this is as it should be, but one is curious to know to what brief they will speak before the Commission on behalf of the Indians; what their instructions are. They gave no clue to it in their speeches at this meeting. They merely advised the Indian community to speak with a united voice. The advice is good so far as it goes, but what we are anxious to know is whether they will themselves protest, and advise the Indian community to protest, against a change in the whole basis of the East African policy, on which His Majesty's Government has apparently embarked. Unless this threatened change is still open to discussion, the Commission is not worth troubling about. But will these two officials resist as well in the name of the Government of India as in that of the Indian community a reconstruction of the political machinery of Kenya so that the Indian, and even more than the Indian, the African native, will be made virtually the bond-slave of the European? We have serious misgivings on the point because Lord Irwin spoke in Simla as if as it were a slight change that was contemplated and did not destroy the basis of the 1923 White Paper. Lord Lovat recently reiterated the hypocritical claim that native trusteeship was still maintained intact. Will Messrs. Maharaj Singh and Ewbank insist that no advance in

representative government will be made unless and until the natives outnumber the immigrant communities on a common voters' list and that a minimum number of seats will be guaranteed to them? This is the least that native trusteeship demands. As a corollary to this Indians too must be placed on the same register, as Lord Irwin himself suggested, and the franchise must be equal, leaving the immigrant communities to capture as many seats as they can out of the seats open to them for election. The other questions that will come up before the Commission pale into insignificance by the side of this all-important one.

* * *

WHILE other provinces are issuing their administration reports for 1926-27, Bombay is behindhand by a year and has just issued its report for 1925-26. It appears from this that only one additional municipality was established during the year, the present number being 156. The total municipal revenue was Rs. 22,288,506, of which Rs. 15,309,000 was realised by direct taxation as against Rs. 14,612,000 in the preceding year, the percentages of direct and indirect taxation being respectively 58.82 and 41.18 as against 55.4 and 44.6 of the previous year. The incidence of taxation rose by four annas from Rs. 5-7-6 to Rs. 5-11-6. Only one Municipality, that at Ahmedabad, went in for a drainage scheme during the year; and though the total expenditure on roads showed an increase of Rs. 5 lakhs, the condition of municipal roads was very far from being above reproach. But our interest mainly centres round the item of "Public Instruction." We are sorry to observe that the total expenditure on this head has, instead of increasing, gone down by over Rs. 2 lakhs. Ahmedabad Municipality which used to contribute Rs. 145,000 to national schools and which ceased doing so during the year under report being responsible for a large part of the decrease. But we do not think this is an adequate explanation. The fact seems to be that during 1925-26, municipalities being engaged in setting up school boards, appointing administrative officers, and satisfying other technicalities of the Compulsory Education Act, the progress of education must not have received any attention at their hands. The evil of accumulated arrears of municipal dues which is steadily on the increase has naturally come in for strong criticism in the resolution. Some of the worst offenders are municipal councillors themselves and their conduct in allowing their dues to fall into arrears is, as Government rightly say, disgraceful. The remedy suggested is publicity and to that end Collectors have been asked to submit to Government, through the usual forwarding agency of the Commissioners, the names of councillors with the debts they owe to their municipalities so that their names will be published to the whole world by means of a Press Note. We do not think publicity of this sort will do much good. If the fear of publicity is at all to act as a deterrent, the publicity must be among the townsmen concerned and a Government press note in the usual official style and in English, whose contents do not always trickle down to the man in the street, will hardly serve the purpose for which it is intended. We would far rather prefer an obligation being cast on municipalities to prepare every year a statement giving the requisite information and to secure as wide local publicity to it as possible, as is done e. g. in the case of the municipal agenda under the Major Municipalities Act now in force. This would perhaps result in some additional cost; but if the co-operation of newspapers, wherever they exist, is enlisted, the additional cost would be considerably reduced.

EAST AFRICAN FEDERATION.

A TENTATIVE scheme has been drawn up by the Executive of the Convention of Associations (the non-official Parliament of the whites) in Kenya for being submitted to the Hilton Young Commission, the gravity of which can be readily understood when it is said that it closely follows the lines of Lord Delamere's speech commented upon by us in our issue of Sept. 8th. It would be enough merely to mention the leading points in the scheme without even a running commentary. They are as follows:—

1. Federation is a subsidiary object, the primary object being a change in the political status of Kenya.

2. A free Kenya possessing a legislature with a non-official European majority is thus an indispensable condition of any scheme of federation, the underlying object being "the permanent entrenchment of British civilisation," and "the securing of Tanganyika for all time as an integral part of the Empire."

3. Kenya must be the centre of the Federation.

4. The Federal Constitution shall consist of a High Commissioner whose seat is to be in Nairobi, and "a nominated Federal Council composed of European official and unofficial representatives of the three States," Kenya having twice as many as members as Uganda and Tanganyika, and unofficial members in each Colony being twice as many as official. The Council, so composed, shall have control of all the subjects assigned to it.

5. The Legislative Council of Kenya shall have a majority of non-official European members. European official members to be 6; representatives of natives, who however must be of European extraction, to be 2; Indian members to be 5; Arab members to be 2 (one of whom to be an official). This accounts for 15 members (at least 8 of whom are Europeans). To counterbalance these it is suggested that elected European members should be 13 and nominated 4. In which case no reserve power like that of vote and certification should be vested in the Executive to overcome deadlocks, for the nominated element of 4 European members may be expected to vote with the Executive if the latter propose a reasonable measure, which will give them a majority in the Council. An alternative to this is to abolish the element of nomination and to have 17 elected European members, in which case however some provision will be made for veto and certification enabling the Government "to conduct *non-contentious* business by some form of proclamation." (Apparently contentious measures have to be dropped if the Europeans take exception to them.)

6. One or two elected European members should be put in charge of some departments.

7. The Executive Council too shall consist of a majority of European unofficials—elected or nominated—according as the one or the other alternatives regarding the composition of the Legislative Council mentioned above is adopted.

Comment as said in the beginning is superfluous!

SIR P. S. SIVASWAMY AIYER ON
INDIAN STATES.

