

# THE Servant of India

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

VOL. XI, No. 19. }

POONA—THURSDAY, MAY 10, 1928.

{ INDIAN SUBSN. Rs. 6.  
FOREIGN 12s.

## CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK ... ..	257
ARTICLES :—	
India in 1926-27 ... ..	259
The Padroado ... ..	261
Problem of Indian States. By Dr. Sumant B. Mehta	262
OUR EUROPEAN LETTER ... ..	263
REVIEWS :—	
Parliamentary Control of War. By Prof. A. R. Wadia, M.A. ... ..	264
The Spiritual Background of Sociology. By Rev. Fr. H. V. Elwin, B.A. ... ..	266
Principles of Indian Economics. By S. V. Ayyar, M.A. ... ..	267
A Social Survey. By N. G. Chapekar, B.A., LL.B. ...	267
SHORT NOTICES ... ..	267
BOOKS RECEIVED ... ..	268

## TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

AFTER the Joint Strike Committee had forwarded their joint demands to Bombay mill-owners there was a good opportunity for the latter to give a detailed reply and allay suspicions. Instead of this they raised technical objections about the constitution of the Strike Committee and refused to meet any but the accredited representatives of registered trade-unions. This is hardly diplomatic in the present condition of general labour unrest all over India. When the mill-owners know that only 2 or 3 p. c. of the textile labourers in Bombay have joined registered unions it seems to be the height of perversity to refuse to meet the representatives of unregistered unions. It is not surprising therefore that the leaders of labour regard this as tantamount to a refusal to negotiate and the situation is further complicated by the fact that picketting has been resorted to to stop all classes of workers from attending mills. In a statement issued to the public the mill-owners complain that their attitude towards the workers has been grossly misrepresented. They emphasize the fact that they have avoided a cut in wages although in every other part of the world wages in the textile industry have been substantially reduced. At a time of general reduction of costs labour cannot escape the effects of this process and in view of the competition from Japan they maintain that the industry in Bombay would be ruined if it deliberately goes on paying the same high wages as before. The most essential thing therefore in the interests of the industry is, according to them, the reduction of the working costs. Now one may sympathize with the mill-owners for the critical condition in which they find themselves, but one can never excuse sheer cussedness in tackling one of the most delicate situations that have arisen during the last few years.

**THE Maharashtra Provincial Conference under the Social Reaction-aryism.** Congress Constitution held its sittings in Poona last week under the presidentship of Babu Subash Chandra Bose, whose aid was summoned for the purpose of allaying mutual jealousies of the two sections of Congressmen led by Messrs. N. C. Kelkar and S. M. Paranjpe. In the Conference itself however there was not much controversy over political issues. The real bone of contention was the resolution regarding anti-untouchability campaign, and the contention on this point was not between pro-change and no-change leaders, who were absolutely united on the question, but between some youthful no-changers and everybody else. The Conference first passed a resolution in favour of divorcing religion from politics and under its cover insisted on excluding the question of Hindu-Moslem unity and abolition of untouchability from its purview. The real reason for giving the go-bye to the latter resolution is the establishment the other day of a Social Equality League, whose avowed object is to bring about social equality between the untouchables and other castes, in the house of Mr. Tilak by his sons, who are keen social reformers. This gave great umbrage to Mr. Kelkar and others, who felt that the new institution was really an attack on their own conservatism. They were so enraged at the Tilak brothers, so to say, bearding the lion in his own den that they determined to give no place whatever to the campaign against untouchability in their own political propaganda. Others also were glad of this excuse to cover up their social reactionaryism and they too joined with Mr. Kelkar and his Responsivist friends in keeping politics clear of social reform. Only a few of the young no-changers revolted, but they were in such an overwhelming minority that they had no alternative but to leave the Conference after protesting against the unconstitutional character of the proceedings. Unconstitutional certainly they were inasmuch as a Provincial Conference has no right to go behind the National Congress. The deletion of the anti-untouchability propaganda does not of course make much practical difference, for anyhow the Maharashtra leaders would have made no propaganda, but the formal deletion only helps to show the extremist leaders of Maharashtra in their true colours of unredeemed social reaction.

**THE third annual sitting of the Hyderabad State Subjects Conference passed off very successfully last week in Poona. Thanks to the repressive policy of the Nizam, this sitting, like the previous ones, had to be held beyond the borders of the Nizam's dominions, there being a strict ban on all meetings, whether political or social, religious or secular, and because it had to be held outside the State, the majority of the participants were naturally**

British Indian subjects in sympathy with the aspirations and the grievances of the subjects of Hyderabad. It was well therefore that the name of the Conference was changed from Hyderabad State Subjects Conference into Hyderabad Political Conference, but as it was, a fair number of the Nizam's subjects took part in the deliberations of the Conference, which is thus entitled to claim that it correctly represents the views of the Nizam's subjects as a whole. The credit for organizing this Conference goes wholly to Mr. Raghavendra Rao Sharma, who was expelled from the State by the Nizam nearly three years ago. These two facts, viz. that the Conference was brought about by an exteree outside Hyderabad, the leading part therein being taken by malcontents in British India, would ordinarily go far to discredit the movement. In this case, however, the discredit is exclusively the Nizam's and the credit of those who organized and took part in the Conference. For the proceedings were characterized throughout by a keen sense of responsibility, as will be seen from the speech of the President, Mr. N. C. Kelkar, which indeed erred very much on the side of moderation, and from the resolutions which only asked for a beginning being made in responsible self-government by free play being given to popular criticism, and as a first step to this criticism it was urged that annual departmental reports and other official literature be made available to the public on payment. Could anything be more reasonable than this very modest demand? One of the resolutions that were adopted stated that H. E. H. the Nizam's Government, in their memorandum to the Butler Committee, still claimed for the Nizam, in spite of Lord Reading's dispatch of 26th March 1926, the status of an independent potentate and, entering its protest against it, asserted the British Government's right of interference in internal affairs which the Conference urged should be rigorously exercised in the interests of the subjects in cases of gross misrule. The Conference suggested that in such cases a fiat should not go forth against any particular prince, but his misdeeds should be brought home to him before an independent tribunal, the prince concerned being given access to all the relevant papers. Indian Princes themselves will support this demand, but whether they will support the rider to this we do not know, viz. that the subjects also should be allowed to tender evidence in support of the charges of misrule and that official papers should be placed at their disposal. It is to be hoped that before long the Conference will be enabled to hold a session in Hyderabad itself—without recourse to satyagraha.

