

THE Servant of India

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

VOL. XI, No. 9. }

POONA—THURSDAY, MARCH 1, 1928.

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

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK ...	105
ARTICLES :—	
The Bombay Budget ...	108
Within or Without?—II. By Raghunath Row ...	108
Treaties and Political Practice.—I. By Prof. G. R. Abhyankar, B.A., LL.B. ...	110
OUR EUROPEAN LETTER ...	111
OUR PARLIAMENTARY LETTER ...	113
OUR U. P. LETTER ...	114
REVIEW SECTION :—	
Irish Youth and Irish Eld. By Shawn Roe ...	115
The Racial Problem in S. Africa. By S. G. Vaze ...	117
Conservatism or Fascism? By M. V. Subrahmanyam, M.A., L.T. ...	118
Employment Psychology. By S. V. Ayyar, M.A. ...	118
American Villages. By Rao Bahadur Prof. P. C. Patil, L.Ag., M.Sc. ...	119
SHORT NOTICE ...	c20
BOOKS RECEIVED ...	120

TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

FROM bitter Calcutta experience we know that neither *Statesman* nor *Forward* will "Official" News. ever give all the news there is, if it can help it, but only that half of it fitting in with its own view-point. Similarly we are quite reconciled to see the *A. P. I.* service telling us all about the favourable reception the Simon Commission is experiencing, whilst the *Free Press of India* service tells all about its unfavourable reception. The wise man reads *A. P. I.* plus *F. P. I.*, *Statesman* plus *Forward* &c. and divides by two; but then, few newspaper readers are quite as sophisticated as all that and it is for them that the one-sided propaganda is kept up. Hitherto however one assumed that Government Departments at least pretended to be above that sort of thing and to give the whole information, impartially. Such assumption certainly is no longer possible, at least in the case of the Statutory Commission Secretariat. The latter has taken to the publishing of press communiqués, which are supposed to be an authentic chronicle of the doings of the seven. But one notices that no mention is ever made of any unfriendly gesture made anywhere by anybody. The only people for whom here is space in these communiqués are the people welcoming, garlanding, addressing, calling, interviewing. People boozing, carrying black flags, closing their shops, sending uncomplimentary messages, banging their doors, passing no-confidence votes imply do not exist for Mr. Bhoré's department. Do they then not exist at all and are they all mere figments of the fevered brain of "a few malcontents and agitators", as the phrase goes?

They are very human after all, are they not, the gentlemen of the Steel Frame, and extremely simple too, apparently, if they think the Indian public simple enough to be taken in by so crude a piece of propaganda.

* * *

IN spite, however, of all that the cavillers may say, the Commission is receiving "Hearty Reception." wide-spread support and a cordial reception, aye, "a really cordial reception". This statement is not made on the strength of the Commission's communiqués either, which may conceivably be impugned as not wholly impartial, but on the unimpeachable authority of the *Times of India's* special correspondent. Why, on the platform of the Central Station of Madras there were no less than 200 persons, and not all officials too, to receive the Royal Commission and incredible as it may seem, they all "bore quite a cheerful appearance". Well, one cannot too highly admire the fortitude of those who, in giving "a really cordial reception" to the Royal Commissioners, could keep their countenance in face of such a visitation. What more convincing proof of the country's welcome to the Commissioners can there possibly be than that the *Hindu*, than which there is no more bitter critic of Government, "has published two special photographs" of them?

And the Council of State also has decided to cooperate with the Commission. It may at the first blush seem unfortunate that this Council of Elder Statesmen can elect only two out of the seven members of the Indian legislature's committee and that it is encountered by the inhibitory vote of the Assembly in respect of the election of the remaining five, but this fact is really an advantage. For then the Committee will be a compact body of just the size one would desire, consisting, say, of two knights like Sir Maneckji Dadabhoy and Sir Umar Hayat Khan, representing the voice of the real India which Lord Birkenhead is so burning to hear. Nor will the sage counsel of these Indian Commissioners be distracted by having to deal with provincial committees, for the Provincial Councils too like the Assembly seem anxious to avoid setting up committees in order to leave a clear field to our Council of State representatives. The Central Provinces, Madras and now the United Provinces have decided to leave the British—and the Indian—Commission alone, and we hope the other provinces too will see the wisdom of a similar self-denying ordinance and make it possible for the pair of Dadabhoy-Umar to negotiate on a "footing of equality" with the Simon Seven on the future constitution of India.

For wasn't it accounted a defect in the procedure prescribed—no, just recommended—to the Commission in Parliament, that the Indian Commission would have only a partial hearing of the case as it might be put to the British Commission if it were to

be superseded by Provincial Commissions in the provinces? It is true that Sir John Simon has very considerably removed the defect by authorising the Indian Commission to attend the provincial sessions and hear the evidence, though the Provincial Committees will be the principal parties which will be chiefly concerned in respect of this part of the evidence. But if things shape themselves as we desire, the two knights will have the sole authority to hear evidence, formulate proposals and conduct negotiations. Lord Birkenhead will also be instantly relieved of the haunting fear that the two Commissions may possibly issue two reports. We trust that the Simon Commission will fully justify His Lordship's confidence by presenting a unanimous report; but in regard to our Commission in the shape of Dadabhoj and Hayat Khan he may be as sure that they will fall in as if he had given a previous mandate to them. And then what will be wanting for India to be planted firmly on the road to self-government? It is a rare opportunity for Indian nationalism which it is to be earnestly hoped it will not lightly throw away.

* * *

MR. H. N. BRAILSFORD has again in the *New Republic* of January 25 given a masterly analysis of the reasons which prompted the reactionary Lord Birkenhead in accelerating the date of the Statutory Commission. It does not differ from the nationalist analysis, but the confirmation is of great value as coming from a writer of Mr. Brailsford's eminence. "As the years of Mr. Baldwin's administration," says he, "went on, far-seeing men had to reckon with a new danger. It is probable, or at least, possible, that a Labour administration will succeed it. Imperialists, especially if they have lived most of their lives in India, might well feel alarm. They had occasionally found even Liberals troublesome, but what would these new men do—men who profess to believe in India's right of self-determination, men who look on Indian trade-unionists as 'comrades,' men who were capable of recognizing Moscow? Accordingly, Lord Birkenhead took a bold decision. He decided to anticipate dates and appoint the Commission himself. This would have the appearance of liberality. It would suggest his own readiness to contemplate ample and timely reforms. It might placate the Indians, who were in a comparatively depressed and modest mood. But, above all, it would save the Empire from the Socialists. For by every precedent, the report of this Commission would lose none of its authority, if the Tory administration should fall. A Labour government would be bound by the custom of British political life to accept its report as the basis of its own legislation." In order to "sterilise the Socialist opposition" the more effectively, Mr. MacDonald was admitted by Lord Birkenhead to his confidence and made a party not only to the appointment of an All-White Commission, but to the unsatisfactory procedure which, with all the appearance of giving liberty to Sir John Simon, had been laid down for him.

* * *

THIS was no doubt a very clever strategy on the part of the Indian Secretary; but it was really altogether unnecessary. We in India know well by this time the quality of the sentiments about self-determination which are mouthed so glibly from Labour platforms and which occasionally find expression even in the resolutions of Labour Conferences. The Socialists, whose only positive contribution so far to Indian politics is the Bengal Ordinance, are not looked upon by Indians exactly as their saviours and need on that account cause no disquiet to Lord Birkenhead and men of his

ilk. Socialism, whatever it may be in theory, differs but little in practice from imperialism, and at any rate to Socialists like Mr. MacDonald (as Mr. Brailsford truly says) "self-determination is a doctrine which has its uses only when it is expedient to break up other people's empires." If imperialists may well in future rely upon Socialists as their allies in empire policy, they must give up relying too much upon communal dissensions in India prolonging their rule here. For Mr. Brailsford himself fears that "it is probable that the attempt to boycott the Commission will accentuate these divisions." The actual result of declaring the boycott on the contrary is to bring appreciably closer together in a common nationality those amongst the Hindus and Mahomedans who are generally forward-looking in political movements but who were apt occasionally to stress overmuch the claims of their respective communities to a share in political power. Being brought to a fresh realization as to how the enemies of India's political advance utilise communal feuds to the abiding detriment of our common motherland, both the Hindu and Mahomedan communalists seem now to be in a chastened mood, agreeable to moderate, if not even to suspend, their claims, and this is having a healthy reaction on the conferences now taking place for the purpose of arriving at an agreed scheme of self-government. We are convinced that the boycott will do little harm politically, but the gain which it has already brought and promises to bring in the near future, outweighs any advantage that may possibly have accrued to us by the inclusion of an Indian element in the Commission.

* * *

THE U. P. Legislative Council has creditably acquitted itself in the matter of voicing the U. P. Council and almost universal feeling prevailing in the country about the Simon Commission. On the motion of its Deputy President Mr. Mukandi Lal, the Council has stamped the present constitution and scheme of the Commission as wholly unacceptable and placed on record its resolve to leave the Commission severely alone. In view of the presence of a strong reactionary element in the Council which, thanks to the efforts of the Mahomedan Minister, had latterly organised its forces, the fate of the motion was not quite a foregone conclusion, which greatly heightens the value of the popular victory. Mr. Mukandi Lal showed how the opposition to the Commission was virtually unanimous, the only dissentient of note being Sir Mahomed Shafi. In asking the Council not to be in a hurry to commit itself, the Finance Member, Mr. Lambert, remarked, "He would not say that it was in all circumstances the best that could be had," which, if the Finance Member's remarks are any index to the official mind, shows that even Government circles do not seem to be altogether satisfied with it. Some capital is sure to be made of the fact that the motion was carried by a majority of 1; but it must be borne in mind that out of the 55 who voted against it, 18 were officials, 5 nominated members and 3 Europeans. The majority in favour of the proposition is thus much larger than appears at first sight. The minority includes also the Mahomedan Minister who does not share the majority's dislike of the Commission and ought in fairness both to himself and the Council make room for one who does. Thus all the three provincial Councils which, since the Commission's personnel was announced, had an opportunity of expressing their view of the matter have given unmistakable evidence that the Commission did not enjoy their confidence.