SIR P. S. SIVASWAMY AIYER, during last week delivered the eleventh lecture on the 'Modern Indian Constitution' in the Senate House, Madras. He continues therein his treatment of the interesting question of Indian States in relation to the new government. (*Vide* our "Topic" in the last issue.) The basic principle of the Indian Constitution is that the form of government must be unitary and that the Central Government must be supreme, possessing adequate powers to enforce its will in all matters. It is the height of political unwisdom, according to him, to establish a new federal form of government. The Indian States can be organically associated with British India either by becoming part of the unitary government on the same footing as the provinces or by a federal union. The first alternative being beyond the range of practical politics, the second alone has to be considered. There are many objections to a federation of the whole of India and the States as separate units. The States are too many, and the size of the Federal Assembly would be too large; the principle of equality of States will have to be sacrificed as minor States will be formed into groups, and even then British India would claim a majority of votes; the new Federal Assembly would be an encroachment on the authority of the Assembly, some of whose powers will be transferred to the new federal body, and even if British India acquiesces in the sacrifice the Indian States would not consent to be bound by the decisions of this federal body. A federal body representative of States only, would be incompatible with the principle of responsible government; it would make the machinery of government cumbrous and inefficient; in case of a deadlock the will of the Indian legislature would prevail, a contingency sure to be unpalatable to the Federal Assembly and the solution of the deadlock by reference to the Viceroy would be inconsistent with Dominion Status.

Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer next discusses the genuine federal constitution. This, he says, is undesirable because it would give more scope for centrifugal tendencies to operate. Besides, the Princes do not want such a Constitution, but one in which the Government of India and the States only are represented. After examining all the conditions of a real federal type of government, he is positively certain that this form cannot be acceptable to the Princes who have shown no desire to submerge their individuality and whose ideas do not go beyond a loose confederation. The unwillingness to recognize equality among themselves and their dislike of deciding by a majority vote are the principal obstacles to the adoption of the well-known type of federal constitution. Novel schemes may be suggested, but the lecturer warns the people of India against accepting loose and illogical schemes of federation. Coming to matters of common interest the Montagu-Chelmsford report suggested that the Chamber of Princes should be consulted as

to the wishes of the States and that joint deliberation between this Chamber and the Council of State be provided for. This has led to the curious claim on the part of the States that a share in the revenues of British India is in justice due to them. This claim is certain to be urged before the expert Committee which would inquire into the relations between British India and the States, and it is necessary, says Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer, to examine the grounds for it. The main grounds applicable to the revenue from customs are that the import duties act as transit duties which have been abolished and that, according to the practice of foreign countries as well as of the British Empire all goods passing into the States, should be exempted. These grounds are not adequate; It is the right of every State to take full advantage of its natural position and a land-locked State has no right to have its goods passed without duty. Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer says emphatically that no treatise on international law contains reference to the principle that maritime States are bound to pass goods free into States in the hinterland. For a free passage of goods a treaty should be entered into with the maritime States. Secondly, abolition of transit duties cannot involve logically the abolition of customs. The fact is that Indian States want exemption from British duty in order that they may levy customs duties themselves. Similarly the claim of the States to be consulted on tariff policy cannot be entertained as budgets have to be kept confidential. As for Railways, Posts and Telegraphs the capital is invested by the Government of India and the States cannot claim a part of the revenue. Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyer concludes by saying that the Indian States should be consulted in these matters as a matter of concession and courtesy.

The most suitable machinery for ascertaining the opinions of States on matters of common interest is the existing Chamber of Princes, provided that it is adequately representative, with an occasional informal meeting of an equal number of representatives from the Chamber of Princes and from the two Houses of the Central Legislature. It is not possible to provide any other workable scheme of bringing about an organic association between the Princes and the people of British India. The relations of a self-governing India and the States have next to be examined. The external affairs of Indian States should continue to be disposed of by the various Departments as heretofore. The Princes have reason to expect a more sympathetic handling of their affairs at the hands of Indians than by members of an alien bureaucracy. As for internal affairs they should, in the opinion of Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer, be left in the hands of the Governor-General during the transitional period but should be dealt with by the new Government when responsible government is a realized fact. It is a pity that when the Princes talk of their share in the reform they are thinking of their own rights and power and not of those of their subjects. Many of the rulers have not yet realized that the Princes exist for the people. The essentials of a progressive administration are the separation of the civil list, regular budgets, the recruitment of civil service by competitive examinations, independence of the judi-

ciary, supremacy of the reign of law, freedom of the press, introduction of representative institutions, and restriction on the absenteeism of the Princes.

After this Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer discusses the grievances of the Princes themselves. The first grievance is the whittling down of their privileges by the Government of India. But it has to be remembered that this interference has generally been guided by the policy of promoting the welfare of the country as a whole as well as that of the people of the States. The Princes cannot expect a literal interpretation of old treaties. Prof. Westlake has pointed out that the relations between the States and the Government of India have been shifted from an international to an imperial basis. The Political Department, however is at times capricious in its action. Out of two rulers equally guilty one is penalised and the other goes scotfree because the latter keeps the powers that be in good humour. But when everything is said, the Princes have to reconcile themselves to the hard facts, viz. the paramountcy of the British power, the greater progress of British India and the promise of responsible government given to it and lastly the progress of democratic ideas. It may be hard for the Princes to part with autocratic power and give up the divine right of kings to govern wrong; many of them believe that western political institutions are unsuited to our climes and are anxious to discover safeguards against the surge of democracy. But the Princes ought to see that it is only a responsible government of a United India can speak for India in the councils of the world and that India cannot be united until the people of British India and the Indian States are welded together by a bond of common political organization. Are the Princes to adopt the soul-deadening belief of our opponents that India will never be a united nation? If they are wise they will address themselves to the task of setting their houses in order and guiding the steps of their people along the path of evolution more or less on the lines on which British India has been guided. They will then find that the strongest support a ruler may receive is the support of his subjects based upon gratitude for his self-denying labours for the welfare of the people. One important question is about the attitude of the citizens of British India towards the States. The answer of Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer is that the policy of non-interference is the wisest to be followed, leaving commercial and social intercourse and the working of political institutions in India to influence silently the Princes as well as the people of the States. In any case no steps should be taken which will weaken the action of centrepetal forces. The Government of India should do their part by manifesting their appreciation of the work of the Princes, who act as constitutional rulers and by relaxing their pressure through their Agents in proportion to the extension of the participation of the people in the administration of the States.