It will be remembered that some time ago Mr. L. R. Phadnis suggested in these columns *Law and Liberty*, the holding of a conference of lawyers for the purpose of considering how civil liberty could best be secured from the encroachments of the bureaucracy. This suggestion was favourably received by the general public and evoked, we understand, enthusiastic support from some leaders, which led the local members of the bar to take it up in right earnest, with the result that a conference was actually organized in Poona last week. Only the lawyers assembled did not consider the question of guarantees of civil liberty as proposed by Mr. Phadnis, but for the most part the privileges of their own profession. We are not surprised at the turn which was eventually given to this meeting and in a sense we are glad, for it is not our belief, as it may be of some others, that lawyers are the best defenders of liberty. On the contrary the lawyer class, appealing as it always does to precedent and tradition, is usually so conservative and hostile to change that we would hesitate very much to make

the legalist the palladium of our liberties. A lawyer's technical concern has rarely made him protector of real liberty, only a protector of law. And the two things are by no means synonymous, for, it is well said, law is "always behind the times and liberty is always ahead of the times."

THE latest Anglo-Egyptian "incident" is typical of the relations existing between the two countries. Egypt, as is well known, has been practically an independent country since the present dynasty (in 1805) came into power, though under a more or less shadowy Turkish suzerainty. To end the latter even technically, Egypt in 1914 was on account of the War declared a British Protectorate, the reigning Khedive deposed and another member of the family appointed owing to much post-war trouble in the 'Protectorate' Sultan by the grace of Britain. In 1922 Britain terminated the Protectorate and the then reigning Sultan was proclaimed king, the British Declaration reading: "The British Protectorate over Egypt is terminated and Egypt is declared to be an independent sovereign State". As a matter of fact, nothing was changed, but the verbal expressions, and on the plea of "reservations" necessitated by Egypt's strategic position and England's trusteeship, the old tutelage continued and continues quite unchanged, "pending the conclusion of a treaty of Alliance". Such a treaty, acceptable to Egypt or acceptable to Britain, has often been drafted; but no treaty has yet seen the light of day, acceptable to both countries. In the meantime the cat-and-mouse game is played: Egyptians are trying to govern themselves, but as soon as an essential point is reached, which proves inconvenient to Britain, the latter employs an argument which has so far never yet failed: some men-of-war are ordered from Malta to Alexandria and Port Said. This argument has once more been employed last week and with the usual success. But one wonders, what would have happened, if the Watanist Party had had its way and Egypt had stuck to its point, "letting force do what it wants". The Custom Houses no doubt would have been seized and Egypt blockaded. For how long, one wonders, if only Egypt had stood firm? Obviously Britain would soon enough have found its position untenable—even more so than it did when it tried to govern the country directly. In fact, because it found the task impossible—and not for any idealistic reason we are afraid—she gave it up and has tried since 1922 the indirect method. It all really comes to this today, that neither will England govern Egypt nor will she allow Egypt to govern herself: a patently immoral position, but one which apparently is exactly after the heart of Lord Birkenhead who has just (on the 1st inst.) at the "Ladies' Imperial Club" made a "never, never" speech on the subject in his most truculent vein. But has Mr. MacDonald really fallen so low, as to deserve all the flattering compliments paid to him on the occasion by Lord Birkenhead?

HOWEVER much it might suit some people to belittle the strength of Indian opposition to the Simon Commission, no Indian Situation, one who looks at the situation with unprejudiced eyes can fail to be impressed by it. Prof. W. C. Webster at any rate who was recently in India is in no doubt as to the reality of India's indignation at the exclusion of Indians from the personnel of the Commission. What has struck him forcibly is the fact that while everything was done to secure the co-operation of all British political parties in its work, nothing was done to

meet the wishes of political India, upon whose co-operation depends the successful working of any scheme of constitutional advance that may be evolved by the Commission. Not only that, but when some Indians took the trouble to go over to England with a view to acquaint the India Office with the real situation in this country, they "were given no entry into the final repository of wisdom upon Indian matters." There is however nothing surprising in this, seeing that the India Council itself were told about the decisions of Government only a week before the rest of the world. The official excuse for failure to consult the Assembly beforehand is, according to Prof. Webster, that even if it had been taken into confidence, agreement would have been an impossibility. But Prof. Webster refuses to take for granted what was capable of clear demonstration. In his opinion, two things are responsible for the slight offered to Indian opinion: (1) "the strange attempt to turn administrators into politicians" and (2) the anomalous position of the Central Legislature. But the root of the trouble is to be found in the fact that "too much power over India still remains in the hands of the Secretary of State and that British interests still count for too much in decisions about India." India has always protested against this; but her protests have fallen on deaf ears.

IN commenting last week on the statement of the Under Secretary of State for India *Honest Dividends?* that many of the State-owned mines in India supplied coal to railways which was not charged for, we assumed that the favoured railways were all owned and worked by the State itself. If, however, any of the railways in question happen to be those worked by companies, the matter assumes a still more serious aspect and that is that the free supply of coal to such railways would amount to putting more monies into the pockets of these British companies as surplus profits than they are entitled to. We have already had experience of a similar occurrence of railway companies being paid monies to which they were not legitimately entitled. This was during the Great War when owing to the difficulty of obtaining railway material for repairs, maintenance and renewals from England, working expenses were very much lower than they would otherwise have been and as a consequence railway companies were paid a larger share of surplus profits than was due to them. This point was brought forward by Mr. K. C. Neogy on March 13, 1923, during the discussion of the railway demands in the Legislative Assembly. In replying to Mr. Neogy, the Member for Commerce and Railways said:—

"I think we all admit that the methods adopted during the war were unwise methods and we are paying for them now. We are all perfectly conscious that during the war we should not have paid away these large sums as . . . surplus profits to the companies . . . The only two points which seem to me relevant at the moment are these. In the first place it is no use crying over spilt milk and it is no use trying to recover this money from the shareholders. The other point is that it is up to us to see that we do not make this mistake in the matter again."