THE Chamber of Princes met recently at Delhi, as usual, behind closed doors and no authoritative report of its doings is available. But it is reported that the Viceroy in addressing it impressed upon the ruling Princes the urgent need of reforming their administrations so as to conduce to the greater happiness and contentment of their subjects. Should this be a fact, Lord Irwin has done a distinct service both to the Princes and their subjects. The first reform emphasised by the Viceroy was "to make the higher judiciary absolutely independent of executive control or executive manipulation." This falls considerably short of what is popularly known as the separation of judicial from executive functions, for which the people in British India have been carrying on a fruitless agitation for years past. But even if Lord Irwin succeeds in seeing this urgent reform carried into effect in all the States, he will have helped substantially in putting a stop to the glaring anomaly, none too rare in Indian State administration, by which the ruler constituting himself the supreme judicial tribunal for his State does more than anyone else to make his people lose all faith in the fairness and impartiality of his judicial administration. The Viceroy has also done well in animadverting upon the scandalously prolonged European tours which some of the ruling princes are in the habit of undertaking year after year. Apart from the expense involved in the tours, they involve long continuous absence of the ruler from his people and put him out of touch with the administration of his State. Another important suggestion by the Viceroy is that the Princes should set a definite limit to their personal expenses. As things stand, these are hardly distinguishable from the public expenses met out of the State treasury, which is very often exploited for the personal whims and pleasures of the Princes. The obvious consequence is that necessary public utility services like education and sanitation are starved. This cannot cease unless the rulers are made to appropriate not more than a stated percentage of their State revenue for their personal use. What proportion the ruler's personal expenses should bear to the revenue of his State is a matter which should be decided in consultation with the princes; but there appears to be no reason why if the Maharaja of Bikaner can carry on with only 5 per cent., a higher percentage should be allowed in the case of any Indian Prince. It is to be seen how soon this proposal to limit the personal expenses of the Princes is carried into effect; at all events the readiness with which it is accepted by them will be regarded by the general public as the acid test of their professed solicitude for the welfare of their subjects, about which endless talk seems to be indulged in in some quarters at the present time.

THE ex-Maharaja of Nabha, who since the severance of his connection with his State, had been staying at Dehra Dun, has been asked by Government to make Kodai-kanal in the Madras Presidency the place of his residence. The title of 'Maharaja' has also been withdrawn and his monthly allowance reduced from Rs. 25,000 to Rs. 10,000. The press communiqué making this announcement is, to say the least of it, extremely vague. It refers to certain conditions attaching to his abdication without telling us what all those conditions were. One of them was that he would remain loyal to the Government which, according to the communiqué, he has violated by repeatedly taking part "in disloyal activities since his departure from Nabha." At best this is an allegation unsupported by any evidence as to how and

when he did so. We daresay such evidence is in the possession of Government; but of what value is it if it is feared it cannot stand the light of day? And if, as the communiqué says, the ex-Maharaja was repeatedly guilty of disloyal acts, one fails to see why the Government waited so long to proceed against him in the manner they have now done. We do not wish to go into the constitutional question whether the ex-Maharaja was a prince at the time when at dead of the night on Feb. 18 he was dramatically served with these orders as he was entraining for Lucknow or whether he ceased to be so only when the announcement was published the next morning. What we are chiefly concerned about is the secret nature of the proceedings against him. If he has broken the conditions of his agreement with the Government, why not tell the public all about it rather than letting it draw inferences based upon insufficient, and therefore misleading, data? The attempt to raise the question in the Assembly by means of an adjournment motion did not succeed owing to the President's refusal to admit it.

THE excise administration report of Assam for 1926-27 makes very disappointing reading. The consumption of country liquor in that province has been steadily growing and rose from 237,480 gallons in 1925-26 to 262,115 gallons in 1926-27. No doubt this consumption is not so high as it was some years ago; but even after making due allowance for the special conditions of Assam and giving due weight to the official explanation given in the report of this phenomenon, the increase of over 11 per cent. in a single year cannot but be regarded as very disquieting. In 1925-26, about 26,000 gallons of foreign liquors were consumed, while in 1926-27 their consumption went up to 40,400 gallons or a rise of 57 per cent. Ganja, whose consumption went up by over 2,000 seers in one year, is more in demand and is very likely taking the place of opium. With a view to prevent the spread of the opium habit to the rising generation, the sale of opium to none but those who hold a pass entitling them to a fixed ration has been prohibited and it is possible that some of the erstwhile opium-eaters on account of their failure to secure the required pass are taking to Ganja in order to satisfy their craving for opium. Every care also seems to be taken that such passes held by persons who are dead do not fall into other hands. For this action to check the opium evil, the Assam Government deserve a word of praise. There was an official inquiry during the year in order to find out whether opium was really giving place to Ganja, but it proved inconclusive. The settlement of opium and excise licenses in Assam is done by tender; and among the steps taken to promote temperance, the first place must of course be given to the new Local Option Act which came into force on April 1st last year. We shall hope that this measure will work better than a similar one did in the Punjab, where public indifference seems to have contributed in a large measure to its failure. Assam does not apparently boast of any excise advisory committees; but in excise matters local boards and municipalities are consulted, which is of course not to say that greater respect is shown to their advice than is done to the recommendations of excise advisory committees in other provinces. In the matter of giving instruction in temperance in the vernacular schools, Assam has set an example which deserves to be copied elsewhere. Another distinguishing feature of the excise administration of Assam has been that aboriginal tribes and tea garden coolies are allowed free home brewing of rice beer only for personal consumption and not for sale.

THE BOMBAY BUDGET.

THERE is no mistaking the pessimistic tone of most of the speeches of members in connection with the debate on the Budget in the Bombay Council. This pessimism, although it may not be justified ultimately, is hardly inexplicable in the light of the facts revealed in the Financial Statement about the figures of public debt, recurring interest charges and provision for amortisation. With a total debt outstanding on the 1st April 1928 to the tune of Rs. 49.37 crores and the annual interest charges standing at nearly Rs. 3 crores, is it surprising that the members of the Council feel the position to be serious? The debt position becomes more alarming in view of the fact that the total sinking fund has only reached the figure of Rs. 78 lakhs. The consoling feature of the debt position is that Rs. 237 lakhs is going to be repaid during 1928-29. It may not be true, as Sir C. V. Mehta reminded the Council in winding up the debate, that "Bombay is tottering on the verge of bankruptcy, or that the Finance Member was juggling with the figures," but with the nation-building departments in a static condition and other departments gradually encroaching on them, it was the duty of members to emphasize this aspect of the matter. The reduction of the splendid closing balance at the end of 1925-26, of Rs. 664 lakhs to Rs. 169 lakhs at the end of 1928-29 is unfortunate but the Finance Member can in no way be held responsible for what was due to an unprecedented calamity, and a large deficit for two successive years under debt heads which reduced the balance by nearly Rs. 3 crores.

Coming to inevitable comparisons, we think Dr. Ambedkar made out a very good point in showing that while in other provinces the expenditure on Transferred Departments had been steadily increasing and that on Reserved Departments steadily decreasing, in Bombay it was just the reverse. The following figures quoted by him are significant; the Punjab had increased its expenditure on Transferred Departments by 29.41 per cent; the corresponding figure for Bihar and Orissa was 44.66 per cent; while in Bombay there was 6.32 per cent. increase on the Reserved side and only 5.8 per cent. on the Transferred side. We think the Finance Member is bound to reply to these allegations about the sins of omission on behalf of the whole of the Executive, including the Ministers. How can we afford to shelve schemes of primary education year after year, on the ground of the shortage of funds? Taking the figures of General Administration also, the comparison is unfavourable to Bombay. The Punjab spends about a crore under this head and U. P. about Rs. 1.5 crores under the same head; while Bombay spends Rs. 2.21 crores. Of course the Finance Member has asked us to remember that Bombay maintains a higher standard of life and consequently a higher level of remuneration; but this cannot explain such a wide divergence between the two provinces. To us it clearly appears to be a case of top-heavy administration.

It is difficult to dogmatize about methods of retrenchment but without going into the details of the several departments we can suggest general heads where economy can be practised. The number of Executive Councillors should be reduced from four to two; the divisional Commissionerships which have been recognized to be the fifth wheel in the coach can be abolished. Civil Works ought to be kept within a specific limit fixed by financial considerations and not by demands of departments. If Government does not begin to retrench from now, it is difficult to imagine what would be the condition of the finances when the Excise revenue in accordance with the prohibition policy will be gradually wiped out. In this connection it is worth noting that the suggestion contained in all financial utterances that the onus of pointing out definite items for retrenchment lies on the critics is vicious in principle as well as practice. Those who know the inner working of departments can alone find out where economy can be practised. All that is required is the will to do so and if the will is wanting the problem would, it appears, be for ever impossible of solution. For a Government to ask the Opposition or the publicist to suggest lines of retrenchment would be to confess to an incapacity for self-analysis.

The fact that we have a balanced Budget during the year ought not to conceal from us the serious condition of the finances of our province. According to Government's own confession all avenues of economising have been exhausted; Education and Public Health will make greater demands on the purse in the immediate future. It would be unwise to count upon getting a large slice of the Income-tax since the Government of India have never given an indication to that effect. The whole question might be reconsidered by the Statutory Commission, but it will be years hence that any decision will be reached. It behoves the trustees of the Bombay Finances therefore to rely only upon the present heads of revenue and cut their coat according to the cloth.

WITHIN OR WITHOUT ?

II.*

DISTRUSTFUL as it seemed of Lord Milner's suggestion easing the constitutional difficulty, the Canadian Government was insistent on maintaining its position that it must have an equal part with the Mother Country in the determination of the foreign policy of the Empire. So the Canadian Parliament was called to a special session on September 1st, 1919, and on the following day the Prime Minister moved a resolution to the effect that "it is expedient that Parliament do approve of the Treaty of Peace between the Allied and Associated Powers and Germany (and the protocol annexed thereto), which was signed at Versailles on the 28th day of June, 1919, and a copy of which has been laid before Parliament, and which was signed on behalf of His Majesty, acting for Canada, by the plenipotentiaries therein named, and that this House do approve of the same". Canada has also her minority-Moslems and Responsivists, and the spirit of the speech of the Canadian Premier introducing this resolution came in for some sharp criticism. "We are not a nation in the true sense of the

* The first article appeared in our last issue.

term," said the Hon. D. D. McKenzie, Parliamentary Liberal leader at the time. "We are part of a great Empire of which we are proud. . . It would be a weakness for us to put ourselves to one side, to separate ourselves from the rest of the Empire, and to attempt to become a separate nation, or a separate part of the Empire as far as these obligations are concerned." A French Canadian, Mr. Lapointe, even raised the issue: "If we are for all purposes separate and distinct members of the League, what would be our position in case of a conflict between Great Britain and another member of the League, in which the Executive of the League should decide against Great Britain and a war ensue?"