"FATHER INDIA." *

II

MR. RANGA IYER denies the fact that Shiva represents the generative organ and goes on giving the beneficent

*FATHER INDIA. By C. S. RANGA IYER. (Selwyn and Blount, Ltd., London.) 1927. 8 x 5. pp. 207.

aspect of the deity; we think he has overshot the mark because there is no gainsaying that phallic worship is closely connected with ideas of sexual generation. Of course Miss Mayo's suggestion that because Hindus worship a phallus, therefore their whole religion is degrading, is stupid and unscientific, as everybody can see from a perusal of her book that she is woefully ignorant of sociology. But the line of refutation surely ought to take a different course from denying a plain fact. Mr. Iyer's complaint that Miss Mayo should talk only of the old religion and nothing of the new revival under the auspices of the Arya Samaj and the Brahma Samaj movements is quite just. Even in quoting speeches from the Assembly she quotes only the speeches of reactionaries and not a word is said about the speeches of valiant reformers who are in the majority.

With regard to Miss Mayo's lurid picture of the Hindu-Muslim and communal riots, Mr. Iyer admits the truth of the contention that Mr. Montagu made the greatest mistake in adopting the communal electorates from the Congress-League scheme although the scheme as such was rejected. He has also to admit that communal riots have become more common since the introduction of the reforms of 1919. He says that a Hindu or a Muslim candidate succeeds better with his constituents if he reviles the religion of the other community and praises everything which is sacred and dear to his own community even to the extent of inflaming passions. With such an orgy of bellicose speeches he does not wonder that "communal propagandism ending in red hooliganism" is the result of the Montagu Act introduced with the noblest of motives. But Mr. Iyer objects to the purpose of Miss Mayo, which clearly is to create the impression that a veritable war is going on between Hindus and Muslims. Miss Mayo chuckles over the riots and asks why they should occur at all if Indians were competent to look after their affairs. Mr. Iyer points out many misstatements of Miss Mayo about the character of the Moplas in Malabar whom of course he knows at first hand. According to Mr. Iyer the Mopla rebellion was not religious but economic, based on a protest against rack-renting and the oppressions of the landlords. The object of Miss Mayo in dilating on the Malabar riot was to show that the Hindu-Muslim unity of the non-co-operators was farcical. Mr. Iyer does not think so and he cites instances to show that it was a reality. *A propos* of the boycott of the visit of the Prince of Wales, Mr. Iyer quotes from *Young India* to prove that Gandhi's object was not to insult the Prince but that the action of the Viceroy in making the Prince was a political instrument; Miss Mayo however wanted to produce the impression that the Bombay riots were only a demonstration of the non-co-operators who were out to insult the Prince of Wales.

Miss Mayo says that the reforms have transferred much power and patronage from British into Indian hands. Mr. Iyer examines this claim in detail and pronounces the judgment that there is no transference of real power even in the provincial sphere. The powers that be in the Central Government are irremovable and are responsible to the Parliament and the Viceroy frequently employs the power of certification; the evidence before the Muddiman Committee is clear on the point of the complete starvation of transferred departments for want of funds. As for Miss Mayo's complaint that the Assembly consists of those who indulge in pure obstruction without understanding the worth of the mechanism of democratic government entrusted to their care, Mr. Iyer quotes the opinions of Mr. Mosley and Mr. Aldous Huxley that the proceedings of the Assembly are too dull and wanting in the ferocity expected of a nation struggling for freedom. If the

"bedlam of frivolous and abusive chatter" which Miss Mayo speaks of were a reality, the Government members would not adopt a consistently flippant attitude of amused and secure superiority which Mr. Huxley hastested to. The Hon. Mr. V. J. Patel said in a statement to the press recently that India's Parliament had nothing to learn in the direction of dignity from the Mother of Parliaments. Mr. Iyer says, and we endorse what he says, that the worst scenes in the Assembly pale into nothingness when compared with similar scenical situations in the Western Legislatures. Mr. Iyer points to the fact that most of the Swarajists pledged to obstruction have settled down as constitutionalists and that they are not demanding Dominion status straightaway but only a settlement. They only demand a representative body to frame a scheme with due regard to the interests of minorities. Miss Mayo's contention that democracy is an exotic plant in India Mr. Iyer meets by a counter question:—"Is democracy the most efficient institution in the world?" What we are demanding, says Mr. Iyer, is not the transplanting of the English democracy or the United States pattern of it but only a mild form of it suited to India. For the matter of that Mr. Huxley, again quoted by Mr. Iyer, says that government by the people exists nowhere except in Switzerland.

According to Miss Mayo, Muslims are loyal to the core and if the British withdraw immediate hell would follow and the Hindus will be either swept off or made slaves. Hindus are, according to her, degenerates, morally and physically, and yet during the Muslim period they were the brain of the administration. Now if the Muslims are waiting to sweep like a hurricane over the Hindu India how can the English, says Mr. Iyer, who deny them this opportunity be the best friends of the Muslims? The reason is that Miss Mayo is either too credulous or too imaginative. The Hindu, Mr. Iyer points out, has not asked the English to clear out bag and baggage, but has only asked for a Dominion Status. According to Miss Mayo, the fate of India would be like that of Britain when the Romans withdrew, if to-day the British withdraw.

The great bogey of those who are against the grant of self-government in India is the Indian Princes and their position under the new regime. This is clearly raised, according to Mr. Iyer, to sow the seeds of mistrust between the Princes and the people of India. If any one reads Miss Mayo's book it would look as if "the British are going away and it only remains to settle as to whether sovereignty should be transferred to the people or to the Princes." With regard to the famous quotation "not a rupee or a virgin will be left in Bengal" if the British were to leave India, Mr. Iyer says, what has been repeated by other reviewers in England, that this conversation did not take place in 1920 as Miss Mayo alleges, but some two decades back. Such, Mr. Iyer moralises, is the veracity of the conversations in 'Mother India'. As a matter of fact we know that half the 'conversations' have turned out to be imaginary. Mr. Iyer shows further on that many of the Princes, instead of distrusting politicians, have shown themselves very friendly to them. Many have felt that their interests are thoroughly identical with those of the people in British India.

As an additional confirmation of the indignation roused by 'Mother India', Mr. Iyer quotes the opinions expressed in English reviews and in other places, of Sir John Maynard, Mr. MacClelland, Mr. Lovatt, Major Graham Pole and Mrs. Besant. All bear testimony to the utter worthlessness of Miss Mayo's generalizations based on scanty knowledge and a rapid survey of the country within the space of a few months. This however is only a secondary retort!