Apart from the characteristically bureaucratic way of admitting even so glaring a mistake, for one such mistake which sees the light of day, there might be, for aught we know, ten others which do not come to the public notice; and if the contingency referred to above turns out to be a fact, it will furnish one more instance of the incapacity of our 'experts' to avoid mistakes which work to the benefit of foreign interests at the expense of Indian interests.

## INDIA IN 1926-27.

THIS annual statement prepared by Mr. Coatman for presentation to Parliament is as usual a masterly summary of the happenings in India in all the departments of activities—political-economic, social as well as medical. The period unfortunately commences with Hindu-Muslim antagonism going to the length of serious rioting. Mr. Coatman's presentation of the psychology behind these displays of acute antagonism is substantially just. It is impossible to doubt, he says, that His Excellency Lord Irwin's speech at the Chelmsford Club stirred the conscience of all who sincerely desired an improvement in the state of Hindu-Muslim relations. As a result suggestions were made for a Round Table Conference which did not materialize, partly because the members of the Assembly did not believe that the times were propitious for such a Conference and partly because the Government through the Home Member declared themselves against the Conference or even a committee of enquiry. But the suggestion made by Mr. Coatman that men of standing of both the communities did not do their duty of influencing their neighbours in the right way and that they did not translate their protestations of goodwill into action is hardly just to the real leaders who have left no stone unturned to bring about a reconciliation. The real remedy, according to him, is that the best men of both the communities in the Legislatures should work for the good of all India wholeheartedly and communal parties should be made to give way to real political parties based on principles, to which one can say only *aye!*

Coming to politics during the year, emphasis is laid on the fact that Indian political life is far from being comprised in the doings of the Assembly and the Council of State. Even with the advantages of a superior organization the Swarajists are described as having lost ground both in the Assembly and in Provincial Councils. It is worth noting that very few Muslim candidates stood for election under any other label than the communal one with the result that in the Assembly they sat as an unorganized group and that all other groups except the Swarajists organized themselves as the 'Nationalist party'. The abandonment by the Swaraj party of the walk-out policy and their willingness to acquiesce in the formation of ministries in provinces is regarded as a proof positive that the "Councils have beaten the caucus." But because the country has already pronounced against the Gauhati resolution by maintaining dyarchy in every province it is wrong to suppose, as Mr. Coatman does, that public opinion regards Dyarchy as a beneficent institution. Indeed all the parties except the Swaraj party ought to be thanked for making the best of a bad bargain. There is nothing very striking in the account of the Delhi session of the Assembly given in the Report; but the general undercurrent of thought is that the Government of India like the King can do no wrong. In the matter of the Ratio Bill Sir Basil Blackett is simply loaded with fulsome praises.

Talking of the agriculturists' welfare the Report trots out the old-fashioned Curzonian test that the multiplication of the third class passengers on the railways is an indication of prosperity. Now every Indian who comes in actual contact with these passengers knows full well that this is not so. The Report says that investigations pursued in Bombay have yielded the result that the average income per head works out at Rs. 100; so far as we are aware the most liberal computation has given only Rs. 60 as per capita income. With respect to medical research we acknowledge the increasing assistance given by Government for this purpose and the result is an improvement of sanitary conditions and public health but it should be remembered that the progress is exceedingly slow.

This year a separate chapter is assigned exclusively to finance for the reason that some of the most important problems confronting the Government of India are problems of finance and these are likely to retain their eminent position for the next few years. This is as it ought to be; we hope it is more clearly realized by all interested in the welfare of India that good or bad finance would be the salvation or ruination of India. Comparing the outlook in 1926-27 with that of 1923 when Sir Basil Blackett presented his first Budget it is a marvel how, after remitting crores of rupees of provincial contributions, the Budget should have been balanced and the Indian Government should have been able to borrow at cheaper rates than the British Government. The effect of the separation of the Railway Budget from the General Budget is that the Indian taxpayer is now assured of a regular and growing contribution in relief of taxation. The Budget of 1927-28, by remitting a total sum of Rs. 125 lakhs of provincial contributions, gave a great relief to most of the provinces which had put aside schemes of development for want of money. A still further relief given to the provinces was a reduction in the interest charges for the money borrowed by them from the Central Government. The Budget of 1927-28 proposed to finance the entire capital programme amounting to Rs. 27 crores and to redeem maturing debt, with less than Rs. 10 crores of new money and it did not contemplate any external loan. The successful issue of a loan at 4 p. c., which however gave 4¾ p. c. on account of a lower issue price, was an indication of the high point at which the credit of the Government of India stood during the year.

The Report recognizes the importance of the problem of Indians overseas by devoting a large space to its treatment. The principal grievances of the Indian settlers in the Empire have been the denial of their right to the franchise and the conditions under which they are allowed to retain domicile, their right to hold land and enjoy trading facilities and escape from compulsory segregation. The delegates to the Imperial Conference of 1921 agreed to a resolution which admitted the claim of the Indians to equality of citizenship. At the Imperial Conference of 1923 Sir T. B. Saprú pleaded powerfully for an examination of the position of Indians in the

colonies by a Committee appointed by the Government of India. The work of the Committee did much, we are told, to abate the bitterness which existed in the relations between different settlers in Kenya; there is, however, little warrant for that statement. As a result of the Habibullah deputation a settlement has been arrived at with South Africa, which has been on the whole well received in India. The Report says that the majority of people in both countries regard the settlement as a good first step in the solution of a complicated problem. During the year the Indians settled in Australia were admitted to more of the privileges enjoyed by the white inhabitants. The question of the fixation of a standard minimum wage for Indian labourers in Ceylon has been settled by an agreement between the two Governments. On the question of India's defence Mr. Coatman is satisfied that expenditure even on the most vital military services has now been pruned to the sap. It is a pity to find him indulging in the usual trick of comparing *per capita* costs of defence in India and in England in order to prove that the former are a negligible quantity.