An answer, if not to this identical query, at least to something like it, was furnished by the events of the year 1922. Late in the summer of that year Mr. Lloyd George realised that the Turkish situation was reversed, a new war with Turkey was the only expedient to preserve what was considered to be vital British interests in the Near East, and made his famous appeal to the Dominions and the *Little Entente* for support of military action against the Turks. There was no ambiguity about Canada's answer to it. "Under our system of responsible government," stated the Canadian Premier in the Canadian House of Commons, "the Canadian Parliament should determine, except in the case of threatened or actual invasion, whether the country would participate in wars in which other nations or other parts of the British Empire may be involved." Probably this very definite policy determined the British Government's action in sending Indian troops rather than seeking to obtain Canadian forces for action in China. This declaration of 1922 was a positive aspect, if so it may be termed, of the right which the Dominion had negatively, so to speak, asserted a year earlier, for when in the summer of 1921 the treaty between Great Britain and Japan was due for renewal, that step had to be abandoned in spite of Britain's inclination for it and of the support of the majority of the Dominions because Canada was against it. The possible reactions of such a procedure on the relations between the United States and Canada due to the strained relations between the former and Japan became the main consideration. In 1923 a further step in the same direction was taken when Canada contested the Imperial Government's right to participate in the negotiations of the Halibut Treaty with the United States and asserted the Dominion's right to conclude treaty obligations concerning them only, wholly and solely on their own account, in the following resolution of the Imperial Conference of that year: "Bilateral treaties imposing obligations on one part of the Empire only should only be signed by a representative of the Government of that part. The full powers issued to such a representative by the Crown should indicate the part of the Empire in respect of which the obligations are to be undertaken, and the preamble and text of the treaty should be so worded as to make its scope clear."

How jealously Canada regards her independence and how substantial it is in spite of her formal status as a unit of the Empire may be realised when it is seen that even after all these developments, when the Peace Treaty with Turkey came for ratification, Canada declined to do it on the ground that she had played no part in the preliminaries of this particular treaty. "My Ministers do not feel they are in a position to recommend to Parliament the approval" of the Treaty; "without the approval of Parliament they feel they are not warranted in signifying approval and ratification of the Treaty" was the Canadian Premier's direct reply.

Turning to Geneva, it will be seen that Canada's part here is characterised by the same independence. From the outset Canada manifested her opposition to Article X of the Covenant of the League of Nations dealing with the guarantee of territorial integrity and political independence of the Member States, one of the few survivals of the purely Wilsonian parts of the League's constitution. At the Peace Conference Canadian representatives voted, however, for the Covenant as a whole, while at the same time making the reservation that the Canadian Government would move an amendment at a later date. At the first Assembly on December 6, 1920, Mr. Doherty, the Canadian delegate, proposed: "That Article X of the Covenant of the League of Nations be and is hereby struck out." The matter went up to the Council for investigation, and on September 14, 1922, Mr. Lapointe, speaking for Canada, at the First Committee stated that as he was convinced that it was impossible to secure the deletion of the article he would be content with instituting the amendment "taking into account the political and geographical circumstances of each case." He also said, "The opinion given by the Council in such cases shall be regarded as a matter of the highest importance, and shall be taken into consideration by all the members of the League, who shall not be under the obligation to engage in any act of war without the consent of its Parliament, Legislature, or other representative body." It is significant that when this amendment was circulated for opinion among the Members Great Britain maintained silence. With regard to both the Geneva Protocol and the Locarno Pact Canada has taken a different line of action from the Mother Country. The Rt. Hon. Sir George Foster, the Chief Canadian delegate to the Seventh Assembly, declared: "I think it is right, at this stage, that we should say to this Assembly and to the League of Nations itself, that we consider that we have equal rights to representation on the Council and otherwise with every one of the fifty-six members of the League of Nations." The Eighth Assembly witnessed Canada's entry into the Council.

The origins of the establishment of direct diplomatic relations between Washington and Ottawa are to be found in the results of the work of the Canadian War Mission in the United States. Between February 1918 and the Armistice, they are said to have secured contracts for the Canadian industries to the extent of £46,000,000. In the course of the Parliamentary discussion of the future of the Mission, the President of the Privy Council stated: "While the several British Ambassadors at Washington have rendered admirable service to Canada, our business with the United States is now on so large a scale that the Government is convinced that our interests can only be adequately protected by a Canadian representative resident in Washington. Therefore it has been decided to continue the War Mission until permanent representation has been arranged for. . . . If the representative is to be truly a Canadian representative, his functions must have a wider scope than of merely dealing with matters of trade. The condition creates the need; the need undoubtedly will be met when the arrangements are completed. Moreover, Canada has a unique opportunity of being the means of keeping more closely together than they have been in the past—the Mother country and our sister nation to the South. We understand the Americans better than the Old Country people do. We may be interpreters between the two; I am sure, therefore, that the appointment of a Canadian representative at Washington is in the interests of the Empire as a whole, as well as of Canada."

The appointment of the Canadian Ambassador at Washington coming as it did in 1926 gave a

precedent to the Irish Free State which it was not slow to follow. The Free State has also set up a big interrogation mark to the term "Dominion Status" by sending in the instrument of its creation to Geneva to be registered among the international treaties. The Mother Country has called the procedure into question, but the matter cannot be said to be settled until some definite issue arises directly relevant to this step.

The right of self-government within the Empire, it has been sometimes urged, is based on *jus sanguinis*, but the inclusion of French Canadians and Dutch Boers among the legitimate claimants to this right denies that contention. It may be, however, argued with some reason that the Empire is a white Empire. Probably this is what Mr. Baldwin had in mind when in the course of his Guildhall speech he said that the future of civilisation itself was involved in it, while referring to the basis of the composition of the Simon Commission. The British made themselves unnecessarily conspicuous by opposing the Japanese proposal to embody the principle of racial equality in the Covenant of the League of Nations. But for their single exception and President Wilson's indigent hurry sometimes to secure his own points which led to his insistence on unanimity in this regard, that principle might now add lustre to Geneva's banner. Here as elsewhere, however, the attempt to unroot some preconceived principle of British psychology is an error. The Britisher is splendidly self-contradictory, and only the other day in the Imperial Parliament a non-white and non-Christian member found himself possessed of the right of influencing a decision on the Englishman's ritual of worship. The Imperial Conference of 1917 as well as 1926 leaves no room to put emphasis on the distinction of colour as a principle in Imperial politics. What is far more probable it that the British have an appreciation of a good fight for a good cause and nothing may be expected of them except through forcible and appropriate assertion. That even Canada could not have obtained her present position in the Empire without it is evident from the Canadian Premier's insistence in the Canadian Parliament on September 2nd, 1919: "I hope that the House will realise that the recognition and status accorded to the British Dominions at the Imperial Peace Conference were not won without constant effort and firm resistance."

RAGHUNATH ROW.

(Concluded).

TREATIES AND POLITICAL PRACTICE.

I.

THE Indian Princes are claiming that their relations are directly with the Crown, that their status is that of 'politically separate and constitutionally independent units of this Indian Empire' and that they are sovereigns in their internal affairs on the strength of the treaties concluded with them. Nobody desires that these treaties should be thrown to the winds or treated as mere scraps of paper. But what is really to be deplored is that, without trying properly to understand the treaties or their provisions, inferences are sometimes drawn from mere catch-phrases and the cry raised of 'treaties in danger.' The Princes are setting up claims on the basis of treaties which cannot stand a moment's scrutiny. The task of reviewing all these treaties is of course beyond the scope of this journal. We, however, propose to deal with the treaties of the more important Princes who at present boss the show of the Narendra Mandal, viz. the Maharajas of Bikaner, Patiala, Jamnagar and Alwar. There are 108 members of

the Chamber of Princes and their treaties undoubtedly deserve serious consideration. An important consideration which deserves to be borne in mind is, as stated in the Montford Report, that the treaties must be read and interpreted as a whole and in the light of the relations established between the parties not only at the time when a particular treaty was made but subsequently. The conditions under which the treaties were executed have undergone material changes and the literal fulfilment of the particular obligations which they impose has become practically impossible. It is further necessary that along with the treaties, political practice, which is in force in connection with these States, must also be carefully scrutinized. Lord Reading in his famous despatch to the Nizam pertinently and authoritatively stated that the sovereignty of the British Crown is based not only on treaties and engagements but exists independently of them. Political practice, therefore, as observed in the case of the Indian States, is a material factor in construing the position of the Indian States in the body politic. It shows the limitations which are imposed upon the right of sovereignty which is claimed by the Indian rulers in their domestic affairs. We are basing our conclusion upon the treaties as published in the authoritative work of Mr. Aitchison. If there are any treaties which are not included therein but which may be in existence in the confidential files of the Government and the States, we are open to correction and we shall feel obliged if the rulers correct the statement of facts narrated below.

BIKANER.

The first treaty which was concluded with Bikaner was in the year 1818 by the East India Company through Mr. Charles Metcalf to whom full powers were granted by the Marquis of Hastings, the then Governor General of India. It was a treaty imposing subordinate co-operation on the Maharaja of Bikaner, and the British Government on their part engaged to protect his territories and reduce his rebellious subjects to obedience. The British Government was to be the arbitrator between the Maharaja and his heirs and successors in case of any dispute. The Maharaja was bound to furnish troops at the requisition of the British Government according to his means and agreed to extradition treaties and to the levy of a scale of duties on goods passing through his territories from Kabul to India. The Maharaja in 1879 agreed to a treaty for not manufacturing salt in his territory. In 1889 the Maharaja ceded to the British Government full and exclusive jurisdiction of every kind over the lands in his State occupied by the Jodhpur-Bikaner and Bikaner-Bhatinda Railway systems. He ceded similar jurisdiction as regards the Southern Punjab Railway. In 1893 the Maharaja entered into an undertaking to abstain from coining silver and copper in his own mint. The treaties were every time concluded by the Governor General of India and were negotiated under the authority of the Government of India. They establish the position of subordinate co-operation of the Ruler with the British Government. The Maharaja agreed not to enter into any negotiations with any Chief or State without the knowledge and sanction of the British Government. This condition, coupled with the conditions of ceding jurisdiction, restricting transit duties, abolition of salt manufacture and the closure of the mint, unmistakably prove the subordinate position of the State, and the pretensions of the Maharaja to be regarded as a politically independent unit of the Indian Empire are thoroughly untenable. Every autonomous and independent Ruler has a right to manufacture any goods and salt is one of such commodities. Coinage is an insignia of sovereignty and the undertaking to close the mint proves only the dependent feudatory