According to Miss Mayo, one of the most direct means of knowing the truth about women is to visit hospitals of women. She describes her visits to hospitals as research. Mr. Iyer points out in the first place the great defects of statistics by quoting the opinion of the Royal Commission on Venereal Diseases in the British Isles 1916. Healthy cases do not go to hospitals and no conclusions can and should be drawn from those that are found in hospitals. Mr. Iyer gives parallel quotations from the report of the Royal Commission to show that the same sort of indictment as the one brought by Miss Mayo could be framed against the English nation; a person however doing so would be sent for the medical examination of his sanity.

Mr. Iyer concludes by affirming that the heart of the people of India is sound and India's loyalty to the throne is unquestioned; what India wants is honourable association with England, like Canada, as a self-governing member of the British Commonwealth. He quotes the famous passage of Macaulay prophesying that having become instructed in European knowledge the Indian people would demand European institutions. Macaulay further says that, whenever the time will come it will be the proudest day in England's history. The time has come, says Mr. Iyer, and England ought to rejoice. He believes in a union of the cultures of the East and West and does not subscribe to the thesis of Miss Mayo that East is East and West is West. Barrin's a few exaggerations and some untenable defences of the extreme Swarajist position, this attempt of Mr. Iyer to pulverise Miss Mayo's oddities and perverse judgments on Indian life and culture is eminently praiseworthy.

OUR SOUTH AFRICAN LETTER.

(From Our Own Correspondent.)

DURBAN, 17th NOVEMBER.

TRAINING COLLEGE FOR INDIANS.

AMONG the first great needs of the Indian community here that Mr. Sastri noticed was the provision of facilities for the training of teachers for primary schools for Indians. At the present moment there are no facilities for regular training. What happens is that the untrained people who are already in service as teachers undergo a perfunctory course of "coaching" and attend a weekly lecture on pedagogy and sit for the Indian Teachers' Junior and Senior Examinations held every year. No expansion of primary education is worth while unless there is forthcoming a constant supply of efficiently trained teachers. There has also been a charge against the Indian community that they are apathetic towards education, and that the absence of private endowments is an evidence of it. In order to meet the need and refute the charge, Mr. Sastri conceived the idea of organising a Training College, the capital expenditure of which he invited the Indian community to provide. The cost is estimated at £20,000 or something like Rs. 3,00,000. This includes the cost of a High School for Indians. In fact the idea is to have a combined Training College and High School. Donations of £100 and over have so far been accepted and the contributors were given the facilities of paying just 25 per cent. of their contributions in cash and the balance in three bills of 25 per cent. each, payable at the end of two, four and six months respec-

tively. So far a little over £17,000 have been subscribed in cheques and bills. It is anticipated that there will be no difficulty in raising the balance of £3,000.

The next question was the site for the building. Within the Durban Borough there is a vacant piece of municipal land, next to the Indian sports ground, of about six and a half acres. It was intended for a housing scheme for poor whites. It is however in close proximity to three Indian schools, which would come in handy as practising schools for the teachers under training. That site was therefore selected for the Training College. There were two obstacles to it. One was a housing scheme for poor whites. But the Corporation officials disapproved of the scheme on the ground that the land was low-lying and in parts "made" and because it was near the Indian quarter and it was not advisable to locate the poor whites so close to the Indian population. Councillor Mrs. Benson, who fathered (!) the housing scheme was therefore induced to drop her project. The second came from confirmed anti-Asiatics of the type of Mr. Acutt who are sworn to segregate Indians outside the borough and not give them an inch of land within it. Fortunately for us, they are in a minority in the Town Council. The erstwhile anti-Asiatic Mr. H. H. Kemp is now a pronounced pro-Asiatic; and the Mayor, Mr. Buzzard, is also on our side and so are the representatives of the Labour Party and also the three lady councillors. There is every hope that the site will be granted. As regards the running expenditure of the institution it is hoped that the Government will look to that.

INDIAN EDUCATION COMMISSION.

Curiously enough, no official announcement has as yet been made of the appointment of the Indian Education Commission, nor is the full complement of its personnel yet assembled. The experts from India are expected here by the first week of December. But it is not likely that the Commission will at once commence its work. For Mr. Hollander, a member of the Natal Executive and perhaps the most influential man in it, is now on two other Committees and it is not likely that he will be free before January from that work. Our experts will thus have the whole of December to study the situation here.

The position of Indian education is by no means good; it is indeed "grave" as was admitted in the Cape Town Agreement. There is a pretty strong feeling against providing educational and technical facilities for Indians, who are much feared as competitors. No technical education of any kind is provided. As for general education, there are, according to the Census of 1921, over 31,000 children of school-going age, of whom just over 9,000 are receiving any education at all. Of these not even 500 pupils are in the standards above the fourth, corresponding to the secondary school standards in India.

There is but one school—and it is a Government institution—which teaches up to the Matriculation standard. Of its existence few Europeans are said to be aware, and that is its security! If it were more widely known, it would have run the risk of being

closed down. There are 33 primary schools, of which 9 are Government institutions and the rest aided ones, mostly run by Christian missionaries. Here, as in India, the Christian missionaries have been the pioneers of modern education for Indians and India has good reason to be grateful to them for their noble efforts.

I have already referred to the training of teachers, rather the absence of it. Of the staff of the Indian schools 43 are Europeans and 260 are Indians. It is freely admitted that these European teachers were failures in European schools and were for that reason dumped on Indian. The Indian teachers are very poorly paid, very few of them getting as much as a waiter gets.

All the schools are frightfully congested. In Durban itself, not to mention other outlying parts of the province, two, and even three, classes are held simultaneously in one small room, side by side. The programme is so arranged that while one teacher is giving reading lessons, the other is giving writing lessons! Even so it is found impossible to meet the demand for schooling. Hundreds of applicants are turned out for want of accommodation.

The syllabus is the same as that followed in European schools and the medium of instruction is, except partly in the first two years, English.

As for Collegiate education, there is the Native College at Fort Hare in the Cape Colony. It is primarily intended for the Natives; but it takes in a few Indians also. There is an unwarranted prejudice among some Indians against sending their children to that College. I have had talks with Indian boys and girls that have studied in that College and they all gave very enthusiastic accounts of it. The only drawback is the unsuitability of the food given in the hostels. But that is a matter that can be easily set right. Of course the Education Commission is not concerned with higher education, which is directed under the Union Government as also technical education.