A separate chapter examines the system of Dyarchy. According to Mr. Coatman, the dyarchic system has ridden out the various storms which beset it and that the ship of state has progressed some distance towards her appointed goal. The description of law and order, one of the most important of the Reserved Departments, follows as a part of the general system of dyarchy. The typical problem of the Indian police is not concerned with the sophisticated crime in the cities but of securing to the dwellers of the widespread and remote rural areas protection and security. During 1926 serious crime showed the smallest figure of any in the past five years. The Report states however that during 1926-27 Communism in India has been both more active and more vocal than in the preceding year. The Chinese disturbances have been made the fulcrum by the Communists to attack Great Britain as the foe of liberty. Coming to the Transferred Departments it is admitted that insuperable obstacles lay in the path of dyarchy at the time of the inauguration of reforms. The predominant activity of the Transferred half of Government has been in the subject of local self-government. While giving the history of local self-government, Mr. Coatman says that Lord Ripon's well-meant attempt in this direction did not produce the results for which the Indian Government looked. But he conveniently forgets that the whole scheme was nullified by the bureaucracy's attempt to have its finger in the pie everywhere and to keep the whole system under its own tutelage. The failure of local bodies is attributed to want of financial assistance and to party and communal feuds. In spite of this the Report unfolds a tale of substantial progress in administration of local affairs. It is undeniable that conditions of public health have improved. After reviewing education in all its branches the Report says that the Ministers take a deep and earnest interest in this laudable work and do much with the funds and machinery at

their disposal.

The Report has a good word to say about cottage-industries in India. These industries do not prosper because the artisan is unwilling to make suitable improvements owing to his indebtedness. One of the great needs is a central trading organization. Co-operation, it says, can relieve artisans by providing loans on small interest, by purchasing raw materials and tools and by arranging to sell the finished product.

The Report is an excellent narrative, but judging from the opinions expressed it does not appear that Mr. Coatman sympathizes with Indian aspirations. His thesis apparently is under the Government of India as it is, everything is for the best in the best of all possible worlds.

### THE PADROADO.

THE recent news about the settlement of the *Padroado* question is not only of vital importance to all Catholics in India, but does not lack those elements either which render it of more general interest. *Padroado* means in Portuguese "patronage", or to use the technical legal term in English, "advowson". This term expresses the right of nominating an incumbent for the ecclesiastical office—a right granted by the Pope to some eminent person or institution for some great services rendered to the Church. Such a right was granted by the Pope in 1557 to the Portuguese Crown and in exercise thereof the Catholic bishops of the whole West Coast of India, as far inland as Trichinopoly, have hitherto had to be appointed in consultation with and as approved by the Portuguese Government. Such right of a foreign power (not a spiritual, but a secular power!) was certainly extraordinary and bound to be resented by the British. That the latter put up with it for so long is only due to the twin facts, that Portugal is politically negligible and that England seems only to feel happy in positions of logical inconsistency.

This *Padroado* however had a further consequence: that of a double jurisdiction, which in effect was very much in ecclesiastical matters what the "capitulations", say in Turkey, were in political. The Governor of a Turkish Province used to be sole ruler of all people inhabiting the area the administration whereof was assigned to him: yet that territorial jurisdiction was broken through by the "Capitulations" which exempted foreign nationals and placed these persons under the jurisdiction of their own Consuls, &c. Similarly, the territorial jurisdiction of, say, an Archbishop of Bombay was broken through by the personal jurisdiction which a Bishop of Damaun had over all Catholics of Portuguese Indian descent. The last compromise in this matter between the Holy See and Portugal dates from 1886 and provided for similar "personal jurisdiction" also of a "Bishop of Mylapore" as against an "Archbishop of Madras", with innumerable little enclaves scattered all over India. So for instance there is a Church here in Poona (which is normally under the jurisdiction of a Bishop of Poona)—yet this one church

which is the parish church of all persons of Portuguese Indian descent, is under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Goa. The position is full of anomalies and would be bound to lead to friction under any circumstances: but what can be expected, when one is told that the Catholic population under *Padroado* far exceeds in numbers the population of the regular, normal, territorial—diocesan! (The whole archdiocese of Bombay, which includes Gujerat and Sind, numbers only 37,199 Catholics, whilst Damaun, which extends to Bombay District only, numbers 94,333 Catholics, according to the latest "Catholic Directory of India.")

The outstanding fact however remains that notwithstanding all these anomalies and the disappearance of Portugal as a Great Power, the *Padroado* has retained the passionate attachment, not only of the Goans but also of large sections of "East Indians" who were subject to it. For an explanation one must look to the fact that the *Padroado* dioceses are the most "Indianized" dioceses of India, with a clergy almost exclusively and purely Indian and a laity which ranks amongst the most independent and best educated. The rest of India is ruled by the Missionary State Department of the Holy See (*de Propaganda Fide*) whilst the *Padroado* dioceses were originally just part of Portugal (Goa was at first a suffragan see of Madeira) and have been treated as such, i. e. as Catholic, not Missionary, countries. As a consequence there has been an absence of *ma-bap* which the *Propaganda* dioceses are only slowly shedding. *Propaganda* has the same aim of course and Tuticorin and Mangalore are now thoroughly "Indianized" dioceses under Indian bishops though still under *Propaganda*. And naturally the *Padroado*ist would hail coming under the jurisdiction of an Indian diocese, though under *Propaganda* but would feel hesitation about exchanging his own status for one under foreign missionaries. And above all this—the Portuguese, not merely as individuals, but as a Nation and as a Colonial Power, have never practised colour discrimination. To-day, a Goan may be, has been, a member of the Cabinet in Portugal; in Church and State, all is open to all talents; in social intercourse, there is no bar and there never has been any bar. Is it a wonder that an Indian Catholic should feel the passionate attachment he does to the *Padroado*, the protecting power, the *ethos*, of Portugal?