position of the Bikaner State. As regards the political practice the history of the State is equally interesting. In 1829 the Maharaja of Bikaner in violation of his treaty engagement invaded Jaisalmer, but the British Government interfered and settled the dispute. In 1830 the British Resident was asked by the 'Chief' of Bikaner to send a British force to assist him in reducing some rebellious nobles. The Resident complied with the request, but he was severely reprimanded by his superiors and it was laid down by the Government that the Chief of Bikaner (it is to be noted that the Ruler is styled as the 'Chief' and not as the 'Maharaja') had no right to call on the British Government for military aid against his disaffected subjects at any future period. They warned the Resident that military aid should never be given to Native States for the suppression of internal disturbances except under the specific authority of the Government. In 1861 the ruler of Bikaner committed outrages on subjects of Jodhpur and he was reminded of his treaty obligations. In 1871 the exorbitant levies of the Maharaja over his subjects gave rise to much discontent, with the result that some of the Thakores of his State had to take refuge in British territory. A British officer was deputed to Bikaner in 1871 to enquire into the differences between the Ruler and his subjects. The Maharaja promised to reduce his expenses and to improve his administration by appointing a Council. These promises were not fulfilled and misgovernment continued. Maharaja Sardar Singh, who was then ruling, died in 1872 and a boy was adopted and the administration was temporarily carried on by a British Officer assisted by a Council. The young Maharaja was entrusted with ruling powers in 1873 but maladministration and the discontent of the Thakores did not abate. The Maharaja Dongar Singh was repeatedly pressed to bring about reforms but maladministration was rampant and led the nobles of the State to rise in open rebellion against the ruler. It became necessary to march a small British force into the country to support the authority of the ruler and the Thakores were subdued without much trouble. This incident happened in 1883 and has a significant moral. When there is acute discontent and the subjects rise in revolt the British Government interferes and supports the authority of the ruler with its military force. This was done in Bikaner twice; once in 1830 and again in 1883. With a view to avert this direct interference in suppressing revolt and in restoring order and good government, the British Government warned to the rulers of Bikaner against allowing a recurrence of similar trouble to take place in future. But these warnings were not heeded, and the British arms had to support the successive rulers of Bikaner on their *gadi* and restore order. Herein lies the real crux of the situation. The Indian Rulers want to enjoy independence in their internal affairs. But this they cannot enjoy unless they maintain good administration and refrain from goading their people to desperation. Can they maintain their dynasties and *gadis* against the oppressed subjects in the absence of the protection of the British Government? The answer is plain. The price of this protection is the maintenance of good government and carrying on the administration in such a manner as not to drive the people to discontent and breaches of the peace. The Indian Princes, therefore, cannot claim sovereign rights even in their domestic affairs. The British Government has the right to interfere whenever peace and order are likely to be in danger by reason of misrule; and this is what is conveyed by the expression 'sovereignty exists independently of treaties.' Lord Curzon once observed, "Security cannot be repaid by license or the guarantee of rights by the uncharter-

ed exercise of wrong." The Indian Princes sometimes chafe at the interference on the part of the British Government in their internal affairs on the ground of their supposed independence and sovereignty. This claim is not however warranted by their so-called treaties. The political practice in regard to Bikaner clearly disproves such a claim and we would request the Maharaja to enlighten us as to what treaty supports his claim of direct relations with the Crown or the theory of his political relations being with the British Government independently of the Government of India, of the Governor General and of the Foreign and Political Department.

G. R. ABHYANKAR.

OUR EUROPEAN LETTER.

(From Our Own Correspondent.)

GENEVA, February 9.

A BETRAYAL.

GENEVA is astir with the news of the betrayal. The International Labour Office has never been anything but a second to the diplomats assembling here periodically, though they are wont to add in parenthesis "and do not let us forget the Labour Office to which are turned the expectations of so many working men all the world over" to their rhetoric at non-diplomatic gatherings. Now the British Government has informed the Governing Body of the I.L.O. that it does not see its way to ratify and enforce the Washington Convention of 1919 of the Eight Hours Day. That instrument, according to this contention, stands in need of revision because it was drafted hurriedly and it does not correspond to the present situation. This last consists in the need to increase post-war European industrial recovery by means of national economies. It is recalled by the British Government that the Convention itself provides for probable revision after ten years. It has succeeded in getting the question made a part of the programme for the meeting of the Governing Body in April when it will be decided whether the demand for the revision shall come before the General Meeting of the International Labour Office next year. Meanwhile the situation that has arisen is, as the Director of the I.L.O. characterised it to be: "*Ce n'est pas tragique, Mais c'est grave.*" It is grave because the fundamental of the Labour position, included in the Treaty of Versailles and engraved in the I.L.O. so as to meet the eye on entering it, the co-relation between economic and social well-being and international peace, finds its concrete expression in the Eight Hours Convention. The theory of high wages as a basis of prosperity seemed to underline it. Attempts to obtain general acceptance of the Eight Hours Day have been the principal business of the I.L.O. in the nine years since its creation, which have seen it grow second only to the League in importance, as is shown by its budget of over eight million francs for the present year.

FRANCE'S POSITION.

The curious part of the proceeding was the support that the French Government accorded to the British position. France voted an Eight Hour Day as a standard in 1919, before the Conference in

Washington. It is one of the few nations to take such a step. Out of the fifty-five nations represented in the I.L.O. such important industrial countries as France, Great Britain, Germany, and Italy have failed to ratify the Convention although in practice they have generally maintained the standard. A conference of the European nations in London some months ago finally agreed in principle to ratify, although each made its action dependent on the others doing it. Here again, therefore, the position is similar to what it is in the League when a simultaneous decision has to be taken in any matter, and the analogy completes itself in the fact that Britain takes the lead in the initiative towards reaction. France would seem as usual to follow suit; yet the reactions of French and British Labour will not be the same in this respect. The traditional forces of French politics are all on the side of the principles Labour represents, and however strong may be Monsieur Poincaré's group at the moment, it cannot in the long run resist them. Power is no novel experience to the Continental Socialists and they are at no pains to don the silk hats and striped pantaloons of political life to make their eligibility to office impressive. Monsieur Leon Blum, the Paris Socialist leader, has taken the matter in hand, and here is what *L'Humanité* thinks of it: "The British employers, with whom the Chiefs of the Labour Party have concluded a social peace, are on the way of throwing out the Eight Hour Day, the essential conquest of the international working class. The Eight Hour Day was obtained on the morrow of the war by the direct fight the proletariat put up for it. In France, the Clemenceau Government had it passed in light days because the soldiers, become citizens, multiplied the strikes, the threats, and the descent into the boulevards. The anger of those who had returned from the trenches was then feared. And it was under the terror of their revolt that the eight hour day was accorded. Today Socialists and Syndicalist reformers have renounced the class struggle for the co-operation of the classes. The employers with whom they collaborate with all their heart respond by pressing for the revision of the Eight Hours Convention. Is this not sufficiently decisive?"

THE LABOUR PARTY.

Stung by the move at Geneva, Mr. MacDonald, in replying to the King's speech at the opening of Parliament, characterised the British Government's demand for the revision of the Washington Convention as "absolutely impossible." Another circumstance to give him reason for introspection has been the Government's decision to put off the Factories Bill until another session. It is a state of affairs which calls for the enunciation of a moral which has long been obvious to those who would see it. The recent apparent success of Labour at the bye-elections (which is really due to the double negative of the ordinary reactions of any electorate to a Government in its fourth year and the collapse of the Liberal Party) has perhaps served to veil it, thus making added affirmation necessary. The truth can never be too often repeated that Europe, and particularly

Great Britain, is today at the cross-roads: the struggle of 1914 was physical; today it is moral and much more decisive. At this turning point there is little scope for the traditional gift of compromise and Mr. MacDonald and his friends, in having pitched their ideal to Downing Street instead of to a star, have enfeebled British Labour considerably. Socialism cannot in the circumstances be practical politics for the moment and it can only be religion to the young, liberalism to the old, and philosophy to the aged. In politics it can only be a moral counterpoise undermining the aggressive preponderance of ruling tendencies. Instead of that the Parliamentary Labour Party is today a piteous lot of middle-aged men with nothing round their nakedness of office-seeking but the worn-out fibre of knightly memories. The MacDonald group, like the professional diplomats, have to take steps which the *New Leader* appropriately calls forward and backward at the same time, and since the morality involved in such a proceeding is of a line with that of their opponents, they do not move at all. British Labour today has lost its best brains (witness the secession of fine spirits such as Shaw and Wells from it), its high principles (witness the easy compromises it made as regards China and India); its universality (witness the constant ruptures with continental bodies) and if it counts on its recent gains at the polls for its strength it will be counting without its host, for when the time comes to manifest its positive features, it will fare as poorly as the Liberal Party fares today. Would the Liberals be where they are now if only Mr. Lloyd George had had the courage to strike a distinctive note at Versailles?

CANADA'S ADVANCE.

After direct diplomatic relations with the United States, France, Japan, and Great Britain, the next move for Canada would naturally be to determine her connection with South America and thus delicately and steadily but surely approach towards defining the position with regard to the Pan-American Union. The far-reaching importance of this last step makes it hesitant but there need be no incredulity about the rumours in this matter after all that has happened. The Canadians have a way of plunging into precedents and those who know how Canada found her way into the Council at the Eighth Assembly and reduced the head of the British delegation to a helpless and dazzled middleman will have an adequate idea of the resourcefulness of Canadians. But it would be wrong to conclude from the Canadian advance that it is due to the pressure of unanimity. Not only did Sir George Foster criticise the Government's forward policy in the Senate, but Sir George Perley in the Canadian House of Commons attacked the Government for "taking a step fraught with such far-reaching consequences as the establishment of new Ministers in Paris and Tokyo without consulting Parliament" and Mr. McKenzie King, the Premier, had to intervene to say that, "at least as far as Japan was concerned, the proposal for Ministries was only tentative and Parliament would be consulted about the appropriation". Mr. Caban, the Conservative member coming from Montreal, was even more outspoken; he urged that Canada was not a sovereign State and that her Parliament was still subordinate to the British Parliament and limited in jurisdiction to her own territory. He went so far as to suggest an advisory committee of Canadian experts to devise ways and means whereby, when the old statutory constitution of Canada was shattered, there might be provided "something enduring which will take its place and keep us in political association with the rest of the Empire".

THE SIMON COMMISSION.

India's reactions to the arrival of the Royal Commission have stirred the world's attention to it. Many a paper, Continental and American, has given wide notice to the problems and conditions in the country.

OUR PARLIAMENTARY LETTER.

(From Our Own Correspondent.)

DELHI, February 24.

ASSEMBLY'S SIGNAL VICTORY.