THE SPRINGFIELD ESTATE.

The Durban Municipality purchased some time ago some estates outside its boundaries with the intention of forming a Native and an Indian village in pursuance of its policy of segregation. Nothing has however been done so far. The Town Council recently appointed a sub-committee to recommend a policy for the utilisation of these estates. One of these is called Springfields and is over a thousand acres in extent. It is now tenanted by about 500 Indian vegetable growers, who are said to be responsible for something like 75 per cent. of the vegetable supply of Durban. The sub-committee proposed that the estate should be leased to Messrs. Chick Sugar Company. And the only reason advanced for this outrageous recommendation is that it would be easier to collect rent from one big tenant than from several hundred small tenants. It was not stated that there was any difficulty in collecting rent from the Indians. In fact, I understand that the defaulters do not come up to even 1 per cent. Further, it is said that the rent payable by the Sugar Company was to be £1.10.0,

while the Indian is now paying something like £3 per acre. This will give an indication to what inhuman and vindictive extent the anti-Asiatics are prepared to go. They give no thought as to what is to become of the 500 Indians who were to be evicted from the land which they have been cultivating, in some instances, for forty years and whose intensive cultivation has so improved it that it is now coveted by the Sugar Company. It is however hoped that these infamous proposals will not be carried as the fanatical anti-Asiatics are now in a minority, though it is disconcerting enough to note that the Town Council in Committee adopted in principle the recommendation of the sub-committee.

SEGREGATION AGAIN.

The same sub-committee has recommended that another piece of land outside the borough which has been purchased by the Town Council in Cato Manor should be made an Indian village. This land is recommended to be sold without the anti-Asiatic restriction clause. The sub-committee naively pretend that thereby the Town Council would be fulfilling its promise to the Government that the claims of Indians for land for housing purposes would not be overlooked, when the Government passed the Ordinance empowering the Town Council to insert an anti-Asiatic clause in the sale of municipal land. But that promise referred to land within the borough. All of which shows how persistent the desire to segregate the Indian community outside the borough is and how eternally vigilant the community has to be to resist it.

THE TRANSVAAL SITUATION.

This has become more complicated than ever. The Secretaries contended that no resolutions were passed at the Committee meeting on the 17th of October and hence they had no mandate to call a general body meeting on the 30th October. Whereupon the pro-Congress party got up a requisition signed by over 700 members asking the Secretaries to call a general body meeting to pass a vote of no confidence in the Secretaries and to demand their resignations, to rescind the resolution of May last seceding from the Congress and to rejoin the Congress. The Secretaries, who swear by constitutionalism, called a Committee meeting instead, which was boycotted by the Congress party. It was explained that the real desire of the signatories of the requisition was to rejoin the Congress and not to dismiss the Secretaries, whereupon the Committee promptly passed a vote of confidence in the Secretaries and dissolved. The Congress party now propose to call a general body meeting themselves. It is clear that the two Secretaries, Messrs. C. N. Camay and M. I. Patel, have the control of the machine and are prepared to fight to the last ditch to retain that control in defiance of public opinion.

THE LIQUOR BILL.

The Liquor Bill has been read the first time in the Assembly. A joint deputation of the Indian Congress, the Licensed Victuallers Association consisting of the European employers, and the Indian Hotel Employees Association waited on Mr. Sastri

last week in connection with clause 104 of the Bill. The employers' representatives are said to have contended that they were perfectly satisfied with the Indian waiters and so were their customers, that there were no whites who could replace them, that the employment of poor whites had a double disadvantage of lowering the efficiency of the service and raising the cost of it, and that they would rather pay white wages to the Indians and retain them than employ the poor whites. Mr. Sastri promised to do his best to get the clause dropped.

The Hotel Employees Association have turned from Mr. P. S. Aiyer to the Congress for assistance in organisation and agitation over the Bill, and are now contemplating a big union of all the employees in Natal.

REVIEWS.

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION.

THE BRITISH CIVIL SERVICE. By HERMAN FINER. (The Fabian Society, London.) 1927. 8½ x 5½. pp. 96. 2s.

AS a necessary appendage to democratic constitutions the Civil Service in any country is an interesting institution and for Indians specially the British Civil Service is bound to be an object of particular curiosity. This booklet gives us the requisite description of that service. To begin with, the author points out that the British Civil Service is not a bureaucracy in the sense of a body of officials imbued with a particular tradition, forming a special caste and aiming at directing the people. "No one in England doubts that the civil service is anything other than the servant of Parliament". This is the reason why there is little jealousy between Parliament and the Departments. In England again, in contrast with the continent, the local self-governing authorities do not make use of the civil service as in France or Germany and hence the field of the civil service is very narrow. The growth in the numbers of the service has been marked since 1870; from 53,874 in 1871 the strength has risen to 2,96,398 in April 1926. The period before 1855 was a period of patronage and consequently of inefficiency. In 1833 Macaulay secured the abolition of patronage and adoption of the principle of open competition. It was recognized at the same time that the general foundation of liberal studies is the requisite test of a future administrator. By an Order in Council in 1855 the Civil Service Commission was established to conduct the examinations; but this only referred to the admission to the ranks of junior offices. It was in 1870 that open competition was made obligatory practically throughout the services.

At this point Dr. Finer gives a detailed analysis of the present organization; the salient points in this are the complete control of the Treasury, the creation of a special Establishment Officer in every department and the practically complete power given to the Civil Service Commission to make rules for the selection of candidates and issuing certificates of qualification. In this connection the author emphasizes the freedom of the Commission from political influence and its complete incorruptibility. The highest grade corresponding to the I.C.S. in India consists of some 450 officials, recruited between the ages 22-24 corresponding with a completed university education. The author's complaint about this class is that this education brings with it a certain amount of nice-mannered arrogance and exclusiveness and that they are lacking in the sense of reality.