The present solution of the old vexed problem amounts to the suppression of all double jurisdiction and as the first Archbishop of a combined Bombay-Damaun diocese a Portuguese Jesuit has been appointed. The solution seems to guarantee sympathetic treatment to the *Padroado*ists handed over to *Propaganda* and constitutes a most ingenious compromise. The present solution stipulates further that the Archbishop of Bombay shall alternately be a British and a Portuguese subject: but all Indians will earnestly hope that when the turn comes for a British subject to succeed to the new Archbishop-Designate, Mgr. J. Rodrigues Lima, the choice will be that, not of an English, but of an Indian subject, of His Britannic Majesty.

### PROBLEM OF INDIAN STATES.

No sane Indian statesman either doubts or belittles the importance of the problem as to how the Indian States will fit into the scheme of self-governing India. It is idle to lay down the exact lines on which the co-ordination between the autonomous Provinces and the equally responsible self-governing States will be brought about. To-day let us fully realise the fact that the Indian Princes and their subjects have become alive to the necessity of making an organised effort to protect their rights and interests.

The Indians in the Provinces heartily welcome the advent of the States into the political arena. The Princes and their people are just as much Indians as those in the Provinces and no one desires that the affairs of the Indian States should be managed by a coterie of political officers working in secret conclave. All secret organisations are liable to the charge of either being partial, unjust, or corrupt, and the appointment of the Butler Committee to enquire into the relations of the States with the "paramount power" deserves to be welcomed. The Indian Princes would be wise fully to realise that they are part and parcel of the Indian nation, and that they cannot be independent of the self-governing India. In the scheme of co-ordination which will mature in course of time perhaps after a severe conflict of ideas, the States and self-governing India will be inter-dependent, neither of them being under the subordination of the other; but they certainly will not be 'independent' of each other. The problem, of the Indian States is thus a great "Indian" problem, not an Imperial problem. Let the Princes not live in a fool's paradise, let them not be so unpatriotic as to imagine that they will have nothing to do with the Indian nation except to arrange fiscal and other problems through the media which will now be created for negotiations with the Indian Government. If the Government of India or some mischief-mongers in Great Britain are putting up the Indian Princes against the Indian nation then they will find themselves disillusioned just in the same way as they did when they attempted to pit the Musalmans against the Congress. The Government will pat them on their backs now and when they find that the aspirations of the Princes are becoming unreasonable or such as cannot be satisfied then they will not hesitate to snub them. According to the *Times of India*, "The Princes have left behind them the old policy of isolation, once so carefully fostered by the Government of India," and now they are soaring in the dreamland of being independent of India and in personal relations with the British Crown. We would advise the Indian Princes not to leave the solid earth so soon, and to think for themselves instead of accepting the borrowed ideas of the hired Britishers who do not properly appreciate Indian sentiment. Let us all fully realise that the Indians either living in the States or elsewhere in India are one and indivisible, that their political, social and economic problems will be solved by one definite Indian policy, and that the Princes have no status in the world except as Indians.

Let us consider now as to what exactly are the Indian States. The Maharaja of Bikaner in his speech before his toy-council definitely said that whenever the interests of the States were spoken of they should be understood to mean the interests of the Princes and the people. When the Anglo-Indian Press talks of the liberal help given by the Princes during the war, it stupidly or deliberately forgets that the help was given by the States and not merely by the Princes. With regard to the relations between the Princes and their people let there be plain speak-

ing. The conduct and the behaviour of the majority of the Princes for the last two generations have been such that they are rightly distrusted. Quite a number of them are living utterly selfish and disgraceful lives. They have spent the State revenues lavishly for personal gratification and have not exerted themselves much to improve the material and moral condition of their subjects. When the meeting of the Princes at Bombay recorded its determination "to devote to the moral and material progress of the subjects of the States the advantages resulting from the equitable adjustment of fiscal and economical issues" it is doubtful if the people of the States were at all impressed by the sanctimonious resolution. The subjects of the people are just as much (or as little) organised as the Princes and the resolutions passed by them in conference recently at Bombay and Madras will show how little the Princes are trusted by their people and how much they resent being misgoverned. The Princes on the other hand desire to rule autocratically; they will not encourage any such thing as sound public opinion, they favour toadies and flatterers and they desire to stop the mouths of the critics outside their States. Even the *Times of India* is led to assert that "they cannot possibly expect to be exempt from intelligent criticism and moral judgment." When the Princes reaffirm "their sympathy with the aspirations of British India, which they regard as legitimate", as they recently did, we are moved to laughter. They are indeed protesting too much.

Let us all think like level-headed men. The Indian Princes are asking for a position of independence in subordination only to the Crown of England. This demand is absurd, and ought never to be entertained by the Government of India. Let them not aspire too much and let them not ride for a fall. Let them realise that they have wasted twenty lakhs on Sir Leslie Scott. They are wasting the people's money for nothing and clever adventurers, both British and Indian, are looting them. Let the Princes introduce good government in their States, let them introduce the rule of law instead of personal rule, which is fundamentally defective and unsatisfactory. There is plenty of scope for their personal influence, if they wish to exert it, for speeding up the uplift of their people. Let them make their personal lives more moral and let them realise that they are guardians, if not servants, of the people. Let them reduce their personal expenses, fix their civil lists at moderate sums in consonance with the economic condition of their subjects, let them respect organised public opinion in their states and for that purpose let them create bona fide councils. The councils of most of the States are ludicrous farces and deceive no one. For God's sake, let the Princes not deceive themselves into the belief that their subjects are either happy or satisfied or that they are themselves trusted by the people.

It is only by *Aima-Shuddhi*, (self-improvement,) that the Princes will reach the higher place either in the hearts of their people, or in the councils of India. The problem is easy and straight, let the false issues raised by mercenaries be laid aside and let them tread the path of self-purification and of strenuous devotion to public good. That alone will bring them the status they desire.

SUMANT B. MEHTA.

### OUR EUROPEAN LETTER.

(From Our Own Correspondent.)

GENEVA, April 19.