THIS week showed clearly once more the difference between the two Houses of the Central Legislature: the Assembly won a signal victory over the Government and its supporters, while the Council of State set its face against the decision of the popular House. The debate on the Statutory Commission was continued on Saturday and all shades of opinion, from wholehearted co-operation to unalloyed non-co-operation, were expressed at their best. Dr. Suhrawardy pleaded for unalloyed co-operation and tried to twit the Swarajists but failed. Dr. Gour imitated Mr. Jayakar in defining conditional co-operation but had no support even from his party in that attempt. Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer represented the Leftist Section in the Congress Party and warned Government that if they did not move with the times, a time would come when the 'constitutionalists like themselves would be thrown overboard and the field occupied by revolutionists'. Pandit Motilal was more clear when he admitted that Sir John Simon might be a big man but India was not going to surrender to the biggest man on that account, and added "We stand upon a fundamental principle that Britain and British Parliament have no right to force a Constitution upon us against our wishes." There was one strain in all the speeches viz., that the composition of the Commission was a deliberate attempt to humiliate India, not only in the eyes of the world, but also in the eyes of the Indians themselves; that there was nothing 'joint' or 'free' in the 'Conference' and that the word 'colleague' was a misnomer. There was very little argument on the Government side and Sir Basil tried to paint a lurid picture of recurrence of non-co-operation and styled the opposition as a barren policy. He repeated what Lord Birkenhead had said the other day, that the composition of the Commission was not to be changed. The very manner in which the defeat of the Government on such a crucial point is being explained away shows how seriously Government is perturbed over it. But Sir John Simon, statesman as he is, has committed a veritable blunder by calling it a defeat by 'a narrow majority' and that the majority of six did not decide the issue for the whole of India. Lord Birkenhead once more warned Indians on the eve of the debate that 'with the assistance of the Legislatures or without, the Commission will carry out its task.' The warning stiffened the opposition to the Commission instead of weakening it, as perhaps was intended.

THE INDIAN NAVY BILL

Immediately on the heels of this defeat, Government was foiled in another attempt at foisting upon India an 'Indian Navy'. Mr. Chetty showed how reactionary the measure was inasmuch as the conditions hedging the recruitment of Indians made it impossible at least for decades to have an Indian officer on it. He quoted from the Hansard and showed how the suggestion that the Indian Navy should not be used out of India without India's consent was considered preposterous; and how the suggestion that the cost of such an expedition should not be charged to Indian revenues without the consent of the Indian Legislature was set aside on the ground that

India in her present transitional stage did not enjoy full control over her revenues. It was also clear that the Indian taxpayer would have to pay for a Navy which would be controlled by the British Government and British officers only. The purpose of the whole scheme was criticised as an attempt to enlarge the British Navy at the expense of India. Mr. Jinnah concurred in Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer's opinion that India would accept it if it was started in a spirit of sympathy and trustfulness; otherwise it would be a misnomer. The House was not prepared to accept the Bill as it involved additional sums on the non-votable items and once more made it clear that it would not take things lying down.

EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES FOR THE DEPRESSED CLASSES.

The day for the non-official resolutions evoked a lively debate on the question of provision of special facilities for the Depressed Classes for education. The Resolution served to expose the true nature of the recent declarations about the Government's extraordinary solicitude for the welfare of the Depressed Classes under their paternal care. Mr. Jayakar made it clear in moving the resolution that there was no political move on his part,—as was hinted at afterwards in the debate. He quoted from the proceedings of the Punjab Legislative Council and showed that at the present rate these classes would have to wait till the Doomsday for their upliftment. He therefore wanted merely to speed up the progress in this direction, with the help of the Government. Mr. Bajpai briefly narrated the achievements of Government so far and the various special arrangements made for these classes. He thought the spirit of tolerance that was quickening would soon obviate the necessity of such special arrangements. Mr. Jayakar wanted the Central Government to issue orders to the Provincial Governments asking them to pay special attention to the education of the depressed classes: but Mr. Bajpai said it was not possible for the Central Government to meddle in the affairs of the Provinces—more so in the Transferred Departments. He tried to delude the House with figures the accuracy of which was repeatedly questioned and Mr. Bajpai had at times to best a hasty retreat due to the vigilance of members like Mr. Joshi, Lala Lajpat Rai and Pandit Malaviya. Mr. Jayakar urged the Government to formulate a policy in the light of the debate and hope that they would not stint money in this matter when they spent so lavishly on the Army and other services.

THE RAILWAY BUDGET.

The Railway Budget presented by the Commerce Member has been generally well received. The position of the Railways six years back was thoroughly unsound and Government had to resort to an increase in rates to restore solvency. The financial chaos has been overcome and the Railways are not only solvent but after making provision for the reserve fund to fall back upon in times of stress they are making a contribution to the general revenues. A reduction of rates and fares has been announced, but that can hardly be called a relief to the travelling public whose average travelling distance has been officially computed at less than 40 miles. The question of separation of railway finances from the general finances is now again open for examination, as the convention was to be in force only for three years. There has been a general complaint that it has given more latitude to the Railway Board which has become an *imperium in imperio*. The Railway Board came in for much criticism when Mr. Jambadas Mehta moved his amendment to cut down the expenditure of the Railway Board to Rs. 1. There was much scathing criticism against the entire Rail-

way policy, specially against the dogged resistance shown by the Railway Board in the matter of Indianisation, promised by the late Commerce Member. One member went the length of asking whether the Indian to be on the Board was still to be born! Mr. Jamnadas Mehta cited instances to show that de-Indianisation was rapidly taking place and Europeans even without qualifications were being dumped upon India on one pretext or another. Several members complained about the indifference of the railway management in the matter of comforts for Indian passengers and ventilated other allied grievances, but the vote of censure implied in the suggested cut failed to pass.

THE SERVILE ELDERS.

In sharp contrast to the Assembly, the Council of State discussed the question of the Statutory Commission in a placid atmosphere. Mr. P. C. D. Chari moved that the Council of State should request Government to form a committee of the Central Legislature to co-operate with the Commission with rights which have been already announced by the Chairman of the Commission in his letter to the Viceroy. Mr. Chari frankly declared that the arguments advanced in the Assembly did not convince him. Sir Maneckji Dadabhoj entered an indignant protest against the spurning of the great opportunity afforded by the British Government. Mr. G. S. Khaparde ridiculed the idea that the situation was grave and harped upon the idea that all would be well if you trusted Government. Sir Pheroj Sethna put up a strong fight and declared it to be the duty of every elected member not to support the proposition in view of the vote of the Assembly. He hit the nail on the head when he said, "constituted as this House is, Government can have everything their own way." He fervently appealed to the members to stand by the other House; but his was a cry in the wilderness and the House by a majority decided to elect a committee of its own by adopting the amendment of Sir M. Dadabhoj to that effect. None dared expect anything better of the Council.

OUR U. P. LETTER.

(From Our Own Correspondent.)

LUCKNOW, FEB. 24.

Simon Commission and Council.—The spring session of the local Legislative Council commenced at Lucknow in the new Council Chamber on Feb. 22. The new building was formally opened the previous day by the Governor. This imposing edifice is much more commodious and much more up-to-date than the old Canning College building which used to house the Council ever since the year 1921. And it will be more convenient for the various needs and requirements of the Legislature—immediate and proximate. Besides the Council Chamber proper, provision is made for a library room, a reading room, a waiting room, three committee rooms and two refreshment rooms, for the special use of members. In addition all the offices of the Government and the Council are accommodated there. Specially constructed for the purposes of a modern house of Legislature, the acoustics of the building are assured; the arrangements for seats in the hall, semi-circular in shape, are made with due regard to the convenience of members. A long standing complaint of the members has thus been removed and the Council begins to work under greatly improved conditions.

The first day's sitting of the Council was expected to open with the momentous debate on the Statutory Commission. The resolution on the subject stood in the name of Pandit Badri Datt Pandey, a

Swarajist member, but Mr. Pandey; acting on advice from the leader of his party, decided not to move it. Soon after, the Swaraj Party in a body walked out of the House, and other non-official business was transacted. The decision was perhaps due to the fact that the non-officials were not sure of their ground. There were still a considerable number of waverers and they had to be 'whipped.' And both the Nationalists and Swarajists were eagerly looking forward to the arrival of leaders from Delhi. To-day the situation seems to be more hopeful and the debate has opened in full vigour. There was a record attendance of members; about 115 were present out of a total of 123. The galleries were packed with visitors, the presence of the Hon. the Maharaja of Mahmudabad and the Hon. the Raja Sir Rampal Singh among them was a source of encouragement to the nationalists. Mr. Mukandilal (Swarajist), Deputy President of the Council, moved the resolution:—"That this Council recommends to the Government to inform the Governor General in Council and His Majesty's Government in England that the present constitution and scheme of the Statutory Commission are wholly unacceptable to it and that it will have nothing to do with the Commission at any stage and in any form." As this is written the debate stands adjourned for the day. It is difficult to give a correct forecast of the voting because of the peculiar constitution of the House, and conditions in U. P. are not the same as in the Central Provinces or even in Madras. The forces are evenly matched; and the gain or loss of a few votes will determine the strength of the nationalists and the reactionaries. Reading through the speech of the Finance Member appealing to the House to postpone consideration of the subject till some time later, one may entertain the hope that the Council will acquit itself creditably.

The Commission's Visit.—On its way down to Calcutta the Simon Commission paid visits to Cawnpore and Benares. Fearing hostile demonstrations, the officials who were in charge of the arrangements maintained the utmost secrecy till the last moment. It was privately arranged that the members of the Upper India Chamber of Commerce, "representatives" of the Muslim community and of the depressed classes and local businessmen should wait on the Commission at the Cawnpore railway station and similarly at Benares a small show was got up for the occasion. Cawnpore, because of its commercial and Benares because of its religious greatness, were certainly deserving of visits from the Commission. But why such secrecy should have been observed, is what one fails to understand. Perhaps the Commissioners were fully conscious of the "cordial" welcome which would greet them if their visits had been publicly announced. All the same, at Benares some Congressmen did organise and accorded to them precisely the reception which they deserved. Processions with black flags and megaphone messages "Simon, go back," etc. werethe greetings which awaited them.

A Muslim Conference.—The so-called "Conference of the Muslim members of the municipal and district boards and the Legislative Council of the United Provinces" was held in Mayo Hall, Allahabad, on Feb. 19, under the presidentship of Dr. Shafaat Ahmad Khan, a professor of Allahabad University. It was a miserable show and failure was writ large on its two days' proceedings. The audience numbered about 200 men, consisting mostly of vegetable sellers, small traders, students and teachers of local Muslim schools. Besides urging the Muslims to cooperate with the Simon Commission for narrow ends, the president had nothing else to say in his address.

REVIEW SECTION.

IRISH YOUTH AND IRISH ELD.

THE LIFE OF TIM HEALY. By LIAM O'FLAHERTY. (Jonathan Cape, London.) 1927. 9 x 6. pp. 320. 12s. 6d.

MICHAEL COLLINS AND THE MAKING OF A NEW IRELAND. Vols. 2. By PIALAS BEASLAI. (George G. Harrap & Co. Ltd., London.) 1926. 9 x 6½. pp. 458. 484. 42s.