The next landmark is the Gladstone Committee which appreciated the work of women in all grades and a resolution of the House of Commons in 1920 declared it expedient that women should have equal opportunity as men in all branches of the Civil Service and under all local authorities. Promotion is now made on the recommendation of Promotion Boards and the right of making representation to the head of the department is recognized. On account of the Cabinet Ministers being, in the words of Mr. Sidney Low, amateur politicians, the civil service has to supply practically everything to the Ministers, although it has to remain anonymous. In addition the departments have to preserve a neutrality and "serve any whom the Parliament designates as the Government." In the main there has been personal goodwill and invaluable co-operation between Ministers and permanent Secretaries. Dr. Finer combats the general notion held by the public that the civil servants without deserving it lead an enviably secure life, permanently assured of short hours, good pay, long holidays, pension rights and not much work. The reason he says is that the service is the only business concern that does not advertise. The House of Commons never ceases to watch, nor does it omit to challenge the day to day administration of the departments; the great engine of performing this inquest is the daily interpellation. On the whole however the English Parliament does not distrust the Civil Service, nor is it jealous of it.

Dr. Finer's treatment of the civic rights of the civil servants is admirable. He is inclined to admit the full extent of the political rights of civil servants, even to the extent of their joining Trade Unions outside the service. The State can oblige its servants to give up the freedom to join the labour movement and to go on strike, but this would be coercion and it would bring the government more and more into contempt. On the whole the author thinks that the State would be unwise to limit such rights which the environment makes necessary. Since 1917 civil servants pressed for the application of Whitley proposals to the public service; accordingly, in 1919 a National Whitley Council and departmental Whitley councils have been established, which is a great triumph for industrial democracy. The peculiarity of England as compared to France and Germany is that there is no special administrative law and each civil servant is liable for torts before the ordinary courts of the country.

There are critics who fear that the civil service, if not controlled by Ministers responsible to the House of Commons, would grow into a tyrannical body seeking to overpower Ministers and even overshadow the authority of Parliament. The question assumes greater prominence in connection with the growing tendency towards nationalisation and the critics think that without competitive enterprise the State will stagnate. The answer of the socialist, the author says, is emphatic. First, the wastage of wealth involved in competition will be avoided; secondly, socialised services will give economic security. Dr. Finer believes that the science of administration can be taught and therefore the civil service made to reach the height of efficiency, and he also trusts that the civil servant of the future will regard public welfare as his sole end and will be almost a paragon of so many virtues. He admits that the task of cultivating these virtues in a couple of million administrators is fraught with immense difficulty and refuses to be dogmatic. We would say he is wise in doing so. If we examine the government service in India we realize that it has hardly a single attribute which characterizes the British Civil service. The East is East and the West is West!

V. N. GODBOLE

MILITARY PROFESSIONALISM.

MASTERS OF WAR AND OTHER HISTORICAL ESSAYS. By NEVILLE D'ESTERRE. (George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London.) 1927. 8 x 5½. pp. 277. 8s. 6d.

THE longing for peace has never been more insistent than it is in the world of to-day, a world which has witnessed the horror and carnage of the late war. The anxiety of the statesmen of the world to establish peace on earth and good-will among mankind is amply borne out by the setting up of the League of Nations and the summoning of Disarmament Conferences. But so far no publicist or politician of repute has come forward with a plea for eradicating the deep-rooted system of military professionalism. An army, we firmly believe, is a necessary evil, and if it is to function well, the members of the Army must be given good training, especially at a time like this when military warfare is very complicated and technical. If a professional training is necessary for teachers, lawyers, doctors and engineers, it is much more necessary for soldiers and generals, for on their skill and efficiency depend the security and well-being of the country. But now comes a writer, Mr. Neville D'Esterre, who puts forward a vigorous plea for the abolition of the deep-rooted system of military professionalism. We can hardly agree with the main thesis of the author in the book before us. But let us not be misunderstood. We would be the first to agree with the author's viewpoint if peace, harmony and good-will were guaranteed in this world. In spite of the League of Nations, war is a likely contingency for which any country must be in a prepared state. We are for the limitation of armies to the minimum of national necessity. We are not for the abolition of professional training to soldiers. The small armies of countries must be given the necessary training so that they might function well in a conflict when it occurs, which God forbid.

Let us see the reasons why the author is against military training. He says that a long professional training makes soldiers and generals unthinking individuals. It is true that in a professional army there is no scope for independent thought. Tennyson says in his 'Charge of the Light Brigade'—

"Theirs is not to question why,
Theirs is but to do and die."

Revolted as this is to most of us, yet we have to reconcile ourselves to this state. If soldiers and generals are allowed to think and act freely, there will be no discipline in the army and the army will go to pieces. We are indeed surprised that the author should talk disparagingly of professionalism because it breeds unthinking individuals. He then goes on to say that in the late war when students, artists and merchants were enrolled in the army, they distinguished themselves much better than the professional soldiers and generals. But we would ask the author: "If England had not had a professional army ready for action in the field, could she have co-operated with France in the early months of the war and could she have rolled back the German invasion?" The battle of the Marne we would consider as the most decisive battle in the Great War and it was won by a professional army. If England had resorted for her security to methods more elastic, if England had abolished professionalism and had begun to give some training to lawyers, students and merchants soon after the commencement of hostilities, could she have won the war? By the time the recruits had finished receiving the military training, Paris might have opened her gates, Germany would have dictated peace, and the Franco-German war would have been repeated. But that is speculating on 'what might have

been'. Our contention, therefore, is that a professional army will be found very useful when the danger is sudden, and so no country in this war-weary, yet war-likely-to-take-place world, should dispense with professionalism. It is interesting to note, however, that the author wants professional training for naval warfare.

The author puts forward an ingenious reason to prove his thesis. Professional masters of war like Napoleon, Wellington, Robert Lee of Virginia, and Grant did not prove remarkable statesmen; their ability did not extend beyond the camp and the battlefield. On the contrary, the author avers, amateur masters of war, those who had no military training at all, like Cromwell, Frederick the Great, and Lord Clive were successful statesmen too. We would like to criticise this finding of the learned author at some length, for it shows a lack of keen historical judgment in estimating men and things.

That Napoleon was a great military genius and that Wellington, Robert Lee and General Grant were really masters of war, no one will dispute. That Wellington was not a successful statesman, that the ability which he displayed in the battle-field did not accompany him into Parliament or Cabinet, that he was a reactionary politician opposing all beneficial legislation—are matters of history. That Robert Lee was very narrow-minded, that his patriotism was parochial and that Grant was not a successful President of the U. S. A. are facts well-known to students of American history. We agree with the author when he says that Wellington, Robert Lee and Grant, masters of war though they were, were not successful statesmen. But we do not agree with the writer when he declares that "apart from his generalship, Napoleon's practical ability in affairs was nothing remarkable."