#### THE PROPOSED PEACE PACT.

THE topic of the day in Europe is the Multilateral Pact proposed by Mr. Kellogg, the United States

Secretary, to ensure peace by outlawing war. The proposition has entered practical politics by the second stage into which it has passed after the preliminary negotiations between the State Department at Washington and the Quai d'Orsay. The Kellogg Note is now the subject of close and anxious consideration in London, Paris, Berlin, Rome, and Tokio. Its terms make it understandable that the Government concerned should have taken cognisance of its appeal to public opinion in general, and the compelling necessity to secure public backing for their attitude towards it whatever that may be. Mr. Kellogg himself, it is no secret, counts on the force of world-opinion almost as much as on that of the United States' diplomacy to see his scheme through. The aim is, as the Note explains, to create a "tremendous moral effect" by the adherence of Great Powers to the purpose which the preamble of the Draft Treaty states: "by formal act to bear unmistakable witness that they condemn war as an instrument of national policy and renounce it in favour of the pacific settlement of international disputes." The High Contracting Parties named in the Preamble of the proposed Treaty are the U. S. A., France, Great Britain, Germany, Italy, and Japan; and the instrument itself is to consist of three articles, the first of which denounces war, the second affirms the pacific settlement of international disputes "of whatever nature or whatever origin that may be", and the last provides for its coming into effect immediately after ratification by all signatories according to the constitutional requirements of each. In his Note Mr. Kellogg explains that the United States Government is of opinion that "every nation in the world can, with a proper regard for its own interests as well as for the interests of the entire family of nations join in such a treaty" and accordingly the Draft Treaty provides that it "shall, when it comes into effect as prescribed... remain open as long as may be necessary for adherence by all the Powers of the world."

There need hardly be any doubt that internationalists and pacifists, of all shades of complexion the whole world over, cannot but hail this simple and strikingly direct affirmation of the tribute to peace as the most welcome sign in the world's horizon after the star of Wilson had set. Nor need any apprehensions be entertained about the progress of this measure from the point of view of world-conditions today. America's name in the world of affairs, whether business or political, has become such a magic formula for Europe that its force can hardly be expected to be recognised in places where Europe still reigns supreme, and all America to a man—more particularly to a woman—is behind the drive. To feel his strength the Anglo-Saxon must work himself to the fervour of an apostle and what can be more calculated towards it than the present measure? The League has been nowhere a greater disappointment to the peoples of Europe than in the matter of prevention of war, and the psychological effects of such a scheme on a war-weary populace periodically subjected to alarms may be readily imagined. The ethical directness of the scheme is, besides, a point of fascination and produces much the same impression in the Western world as the Non-cooperation programme did in India in the troubled politics created by the Rowlatt Acts. It must at once be conceded that the American proposition coming at the present time and in the present fashion has had the effect of precipitating Europe's necessity to face the issue of peace. It cannot, however, be overlooked that it is an axiom in diplomacy that every move, however brilliant, shall be regarded, from the point of view of realities, and even thus regarded, it will be seen, the importance of the present position is only heightened.

#### FRENCH COMPLAINTS.

The dominant attitude of France, consequent upon Mr. Kellogg's dispatches to London, Berlin, Rome, and Tokio, is one of bitter complaint. In his Note the United States Secretary says:

The Government of the French Republic while no less eager to promote the cause of world peace and to co-operate with other nations in any practical movement towards that end, has pointed out certain considerations, which, in its opinion, must be borne in mind by those Powers which are the Members of the League of Nations, parties to the Treaty of Locarno, or parties to the other treaties guaranteeing neutrality. My Government has not conceded that such considerations necessitate any modifications of its proposal for a multilateral treaty.

M. Briand's Note to the State Department at Washington had insisted that France made her adherence to the treaty conditional upon the following four reservations: (1) all the Powers of the world, at any rate those susceptible to be victims of aggression, to be allowed to participate in the new instrument; (2) the legitimate rights of defence to be entirely safeguarded; (3) every one of the signatories to be empowered to resume liberty of action towards a violator of the contract; and (4) the obligations involved in the Covenant of the League for its Members to remain intact. French opinion is resentful of what it considers to be scant regard conceded to the French thesis, and it is all the more sensitive about it because the genesis of the present proposal lies, it will be remembered, in Monsieur Briand's initiative. Pertinax in *L'Echo de Paris* considers that "the most comic thing about it (the Note) is that he (Mr. Kellogg) pretends that France consents to this step." "We should have nothing to say if the Note limited itself to resuming the previous conversations in a manner permitting the other Powers to decide their attitude," says the *Journal*, "in full independence. But the United States Government communicates a treaty which engages it personally and makes no mention of the French reservations. The negotiation will begin without our having obtained any guarantees for which we ask." "It must be noted", according to the *Figaro*, "that the Government of the United States has not considered it necessary, despite our interventions, to modify in any respect its first project, which condemns all wars and not, as we would have wished, all wars of aggression." In France, as indeed in the political circles in Great Britain, the impression prevails, as *L'Oeuvre* says: "Mr. Kellogg is certainly desirous of safeguarding the peace of the world, but he is preoccupied to an even higher degree to safeguard the success of the Republican Party at the coming election." It is felt that the American Government's move is nothing but an effective counterpart to the Wilsonian heritage of the Democratic Party. It is possible that in view of the tremendous enthusiasm which the name of Geneva invokes in America in spite of the equally striking fact that American opinion in general does not stand for America's incorporation into the League, the Republicans who are now in power have found it necessary to go ahead with the present measure to perpetuate their authority. That, however, only adds to its urgency, and, besides, from the point of view of political actualities, it is no less clear that France's concern is not so much with the obligations of the Covenant of the League as at first it was pretended, as her alliances on the European continent. These make Paris diplomatically more important than Rome, and now that ten years have passed since Versailles, bereft of these traditional and diplomatic props, the relative importance of various powers would undergo a change which cannot but be unwelcome to most of them. The present measure, by





striking at the root of diplomatic prestige certainly creates a new order.