IN the preface to the *Life of Tim Healy* the author says: "I hardly recognise it as my own work. It seems that I have been possessed while writing it by some merry imp; no, not always merry, but devilish bitter at times. I have read it over. It is the most inconsistent book I ever read. The man who wrote it, or rather the spirit that wrote it, must be as changeable as a weather cock in an uncertain wind. I myself am an artist, without any very definite convictions about human affairs, other than those subtle aspects of life which are of interest to an artist. But the individual who wrote this is an extremely prejudiced fellow, almost a Jesuit. I know nothing about politics and care less. But the author of this work sets out to tell the whole human race how the business of politics must be conducted with benefit to the entire world. . . . The author of this book very impudently measures every human act as if he carried about him, on his person, a large series of gods and all of them infallible." Perhaps we may leave it at that: who is the reviewer that he should contradict Mr. Liam O'Flaherty?

Michael Collins was the youngest of eight children, all strong, vigorous and intelligent and all, except himself, alive to-day. Their parents were respectively sixty and twenty years of age when they married, and the father was seventy-five when his youngest child, Michael, the subject of this biography, was born. Michael Collins, senior, was a farmer, builder, and carpenter—with a good knowledge of Greek, Latin and French, and a strong bent for mathematics. He was equally at home in the English and Irish languages. Michael Collins, junior, was born in 1890. At the age of four years and a half he was sent to the Lisavaird National School, then taught by Mr. Denis Lyons, an old Fenian, who stood for an independent Ireland and, if need be, a war of independence. It is curious that the national language played no part in the boy's education either at home or in school: his parents only spoke Irish when they did not wish the children to know what they were saying. Total ignorance of their mother tongue was considered an asset in the struggle for life in Ireland thirty years ago. This explains the determination of Collins and the present Free State Government to force every child in Ireland to learn its mother tongue, or grandmother tongue, or great-grand-mother tongue, (as the case may be). They feel that England in depriving them of their language was at the same time stripping their souls of Irish culture and Irish thought. The present writer has sometimes heard complaints against the Government of this

country for requiring an elementary knowledge of the vernacular from Indian boys, before allowing them to join a European school: would that Ireland had had a little of the same grievance!

Little Mick developed into a great reader like his father and all the family, and they had a good selection of books at home: besides Scott, Dickens and Thackeray, some of the best Irish poetry and fiction; but the writers who most influenced the youthful mind of Michael Collins were Thomas Davis and one with whose name Collins' own will go down in history: Arthur Griffith.

When 13½ years old, Collins went to Clonakilty to be prepared for an examination for a P. O. Boy Clerkship; at fifteen he passed his examination and started life in London as boy clerk in the P. O. Savings Bank in West Kensington. It was July 1906. He left the Post Office Savings Bank about 1910 and took a position in a stockbrokers' firm, Horner & Co., which he left during the moratorium after the outbreak of war in 1914, and soon after got a post in the Guaranty Trust Co. of New York, in Lombard Street.

In November 1909 Collins had joined the Irish Republican Brotherhood (hereinafter called the I.R.B.), a secret society which had survived from Fenian times and which maintained the doctrine of physical force. Not only had this doctrine been discredited in Ireland by repeated failures and by the Church's ban on the Fenians, but there was a very strong feeling against any movement that might undermine the national unity. "Young Ireland of to-day can hardly conceive the atmosphere of the Ireland of that time, nor the contempt and dislike with which the majority of the Irish people looked upon the advocates of physical force" (p. 30). Then "came Sir Edward Carson to save the situation for the physical force party. He, more than any other man, is responsible for the events which have made Ireland a Free State. He defied law, appealed to force; he preached the doctrine which led to the founding of the Irish Volunteers—and the amazed Irish people . . . saw the (British) Government recoil before the bluff of the 'Ulster Volunteers'. They found threats of physical resistance by a minority accepted as a successful argument against justice to a majority. They found that the rifles and parades of the 'Ulster Volunteers' were jeopardising the long expected Home Rule Act. Here was the opportunity for the I.R.B. Some prominent Irishmen not connected with that organisation had begun to ask, "Why, if Ulster can arm and organise to defeat Home Rule (an Act of the British Parliament), can we not arm and defend it?"

The Irish Volunteers were started. Mr. Asquith's Government, which had allowed the Ulster Volunteers to import arms and drill openly for eighteen months, prohibited the importation of arms into Ireland. On April 24th, 1924, they again landed a cargo of rifles and distributed them without interference from

the Government. The situation was menacing for the majority of the Irish people, the period was fast approaching when by means of the Parliament Act the Home Rule Bill was to pass into law in spite of the House of Lords. That event was to be the signal for a civil war in Ireland, in which one side would be well armed with rifles which were said to have come from Germany. But there was the British garrison in Ireland, quite capable of dealing with any volunteer force, however well armed. The British Government ordered a regiment to march from the Curragh to the North by way of a demonstration against the Ulster Volunteers. The officers resigned in a body; a deputation went to the War Office in London and returned in triumph with a signed assurance that they would not be ordered to fire on the Volunteers. The picture papers showing the regiment welcoming the conquering heroes, on their return to the Curragh, flourishing their Magna Charta, must have been curious and interesting reading for Army Headquarters in half a dozen capitals of Europe, not least in Berlin. On the 26th July 1914, about 800 Irish Volunteers marched out to Howth, seven miles from Dublin, and a large consignment of German Mausers was landed, but no ammunition served out. On their march back to Dublin, they were met by about 200 policemen and a company of the Scottish Borderers and about a dozen of the rifles were captured. While the Borderers were being marched back to barracks through the streets of Dublin, they were jeered at and hooted and, it is said, stoned, whereupon the solidiers opened fire on the crowd, killing four persons and wounding thirty-seven.

Just before Christmas 1915 Collins and other I.R.B. men in England received a secret summons to return to Ireland. He left about the middle of January 1916 telling his employers that he was going to Dublin to "join up" in an Irish regiment. He joined an Irish Volunteer regiment and took part in the rising of Easter week, 1916. After the rising he was one of about 1800 Irishmen who were interned in Frongoch Prison Camp in the neighbourhood of the Lake of Bala in Merionethshire, North Wales. Many of these men had no more to do with the rising than the man in the moon, but were likely in the next rising to give the British Government something to intern them for. Meantime the captured Volunteers used the camp as a school of military discipline (see "With the Irish at Frongoch"). Owing to the agitation in Ireland against the detention of so many men who had nothing to do with the rising, and the difficulty of identifying the prisoners who had fought from among the suspects, all at Frongoch were released a day or two before Christmas 1916. They came home to find that General Maxwell's régime had succeeded in converting nationalist Ireland to the ideals of the I.R.B., which by a strange freak had come to be dubbed "Sinn Fein" (the name of its opposite, the little group led by Griffith which had always advocated passive resistance). Collins busied himself with reorganising the Volunteers and the I.R.B., becoming a member of the latter's Supreme Council. On the 3rd April 1917

Collins was arrested in Dublin on a charge of making a speech likely to cause disaffection, and sentenced to a short term of imprisonment. On April the 9th Lloyd George introduced his Man-Power Bill to apply conscription to Ireland and on April 16th it was read a third time, by 301 votes to 103, the minority being mostly Irish Nationalists. Henceforth they decided "to abandon attendance at Westminster and assist the people at home". Lloyd George had succeeded in uniting almost the whole Irish nation against conscription. He then arrested over eighty "Sinn Feiners", including De Valera, Griffith, and Cosgrave, on a bogus charge of plotting with Germany. This happened a few days after Lord Wimborne had been succeeded by Lord French as Viceroy of Ireland: Lord Wimborne publicly stated that he had no knowledge of any evidence for the alleged plot. The night of the arrest Collins, who had secret information, went to warn his friend Sean Mac Garry, but Sean had already been arrested. "He decided that the safest place for him was a house that had already been successfully raided, and so went comfortably to sleep in Sean Mac Garry's house."

"From the night of May 17th, 1918, except for a two months' respite in the beginning of 1919, Collins was evading arrest by the English, or, as we called it, 'on the run' up to the truce of July 11th, 1921. His life on the bicycle had begun. From that time he rarely moved about town except on a push-bike, but apart from this he was able to boast that he had never allowed the danger of arrest to interfere with the freedom of his movements. He wore no disguise and never had such a thing as the body-guard of English legends". During those three years it was well known that he often escaped arrest by the skin of his teeth, and all this time he was certainly the brain of the Irish Republican Army. In addition to directing intelligence work and military organisation he was minister for finance. By way of variety he would, from time to time, arrange the plans of a sensational escape from an English or Irish jail.

The truce brought a respite to his hunted life, but little respite to his labours; there was no longer a price on his head, but on the fighter was forced by De Valera the uncongenial task of negotiating the peace terms with England, and then De Valera and his party turned and rent him for not having brought back the moon—in the shape of a republic—or at least the moonshine of an external association with the British Commonwealth of Nations which would give the English at least as much internal control of Ireland as they secured by the actual treaty. The bickerings over the treaty led up to the lamentable civil war and the tragedy of Collins' death by an Irish bullet, and material damage to the country which rivalled, if it did not surpass, the ravages of the Black and Tans: *quod non fecerunt barbari, hoc fecerunt Barberini*.

And what of the moral cost of the Irish revolution? The author seems to ascribe the moral demoralization entirely, or almost entirely, to the protracted peace negotiations, an interregnum of six months.

during which there was no effective government in the country. But there are still unrepentant followers of John Redmond who question in their hearts whether the slower constitutional methods of the Irish Parliamentary party would not in the long run have brought about happier results than those achieved by young men in a hurry. When we were young men we were taunted with being in a hurry for Home Rule, and we impatiently explained that, when a man is running after his hat, he is not inclined to stop and argue why he wants to recover it, but at least we did not think it necessary in our hurry to jump on the hat.

For any one who wishes to gain an insight into the history of Ireland from 1914 to 1922, this is not a book to be recommended, it is a book that is indispensable.

SHAWN ROE.

THE RACIAL PROBLEM IN S. AFRICA.

THE POLITICAL FUTURE OF SOUTH AFRICA.

By EDGAR H. BROOKES. (J. L. van Schaik Ltd Pretoria.) 1927. 8½ × 5½. pp. 99. 5s.