We would ask, Was not Napoleon, the greatest military genius of modern times, a remarkable statesman? The author himself refers to Napoleon's notable achievements, the Code Napoleon and the Concordat, but he is so prejudiced against Napoleon the statesman that he says, "The reform of the law was desired by almost the whole body of French jurists, and the reconciliation of France to the Church by the great bulk of the French people. When Napoleon decreed that the law was to be revised, and an agreement entered into with the Vatican, he was merely taking a step which the needs and the spirit of the French people must have compelled any ruler of France to take sooner or later, and in each case it was at the instigation of others that he asked". We have read a great deal of the literature on Napoleon and his times, and our reading of history has taught us that though Napoleon had received only a military training, he quickly made himself acquainted with the legislative system of France and the problems connected with it, and that he determined to codify the laws of France as the Emperor Theodosius and Justinian had codified the laws of Rome many centuries earlier. Again we have read in regard to the Concordat, that Napoleon's motives in his religious policy were entirely political and that he saw that no State could rest upon a stable foundation until its religion was in a settled condition. Even supposing the author is right in saying that "Napoleon was merely taking a step which the needs and the spirit of the French people must have compelled any ruler of France to take sooner or later," we ask, "Is it not a mark of statesmanship?" A statesman is one who feels the pulse of the nation and acts accordingly. Napoleon was such a statesman. In this connection we would quote the estimate of Napoleon by no less a distinguished historian than Professor A. J. Grant. This is what he says in his 'History of Europe': "His career shows that he was a man of extraordinary military genius, as capable

of conducting a campaign as of directing a battle, but his achievements in the government of France prove that he possessed abilities nearly as high for the management of affairs in time of peace.... Were it not for the unlimited ambition and passion for power which runs through the whole of his career, history might have seen in him one of the greatest of all agents in the progress of civilisation; as it is, we see in him the cause of many beneficent changes in France and in Europe, but also the cause, and often the guilty cause, of 15 years of continuous warfare." (pp. 586 and 587.)

Our greatest surprise is that the author should regard Frederick, Cromwell and Clive as masters of war in the same way as he regards Napoleon. Neither Frederick the Great, nor Cromwell, nor Clive can be called 'master of war' in the sense in which Napoleon was master of war. Frederick's victories were won against the Austrian Queen Maria Theresa and Louis XV who was dominated by Madame de la Pompadour. Cromwell's victories were scored against his own countrymen and Clive's so-called astounding victories of Arcot and Plassey were scored against the ill-trained troops the incompetent Rajasahib and the headstrong, inexperienced Surajudaulah. It is a matter of history that Mir Jafar's defection was partly responsible for Clive's success at Plassey. On the contrary, Napoleon's victories were won, as the author himself admits, over the best generals of Europe. The author seems to judge generals by their victories and not by the circumstances in which victories were won.

Even granting that Frederick, Cromwell and Clive, in spite of the fact that they were amateur generals, were masters of war, were they remarkable statesmen as the author wants us to believe? Frederick may have been the architect of Prussia and so may claim the rank of a statesman. But Cromwell failed to give a stable constitution to the people of England; yet he is called a great statesman. Clive, whose notorious Dual Government of Bengal has become a by-word for corruption, is hailed by the author as a great statesman.

Our conclusion is therefore obvious. Military professionalism has nothing to do with statesmanship. Military training is quite a necessity for generals and soldiers. Nor do we agree with the writer when he says that the organisation of the army could be undertaken by amateurs. The author quotes the army reform of Lord Cardwell and of Lord Haldane who were only civilians, but ignores the fact that but for the unstinted help given by the War Office Cardwell and Haldane could not have come out with their Army reforms.

In the next essay 'Israel in Egypt', the learned author fits in the account given in the Hebrew chronicles with the known facts of Egyptian history. He does not regard the account as purely legendary. He states that some of the stories like the story of the magic practised by Moses and Aaron, the story of the Plagues of Egypt, the destruction of the Pharaoh's army in the Dead Sea—to give only some—are incredible, and gives a rational interpretation to all of them based on the known facts of Egyptian and Syrian history. We need hardly say that this essay will be found interesting by theologians.

The third and last essay of the book will be welcome to students of English literature and history. The essay "A Dissertation on England and the English" raises two questions on which, as Sir Roger said, "much can be said on both sides." Is the English language predominantly Anglo-Saxon, and is the English nation predominantly an Anglo-Saxon race? These are the questions which are raised in the essay, in which the answer of the author

—not acceptable to many—is that the English language is compounded of many elements and so too is the English race. As we said above it is his only controversial matter, and we leave it at that.

Though we do not agree with the sentiments expressed by the author in his first essay, we would still regard the book as a contribution to historical literature. The second and third essays will set theologians and philologists thinking. The style of the author is extremely good, and the get-up of the book leaves nothing to be desired.

M. V. SUBRAHMANYAM.

SHORT NOTICE.

THE INDIAN MYSTIC. By J. C. WINSLOW
(Student Christian Movement, London.) 1926
7¼ × 4¾. pp. 71.

THE present book is an indication of the slow but healthy change visible amongst Western thinkers about India. The very opening sentences of the Introduction tell us that the book starts from the point of view of sympathy, and that it repudiates the older view which laid all the emphasis upon the difference between Christianity and other religions, believing that we of the West had everything to teach and nothing to learn.

The book is an analytico-critical study of Indian Mysticism in its three characteristic expressions—Bhakti, Sanyas and Yoga—made by a Christian missionary and, as we are told, for Christian readers. The author believes that the light which Indian religions will be able to throw upon Christian thought will be almost revolutionary and reveal our present understanding of them as singularly partial and inadequate. According to him, India will also gain, and perhaps more, by a study of Christianity; for "Christ will bring to a richer completion the several elements involved in the spiritual heritage of India."