#### THE OUTLAWING OF RUSSIA.

The American proposal as at present conceived, if it outlaws war, no less definitely also outlaws Russia. The projected treaty no doubt provides for the incorporation of powers other than its original adherents, but as the significant coincidence of the omission of Russia from the peace deliberations with a similar omission of that country from the sphere of the newly formed Anglo-American Company would show, the projected peace-pact is a deliberate provocation to Soviet Russia. In view of the realities of the world-situation today it cannot be pretended that this persistent bullying and isolation of Russia on the part of the Powers is calculated to usher in world peace. It also creates outstanding questions which must come in the way of a satisfactory conclusion of the Kellogg scheme. Suppose Germany, after signing this treaty, entered into alliance with Russia, and Russia waged a war with Poland, what is to be the position of the signatories *vis-a-vis* to Germany? This is by no means a barren speculation and the French reservations are an outcome of pre-occupations such as these. Italy, for example, it is well-known, is not only indifferent to the American proposal, but also regards it with open contempt. Without Italy's adherence to the treaty such a commitment on the part of France would be an act of faith, and even blind faith. Yet in the present state of the Balkans and the Baltic to ask Fascist Italy to surrender the prerogatives of war is to demand the impossible. Germany, it is true, is more prepared than any other European State perhaps to enter into the American scheme. As her marvellous post-war recovery has shown, she has everything to gain by a world-order where production, and not political position, will be the determining condition of power. All the same she too has her distinct political issues such as frontiers and colonies and reparation payments, the last of which has, in recent discussions, tended to be connected with Debts, much to the chagrin of Americans. These and such other details have got to be faced and they cannot be wiped out by the mere citation of the principle that the trees should not be allowed to obscure the forest.

#### WHERE BRITAIN STANDS.

It is widely recognised that in view of Germany's restricted position and Italy's apathy, Britain's attitude towards the American proposal would decide its ultimate form. The present issue is mainly confined to Europe and so Japan's part in it is, so to speak, secondary. Thus it comes about, that circumstance once more makes Britain the decisive factor in determining the peace of Europe. The scheme has not been sprung as a surprise on Britain. It has been anticipated for quite a long time. In all that long interval as well as immediately after its reception the British reactions towards the proposal have been characteristic. None of that enthusiasm which marked Locarno for instance has been caused by it though there is a distinct recognition that the American move is important. Only in certain circles in Britain, where the union of English-speaking peoples amounts to a cult, there is some exhibition of warmth, and it is a great mistake to base any deductions on this factor. The Foreign Office enjoys a very special independence as regards its policy in the British traditions, and even if the present Government had to discuss its position in Parliament, in a House of Commons as at present constituted every conclusion would be foregone. It will be what the Government makes it and there is reason to believe that its policy is "wait and see." It is to gain time so as to arrive at a more accurate estimate of the strength behind the American proposal by elimina-

ting the effects of the exigencies of the election on it, and to mark the course of the French and German elections. A protracted correspondence may, therefore, be presaged and there is excellent excuse in the necessity to consult the Dominions. Meanwhile, as the British Government's principal care is to ensure the proper enjoyment of the Empire's wealth in the same fashion as has prevailed hitherto, they would no doubt take steps to put colonial wars on a different footing from international wars. Nor would the task meet with much difficulty considering the entanglements of the Monroe Doctrine.

#### —AND GENEVA.

Finally, no account of the implications of the proposed peace pact can be complete without some indication of its possible effects on the League of Nations at Geneva. If it is arguable that the American project and the League stand toward each other as two incomplete but mutually complementary halves of a circle, it can be also shown, even more forcibly, that the two are mutually exhaustive alternatives. In practical affairs what matters is not the theoretical points about a scheme but the actual forces behind it. If the League has tottered due to lack of America's support, it should be plain that a scheme which obtains it would ultimately supersede the League. The League cannot be adapted into the new scheme, nor can it be incorporated into the League; for the fundamentals of the present position are, first, the impossibility of America joining the League, and, second, the no less impossible solution of the problem of world peace by basing it on the conception of sanctions. Between the League idea and the Kellogg idea the primary difference is that while one approaches the problem from the point of view of ethics and general principles, the other has sought the way of politics, of possible breaches and sanctions, and so forth. What we may anticipate is the transformation of the League of Nations into the League of European Nations, and when that transformation takes place history would record the last step in the change of the world's centre of political gravity from one continent to another.

#### REVIEWS.

##### PARLIAMENTARY CONTROL OF WAR.

PARLIAMENT AND WAR. By FRANCIS R. FLOURNOY. (P. S. King & Son, Ltd., London.) 1927. 8¾ x 5½. pp. 282. 15s.

THE colossal nature of the last war and the suddenness with which it was forced on all the great powers of the world has brought to the forefront in an acute form the equity and the justifiability of a few ministers having so much power as to undo half a century's work of peace. It is notorious that in the hour of crisis the Parliaments find their hands fettered and feel the impotency of their position. Should parliaments have a greater controlling power over foreign affairs or not? That is one of the burning questions of the day, and Dr. Flournoy in the book under review tackles with it. The reader, who expects to get a clear-out solution of it, need not go through the trouble of reading it. But if he has confidence enough in himself to come to a conclusion on the basis of an exhaustive summary of all the relevant facts relating to the major wars, in which England has been engaged during the last ninety years, he will find it a mine of information. It is a heavily documented book, scholarly in the best sense of the term, so impartial.

as to be almost irritating at times. Though without any purple patches, the volume is lucid and never flags. The author deals with the following wars: The First Afghan War, the "Opium War", the Crimean War, the China War of 1856-1860, the war with Persia 1856-57, the Abyssinian War, the Afghan War of 1878-1880, the Occupation of Egypt, the Boer War, and the Great War, under whose shadow we are still living. In every case the imperialism of England comes out in its true colours. The passions aroused by the last war have not yet had time to die out, and so a dispassionate judgment is out of question. But in every other case it is questionable whether England was not unjustly aggressive. Lord Derby himself described the China War of 1856-60 as "the shedding of the blood of unwarlike and innocent people without a warrant of law, without moral justification", and Lord Malmesbury condemned the conduct of the Government as politically immoral. Cobden with his usual outrightness condemns the English as "bullies to the weak". With reference to the Persian War Lord Granville, who defended the Government's policy in the House of Lords, admitted in a private letter that England's treatment of Persia was "inconsistent with all the principles of justice". Few Englishmen are proud of the Afghan Wars, and fewer still would care to justify them on the ground of "scientific frontiers." When Egypt was at the mercy of England, Labouchere wrote: "Success was everything. This is the moral law, as understood by the English nation. Bombard any place, but show a *quid pro quo*". The Boer War was nothing but a determined effort to British-imperialise the whole of South Africa, and the means adopted by the great colonial statesman, Joseph Chamberlain, were not characterised by moral finesse, a worshipper as he was of high imperialism. And then about the great war—Germany may have rattled the sword a little too noisily. But there can be no denying that England was prepared for the war long before the war came, and her sacrifice of Persia was but part of the game that sought to hem in Germany on all sides. There is no denying that the *Entente* were forging a clear-cut military and naval policy against Germany, and Lord Cecil himself knew that long before Parliament openly went in for the war the British ministers had made it a matter of honour for England to cast in her lot with France against Germany, whatever the cause of the war and whenever it came to be.