THIS monograph by Prof. Brookes of Pretoria University contains a reasoned advocacy of segregation and gives qualified support to Gen. Hertzog's native policy. It however remains true that the book is pervaded by a high-minded resolve to do even-handed justice to all races and is scrupulously free from the vulgarity which too often disfigures expositions of the theory of parallel institutions. Indeed, one may say that this small work breathes throughout a spirit of loftiness very rare in South African books dealing with racial problems. Dr. Brookes thinks that Rhodes' famous formula, "Equal rights for all civilised men south of the Zambesi" is impracticable and also defective inasmuch as it takes no account of the factor of nationality. "An Indian may be as fully civilised as, perhaps much more civilised than, the average English-speaking South African. Yet is not the national ethos of the one very different from that of the other? Both are entitled to respect; but ought they to be amalgamated?" And, our author argues, whoever cannot be racially amalgamated must not be brought into the same representative institutions; they should be accorded all civic rights, but in parallel institutions. The formula, therefore, which Dr. Brookes has evolved, in opposition to the Rhodesian formula, is: "As wide a comprehension as possible and full toleration for all those elements which cannot be comprehended." The races which can be assimilated to the Europeans should share with them, on identical terms and in identical institutions, rights of franchise, representation, &c., without special economic or other barriers. The English-speaking and Dutch-speaking Europeans, though separated from one another in many points, are yet assimilable and so are the Coloureds, who number half a million. They, therefore, should enjoy equal rights and should labour under no disabilities of a racial character. The two hundred thousand Indians and five million Natives cannot, however, be so absorbed into the South African nation. The former will ever remain apart on account of, for one thing, of their race pride and ancient traditions; the latter are certainly capable of fusion in process of time as they offer almost a clean slate, but yet it is undesirable to make an attempt at fusion. Hence, both these must be treated as unassimilable groups. This does not mean a denial of political rights, for Dr. Brookes is as vigo-

rous an opponent as may be of a "White South Africa" policy or of one of Nordic ascendancy: but it means the bestowal of those rights in parallel institutions and possibly on a differential basis.

In the case of Indians, for instance, Dr. Brookes is all in favour of the grant as well of a political as of a municipal franchise, but would advocate the institution of communal electorates. He, therefore, recommends that they should be made autonomous in respect of an elected advisory Council and should be enabled to influence the general policy by granting a communal franchise for the House of Assembly and nominating one Senator (who should, for the present, be a European) to represent Indian interests. The inadequacy of these proposals is obvious, and yet we find Dr. Brookes saying that "they would entirely satisfy Indian opinion." On the economic side our author sees no reason for any discriminating legislation. "The economic difficulties amount to very little on careful analysis. The largest class, that of the coolie working on the sugar plantations, is one which it would be difficult to replace, and which no one honestly or seriously proposes to banish from the country. The more attacked classes—those of the merchant, the small shopkeeper and the hawker—are in nature and methods of work so exactly analogous to a certain class of Jew that it is difficult to attack the one race without attacking the other. It is not very clear that the country will benefit greatly by the substitution of Lithuanians for Indians, yet such would be the result of the expulsion of Indian shopkeepers, for South Africans have shown little aptitude for the type of commerce in question. A third class of Indian is employed in clerical and in other work in some Natal towns and villages, especially Durban. Here it is quite true that there is direct competition from which white lads suffer. Yet the proper application of the Minimum Wage Act and the successful functioning of the Juvenile Affairs Boards should greatly reduce the competition." Indians, he says, are entitled to the minority protection system devised by the League of Nations, and in view of Section 104 in the Liquor Bill which is in clear contravention of the Indo-Union Agreement, his suggestion that "it might perhaps be desirable to place any conclusions arrived at between India and South Africa under the guarantee of that body" is of extreme interest. Happily, the offending clause is now withdrawn, but Dr. Brookes' suggestion is none the less valuable on that account.

In respect of the Natives, Dr. Brookes advocates, in addition to a communal franchise, a policy of modified territorial segregation. His proposals need not be considered here in detail; they generally endorse the specific proposals contained in Mr. Hertzog's four Native Bills now before the S. African Parliament. The general principle underlying these proposals is "that the Natives have the right not only to govern themselves so far as possible, but also to participate in the general government of the country."

I have left myself no space to deal with the constructive suggestions of Dr. Brookes regarding the machinery of government, but all these will be of great value and help to those engaged in constitution-making in India in solving problems like Federation vs. Union, Second Chamber, Cabinet System and so forth. On these I would strongly recommend the reader to refer to this small but exceedingly suggestive volume.

S. G. VAZE.

CONSERVATISM OR FASCISM ?

A DEFENCE OF CONSERVATISM. By A. M. LUDOVICI. (Faber & Gwyer Ltd., London.) 1927. 9 x 5¾. pp. 613.

GOOD causes are often ruined by over-zealous advocates. Such a fate has befallen Conservatism. Conservatism that we know and that is the political philosophy of the Baldwin Cabinet has much to recommend it; but the Conservatism that Mr. Ludovici expounds in these pages has nothing but the reprobation of every lover of democracy. After going through the book carefully, we have come to the painful conclusion that what is expounded in it is not Conservatism but Fascism.

Mr. Ludovici is a lover of strong government. Like Mussolini he cares more for 'order, subordination to authority, and discipline' than for liberty. He thinks that democracy is inconsistent with what he calls 'True Conservatism.' "Truth to tell" says the author on p. 75, "the traditional and orthodox Tory and Conservative position is one definitely opposed to democracy. And the idea mooted ever since the eighties of last century of a Tory-Democratic party is thus an absurdity. Far from believing in the natural or inherent right of every individual to political liberty, the Conservative believes that all men are directed by the general constitution of human nature to submit to government, and that some men are in a particular manner designed to take care of that government on which the common happiness depends."

Mr. Ludovici thus believes in the inherent capacity of the aristocracy of England to govern the Empire. If anyone wishes to know more fully his views thereon, let him go through his two works, 'A Defence of Aristocracy' and 'The False Assumptions of Democracy.' In the chapter entitled 'Religion and the Constitution' in the book under review, the learned author lays down the lines on which reform of the constitution should be undertaken. Briefly put they are (1) strengthening the power of the Crown, (2) making the House of Lords a powerful political body in the State, and (3) making the House of Commons more representative of the nation than before. The learned author therefore wants every Englishman to undo the work of centuries. His model King is Charles I, over whose administration he falls into rapturous eloquence, and whom he calls the 'first and the greatest Tory in England.' His political gospel is Viscount Bolingbroke's "On the Spirit of Patriotism." He laments over the Great Rebellion of 1642, and the Parliament Act of 1911, for whereas the one made absolute monarchy impossible in England, the other rendered the House of Lords politically impotent. He calls Macaulay a 'womanly thinker,' for he has no love for Charles I and Mr. Lloyd George 'a shallow politician' for the important part he played in connection with the Parliament Act of 1911. He calls his Conservative philosophy as 'Classical' while he regards the Liberal philosophy 'Romantic' Expressions such as these remind us of Dr. Johnson's dictum that in the sphere of politics "to treat one's opponent with respect is to give him an advantage to which he is not entitled." Well, Dr. Johnson who regarded the Whig as 'the first devil' was an orthodox Tory; and the author of the book under review is really his disciple in the matter of treating his political opponents.

Now let us give a sample of the religious views of this 'upholder of authority and order.' To the author the right of private judgment is a most anarchical doctrine, subversive of all authority and order. This is what the writer says, "The fact that the anarchical principle of the right of private judgment

forms the basis of all the Reformed Churches is unfortunate from the point of view of the Tory and Conservative position." The author holds that "Catholicism is more suited than any other religion to governmental authority." It is indeed strange that a writer of such eminence as Mr. Ludovici should give expression to narrow religious views in this Age of Light and Reason.

Perhaps the most outrageous pronouncement is that which the author makes on p. 252. In justifying the existence and putting forward a plea for the continuance of the British Empire, the author says thus: "If we are believers in the radical inequality of mankind, we see nothing strange or revolting in the spectacle of a superior people winning in such a struggle, and securing food for its women and children at the cost of an inferior population. On the contrary, from the standpoint of the world's future, we should regard it as most regrettable if they failed to do so. For by winning they would not only secure the continuance of the human species, but also its *perpetuation in the most desirable form*. To argue therefore that the Empire is wrong because it conflicts with the principle of human equality is about as sensible as to say that War is wrong because it conflicts with the principle of human sphericity. In a limited area like the terrestrial globe, a superior race has the incontestable right to spread itself at the cost of inferior races. Nature and life themselves give the mandate for such a procedure."

This is an exposition of the Survival of the Fittest Theory in the realm of human affairs in its most naked form. A Jingo or a Mussolini would express himself in this manner, but not a Conservative of the stamp of Mr. Baldwin or Lord Hugh Cecil. Baldwin and his stalwart colleagues would only exclaim, "Save us from our friends."

The author defines true Conservatism "as the preservation of the national identity throughout the processes of change, by a steady concern about quality throughout the whole of the nation's life." To preserve the 'national identity' the author wants the Government to check the immigration of aliens into the country. It is within the knowledge of students of English economic history that in the 11th, 14th, 16th and 17th centuries, aliens immigrated into England in large numbers and laid the foundation of certain important industries in the land. Aliens were needed *then*, they are not needed *now*!

To sum up, the Conservative philosophy as expounded in these pages does not believe in liberty, self-reliance and independence; it believes in private property, but recognises that property has its rights and duties; it is opposed to foreign marriages and granting too many facilities to foreign settlers; and it is opposed to fraternity and universal love. These doctrines would never be accepted by the Tories of England. That is evidently the reason why the author falls foul of the Tory party as it has been functioning since the eighties of the last century. We have no hesitation in saying that the book would be regarded as a welcome addition to Fascist literature by Benito Mussolini and his Black Shirts.

M. V. SUBRAHMANYAM.

16019 EMPLOYMENT PSYCHOLOGY

PRINCIPLES OF EMPLOYMENT PSYCHOLOGY. By HAROLD ERNEST BURTT. (Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston.) 1927. 8¼ x 5½. pp. 568.

PROFESSOR BURTT'S book consists of sixteen chapters running into more than 500 pages and deals with

such interesting topics as scientific vocational psychology, mental test technique, rating scales, trade tests, and a number of others. The writer is careful to point out in his preface that no definite stand has been taken regarding the fundamental points of view of metaphysical considerations of theoretical psychology.

Employment psychology has come to be of great interest in the modern world, more especially under conditions where the employer and the employee are separated from each other by many differences of place, time, and general sympathies. Its necessity is great, its usefulness clear. But the really important point is to see how far the methods are scientific and generally acceptable.

America has been a land of experiments. Good work has been done in the field of Applied Psychology. In the introductory chapter Prof. Burt says out the value of employment psychology and shows its economic advantages. Says he: 'Many delinquents or criminals can be accounted for through economic failures. Typical of this class is the individual who is hired for one job after another, but fails in each after extensive trial. Furthermore, maladjustments lead to dissatisfaction and unhappiness. A considerable portion of industrial unrest is due to the fact that workers are not engaged in those types of work for which they are suited.' It is all very true, but one is unable to see how far experimental psychology can create enough work of the right type for all. To estimate what a man is fit for is one thing, and to give him the opportunity is entirely a different thing.