Though Rev. Mr. Winslow has been able to detach himself to a great extent from the prejudices common to his fold and though his book reveals a fairly good study of Indian Mysticism, it must be said in fairness that the detachment must still grow fuller and acquaintance deeper before he can grasp the inner spirit of Indian Mysticism. In the analytical description of paths he has succeeded well. But in other and more important parts we might say he has almost failed. We only refer, for illustration, to the discussion of lacuna, according to him, in the Bhakti doctrine. He still harps on the old misleading descriptions of Lord Krishna. Indian youths, even educated, have by the growth of critical faculty been able to construe Lord Krishna so as to be a worthy object of love. Having no direct knowledge with the vast literature of Indian Mysticism, he has failed to grasp the inner spirit of Indian Mysticism, and his book has therefore assumed the form of a thesis upon Christ's famous sentence from the Sermon on the Mount "I came not to destroy but to fulfil," developed in relation to Indian Mysticism.

We however recommend this book to the Christians, for it will give them a fairly impartial conception of Indian paths.

S. V. DANDEKAR.

CORRESPONDENCE.

ENGLISH EDUCATION OF INDIANS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SERVANT OF INDIA.

SIR,—I read with my great interest your notes on Sir C. P. Ramaswami Iyer's interview and Dr. Paranjpye's address to the students in the issue of

3rd November. I am very glad you drew pointed attention to the significant evasion as regards disarmament. From my experience of Geneva so far, speaking about the League, I should like to submit the following points:—(1) Greater initiative on the part of the Indian delegation and more vertebrate defence against being swamped in the preliminary meeting of the British delegations where future voting is settled. (2) Let the Indian delegation have some definite points to put forward at Geneva each year concerning Indian interests and not be content with confirming the nods and smiles of other delegations. (3) If Canada can be a candidate for the Council, why not India? (4) Is it true that Lord Lytton did show himself anxious to put forward India's candidature in September last and was discouraged by the India Office? (5) Does the India Office or the Government of India determine/influence the appointment of Indians in the internal services of the League (and the Labour Office)? (6) There is some bitterness among the officials (some of them high) of the League that India should have raised the question of stabilisation of the League's Budget in 1926. They regard stabilisation, as equivalent to stultification. While there is no doubt that India does not get the money's worth from Geneva, there is no doubt either that her part in determining the contribution towards the League will be nominal. The expansion of the League is all to India's good and a certain warmth of feeling between India and the League circles is also to India's good. It is a pity therefore that we should gratuitously incur other people's wrath, especially when the aggrieved party happens to be so excellent. If India may withhold her part at Geneva altogether it is a different matter; but seeing that we have to learn to dance we may just as well cultivate a taste for it and derive exhilaration from the performance. I have reason to believe that the League officials will use the manifestation of public opinion in India against official pressure should it happen to be contrary to their interests. We may therefore express friendliness and aid them. That is how the whole business appears to me.

As to Dr. Paranjpye's address to students, I would like to submit to you an opposite thesis and appeal to you personally in the matter. First as to facts. £350 per year for a student is a mathematical not a typical average. I was living at Edinburgh within £200 a year and I was living in comfort. Where my expenses showed themselves well managed is as regards entertainments and amusements. I used to go fairly frequently to the theatre, but I hardly ever had the very expensive pleasure of entertaining young women. That is where all the Indian student's money goes. I have heard from British students at Oxford that they do not exceed the £200 limit too much. And Oxford is most expensive. Nevertheless the mathematical average may be true, and I think it is because a few spend a great deal. There are also very good friendships cultivated among Indian students with Britishers. I made a very good friendship with a Scotch boy at Edinburgh who, though later he came up high in the I. C. S. examination, was rejected on medical grounds and is now in Tanganyika and writes to me in the most affectionate manner regularly. (I flatter myself that he cannot get out of his head that a man of colour has been worthy of his affection, and from the influence of such personal intimacies much good may result. But it cannot be calculated as it is of the nature of invisible exports. Friendships are not too common between British and Indian lads

because, besides other reasons, comparatively few Indians cultivate larger human interests so to speak. All this is changing rapidly but home influences are very potent. And if a British lad cannot put up with one thing, it is clumsiness. The number of American tourists in Europe (say in France) is so great that it is an important item in the revenue but Americans do not consider it drain. They consider it a means of broadening the outlook. An American told me only yesterday that much of the Anglo-American feud at present is due to Americans travelling in Europe now in such large numbers. "The English laugh at us, we are now finding it out and we don't like it." Again, taking the other Eastern countries, Japan, China, Siam, Indo-China, etc., they send yearly more and more students and not less. The whole habit of the drain theory where students are concerned seems to be prejudicial to our greater national interests. Last year I encountered it among Indian merchants in Paris and Lalaji had done it. It is not in the return in educational results in the narrower sense of the term, but in the broad sense of stimulation that we have to measure in this connection. I have met several non-entities from the point of view of university learning among the Indians over here but not one of them can be said to be the dunce that he would be in India. All of them are stimulated, individualised and rendered stronger, more original entities than otherwise it may have been possible.

Also, what to my mind seems quite necessary in this connection is to abandon the habit of conceiving England as our intellectual Mecca. The difference in treatment between the products of continental and British Universities must be abolished. And more and more should our people be encouraged to make the continent their place of sojourn in the West. Here there is a liberty of association, a love for intellectual things, a freedom from the ever-embarrassing burden of expense on account of the comparatively cheaper living, which are all stimulating and helpful.—Yours, etc.

AN INDIAN.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- THE AGRICULTURAL COLONISATION OF THE ZIONIST ORGANISATION IN PALESTINE. By ARTHUR RUPPIN. (Martin Hopkinson & Co., London.) 1926. 8½ x 5½. pp. 209. 10s. 6d.
- INDIA BY AIR. By SIR SAMUEL HOARE. (Longmans Green & Co., Ltd., London.) 1927. 8½ x 5½. pp. 155. 6s. 6d.
- THE PATH TO PEACE. By JAMES H. COUSINS. (Ganesh & Co., Madras.) 1927. 7½ x 5. pp. 60.
- FATHER INDIA. By C. S. RANGA IYER. (Selwyn & Blunt Ltd., London.) 1927. 8 x 5. pp. 207. 6s.

LUCKY CHANCE.

Invest rupee one and get thereby fifty thousand. Do not miss this golden opportunity, it comes seldom. Ask for prospectus. This advantage is only for four months.

DULICHAND JAIN, B. A.
Partabgarh (RAJPUTANA) Malwa.

WANTED Candidates for Telegraph and Station Master's Classes. Full particulars and Railway Fare Certificates on 2 annas stamp.
Apply to—Imperial Telegraph College, Delhi.