At the very outset Prof. Burt criticises the claims of the pseudo-psychologists and exposes lucidly the weakness of astrology, spiritualism, phrenology, and physiognomy as aids to estimate correctly or even reasonably the abilities of men. Mr. Burt then traces the origins of the experiments made in a scientific spirit to study human 'intelligence.' In pages 58-59 Mr. Burt says: 'The first extensive test programme occurred at Columbia in 1894. Subsequently there was co-operation in developing and standardising a variety of tests. A distinct contribution was made to the methods of measuring general intelligence by Binet, and tests for special capacities were collated by Whipple. Munsterburg was the pioneer in the practical field.'

The whole book is very interesting reading and the author has attempted with a fair degree of success to rivet the attention of the reader right through. But what strikes the critical observer is whether even after these experiments we have come to a stage where we can with any accuracy claim definite results in the field of experimental psychology. It is an undoubted fact that the modern growth of industry in the direction of standardization and large units of organization in production are presenting to us problems of a very serious type.

The one real difficulty is about the foundation of the methods adopted. 'Notions as to the nature of intelligence vary,' says the author, 'but there is apparently some capacity measured by our so-called intelligence tests that gives a person a poorer or better chance for survival in the economic struggle.' The psychologist can measure intelligence though he is not certain what it is! But without a clear terminology, tests may be very misleading in real application to practical problems. Intelligence is a complex of many capacities and it would be dangerous to speak of intelligence tests as such unless we are prepared to define what we are doing. Mr. Burt himself admits at page 12, that 'there are many aspects of personality that we are at present unable to measure, such things as honesty, tact, leadership.

It is at present necessary to depend on judgments or estimates of persons who *know* the applicant in question'. This would considerably vitiate the rating methods and the details that may be arranged for testing employees which may be set up by the employer. Even a psychologist is a man, and is bound to have his own bias. It is exactly this that has made the labour movement look with fear, if not with antagonism, at the psychology behind what goes by the name of 'Scientific Management' in Industry. On page 369, Mr. Burt says: 'Subjective traits in rating procedure have appreciably less reliability than those more objective. The raters ought to receive systematic training. They must be taught to take an impersonal, impartial attitude. They must adopt a normal rather than an extreme standard as a basis for judgment.' All noble sentiments! But where is the man with all these qualifications?

One might be excused if one demurs to the conclusion of Mr. Burt that 'Experimental Psychology is at present a well-established science.' It is so at some universities. But when it makes practical claims to solve human problems, the empirical nature of its conclusions makes it a risky guide in business-life. As was pointed out above, experimental psychology claims to analyse the human element in business, but it leaves unanalysed in a great degree the subjective factors. There is a danger that in the hands of unscrupulous employers, under conditions of so-called scientific management, workers may be exploited worse under cover of the scientific platitudes of experimental psychology even as they were exploited in the good old days of economic liberty or laissez-faire and the 'Laws of Political Economy.'

Professor Burt's book is an exceedingly interesting attempt at presenting the case for 'Psychology in Business'. The book is well worth a detailed study. The bibliography at the end of the volume is very useful for the serious student of the subject.

S. V. AYYAR.

AMERICAN VILLAGES.

AMERICAN AGRICULTURAL VILLAGES. By BRUNNER, HUGHES AND PATTEN. (George H. Doren Co., New York.) 1927. 8¼ x 5¾. pp. 326. xxiii. \$3-50.

STUDY of rural life in its socio-economic aspects is one of the important subjects in the American universities. So far as the reviewer knows, such studies do not yet form part of university curricula in India. The reviewer can neither boast of having studied this aspect of rural life in India or in the U.S.A., though he had opportunities to visit and observe rural conditions in the States.

By village we in India mean a group of houses with a temple or a mosque and a *chavdi*. The lands worked by the villagers are included in the village boundary but generally we do not think of lands when we hear of village. American farmers live in farm houses on the farms. For each village however there is a business centre where village school, village bank, church, cooperative society, library and shops are situated.

The Present Position:—Brunner's studies bring out some very pertinent facts which hold good in U.S.A. as well as in other countries. He shows how land prices rose from 1914 to 1920. Prices doubled in 1920 and large acreage of land changed hands. Side by side prices of all commodities rose from 100 to about 230 (he uses index numbers). Food prices rose to 210. By 1924 however the index number for all commodities and food fell to 150 and 120 respectively. As a result agriculture is suffering.

Low prices of agricultural commodities alone do not bring agricultural depression. When the farmer gets low price for his commodities and has to pay more for such articles as he needs, then the position becomes critical for him; and that is what has happened in America as well as in India. Brunner shows how the costs incurred by farmers remained high, and how they had to pay more for the things they needed and to accept less for the things they sold. Those who purchased lands during the boom period are obliged to put up these to sale, as they cannot pay interest on the loans taken after paying costs of production. A number of banks failed because farmers cannot make payments.

Studies.—Brunner describes how different factors influence (a) boundaries of communities and (b) areas occupied by different communities and how proximity of a city affects population of village school, church, and business in the village. He gives the causes of conflict between villages and cities, between producers and purchasers, between lenders and borrowers. They are the same here as in the States. He traces the origin of conflicts and attributes these to economic causes. Even in India the disputes between the Savkar and debtor, landlord and tenant, farmer and his Dalal and the fight for Government services between the forward and backward classes are mainly due to economic reasons. In his studies valuation of property, the ratio of assessed to full property value, amount of deposits in village banks and tangible and intangible property of householders are given.

School.—He compares village schools in the villages under study. According to Brunner out of the 5 year old children 20 p. c. attend school, out of the 8 year ones 90 p. c., and out of those between 10 to 13, 95 p. c. The percentage drops from the 15th to 17th year. Only 10 p. c. of the 20 year old children attend school.

Libraries, Newspapers, Cinema houses.—Fifty-six per cent. of the villages studied possess libraries. About 63 p. c. of the libraries have separate library buildings; the average number of volumes in each is 1000. 97 p. c. of the villages investigated had at least one newspaper and 85 p. c. of the villages had cinema houses. Indian villages cannot stand any comparison with American villages.

Village Organization.—Villages have lodges (like masonic lodges), clubs and social and economic organizations as field-days, poultry shows, corn shows, dairy-man's day. There are associations of teachers and parents. Expense on such organizations comes to about Rs. 21 per annum per head.

P. C. PATIL.

SHORT NOTICE.

STUDIES IN INDIAN RURAL ECONOMICS

By S. KESAVA IYENGAR. (P. S. King & Son, Ltd., London.) 1927. 8¾ × 5½. pp. 161, viii. Rs. 8.

THE above book is the compilation of the various articles on Indian Rural Economics formerly contributed by the author to various newspapers in India. It covers various aspects of rural life in India from agricultural holdings including the questions of excessive fragmentation and the revenue assessment down to Rural Reconstruction. The questions of Forests, Transport and Trade are also dealt with by the author in three independent chapters. Capital and labour have received due consideration while the

chapter on rural life deals with thorny questions like overpopulation and the birth-rate and their relation to Indian famines. The author devotes one whole chapter to the vital subject of education and does not restrict himself to the educational needs of the rural population but deals with secondary and even University education. The author is Professor of Economics in the Nizam's College at Hyderabad and was for some time Economic Survey Officer with the Government of Mysore. In his latter capacity he came in direct contact with village life in South India and could collect comprehensive data on the economic life of Indian ryots. The present series of articles, being primarily meant for newspaper readers does not give any data obtained by detailed studies of rural life, but are the opinions and conclusions of the author based of course on data collected and the studies made by him. And though the author recognises the necessity of pure scientific spirit and freedom from political or religious bias for carrying on economic surveys and for drawing conclusions, the opinions expressed by him on some questions like the surplus cattle and the population questions show that he himself is not entirely free from such a bias. The chapter on Agriculture and Future Policy shows opinions of a layman on a technical subject.

N. V. K.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- A STUDY IN PUBLIC FINANCE. By A. C. PIGOU. (Macmillan & Co., Ltd., London.) 1928. 8¾ × 5½. pp. 323. 16s.
- BISMARCK, THE STORY OF A FIGHTER. By EMIL LUDWIG. (George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., London.) 1927. 9¾ × 6¾. pp. 646. 21s.
- ENGLAND AND AMERICA, RIVALS IN THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION. By C. H. VAN TYNE. (Cambridge University Press.) 1927. 8 × 5. pp. 191. 6s.
- MODERN INDUSTRIAL TENDENCIES. By SIR CHAS W. MACARA. (Sir Charles W. Macara, Manchester.) 1927. 7½ × 5. pp. 414.
- BEFORE SCOTLAND YARD, CLASSIC TALES OF ROGUERY AND DETECTION. By PETER HAWORTH. (Basil Blackwell, Oxford.) 1927. 7¼ × 5. pp. 303. 7s. 6d.
- INDIA AND THE WEST, A STUDY IN CO-OPERATION. By F. S. MARVIN. (Longmans, Green & Co., London.) 1927. 9 × 5½. pp. 182. 7s. 6d.
- THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE AND ITS SUCCESSORS, 1801-1927. By WILLIAM MILLER. (University Press Cambridge.) 1927. 7¼ × 5. pp. 616. 16s.
- FROM BISMARCK TO THE WORLD WAR. (A History of German Foreign Policy 1870-1914.) By ERICH BRANDENBURG. (Oxford University Press, London.) 1927. pp. 542.
- HEALTH PROBLEMS IN ORGANISED SOCIETY. By SIR ARTHUR NEWSHOLME. (P. S. King & Son, Ltd., London.) 1927. pp. 253.
- MEDICAL ASPECTS OF CONTRACEPTION. Being the Report of the Medical Committee appointed by the National Council of Public Morals. (Martin Hopkinson & Co., Ltd., London.) 1927. pp. 183. 10s. 6d.
- JOHN MARSHALL IN INDIA—NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS IN BENGAL. VOL. V. By SHAFIAT AHMAD KHAN. (Oxford University Press, London.) 1927. 9 × 5½. pp. 471. 21s.
- THE ORDINARY MAN'S INDIA. By A. CLAUDE BROWN. (Cecil Palmer, London.) 1927. 9 × 5½. pp. 295. 10s. 6d.
- THE HISTORY AND ECONOMICS OF THE LAND SYSTEM IN BENGAL. By K. C. CHAUDHARI. (The Book Company, Ltd., Calcutta.) 1927. 8¾ × 5½. pp. 148. Rs. 5.