What is the net upshot of all this historical review? It points to the fact that Parliament has not had enough power to control the policy of ministers. There has been in a way a healthy tradition in English political life that foreign affairs must be outside the pale of party politics. This has had the inevitable consequence that the foreign ministers have practically possessed wide powers which are far too dangerous in these democratic days. There has been a cry from the Labour Party that foreign affairs should not be carried on with all the paraphernalia of secret societies, that everything should be above board. That this is highly desirable few per-

sons should deny, who are not wedded to old ways of foreign policy: use my country to exploit other countries. Hence the question: should there not be a greater parliamentary control on foreign policy?

Dr. Flournoy fights shy of a clear-cut answer. He thinks that on the whole the English Parliament has had generally an opportunity to take some action in foreign affairs, as in some form or other it has always been consulted. But he admits that this consultation was often highly unsatisfactory, when e. g. at the time of the Afghan War important information in favour of Dost Mahomed was unscrupulously suppressed, or when at the time of the occupation of Egypt the movement headed by Arabi was represented as a merely military revolt, when it had a great nationalist support, or at the time of the last War Parliament was never informed of the long series of secret engagements that had preceded the war and in fact made it inevitable. Dr. Flournoy also admits on p. 259:

"Moreover the Government's right to decide on the precise action to be taken in the final steps leading to war, has never been seriously questioned and has in fact been admitted by prominent statesmen in Opposition".

And again on the next page:

"There appears, however, to be no case in which a government has given any pledge that it would consult Parliament before committing the country to war."

Put these ideas side by side with the general historical conclusion that the foreign ministers and cabinets have not been always very fair in dealing with foreign nations especially when they happen to be weak or non-European, and the conclusion is inevitable that the cabinet need very definitely a firm controlling parliamentary hand. At this stage Dr. Flournoy with his scrupulous scholarship is constrained to point out that "it might seem from the narrative of the cases studied that the influence of Parliament in times of crisis is likely to be in favour of a war policy rather than opposed to it." But this danger is not very real. For what has been happening in the past is that practically till the hour of crisis Parliament is kept in the dark, and then a bellicose foreign minister or a colonial minister like Joseph Chamberlain can always be trusted to stress a particular aspect of the question, and an appeal in the name of the honour and prestige of the country may be trusted to do its work with a more or less heterogeneous body of men like the Parliament. The real solution lies in the honest policy which was tabled by Mr. Ramsay MacDonald's Government, a policy which of course has not been accepted by the present Government, viz. that no treaty shall be entered into with a foreign power without its being placed on the table for the information of the house for 21 days, and that important treaties would be permitted to be fully discussed. It has been the misfortune of foreign affairs that they have the tradition of secrecy behind them, and Foreign Office officials naturally find it hard to give up their power of doing immense mischief (or good, as they conceive it) without the fettering control of an honest and open discussion in Parliament. Dr. Flournoy with needless humility thinks "it is useless to give his own conclusions" about

the disadvantages or advantages of Parliamentary control of the war power. But truth will out and in the last paragraph he has to admit that so long as there are only two parties the party in power may claim to represent over half the nation (a conclusion, however, which has been proved to be false by the adherents of proportional representation). But now that we have three parties, there is no guarantee that the party in power really represents even half the nation, and this would justify "the establishment of a Parliamentary check over the war power of a more definite character than at present exists". The verdict of those who prefer the well-being of humanity to the narrow interests of a nation will cordially endorse the conclusion of an author, who has left no relevant record unstudied, and whose study has been marked at every stage by scrupulous impartiality.

This is as it should be, if we are all agreed that peace is better than war. But war has had its devotees not merely in Treitschke and Bernhardt with their host of German admirers. It has English devotees as well, e. g. Dr. L. P. Jacks, the famous editor of the *Hibbert Journal*, who a few years ago in an article on the Martial Instinct argued that England had always been martial, and that a universal peace would come into conflict with this martial instinct. If this be the goal, the ideal polity would be that, which dethrones Parliament even in domestic affairs, and enthrones a Mussolini.

A. R. WADIA

### THE SPIRITUAL BACKGROUND OF SOCIOLOGY.

**PRAYERS OF THE SOCIAL AWAKENING.** By WALTER RAUSCHENBUSCH. (Student Christian Movement, London.) 1927. 7 x 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ . pp. 138. 3s.

"OUR life-blood is spirituality", said Swami Vivekananda. "Each nation, like each individual, has one theme in this life, which is its centre, the principal note round which every other note comes to form the harmony. In one nation political power is its vitality, as in England; artistic life in another, and so on. In India religious life forms the centre, the key-note of the whole music of national life". The introduction, therefore, of a book like "Prayers of the Social Awakening" needs no apology in this country. There is no such thing, least of all in India, as "mere humanitarianism"; for, whether men admit it or not, the secret springs of their nobility rise in a source purer and higher than themselves. The social movements of the whole world have been rooted in religion. We think of Mahatma Gandhi: we think of St. Peter Claver pouring out his life in service of the negro slaves of South America: we think of Father Dannien setting out with his shipload of lepers to a life-long exile, and of his words when he himself contracted the disease: "I would not be cured, if it meant leaving the island, and giving up my work"... We remember that the great English social reformers, William Wilberforce, Lord Shaftesbury, George Cadbury, Henry Scott Holland, Charles Dickens, were religious men.

The late Baron von Hügel, that great and universal thinker, analysed religion into three elements, the national, the mystical and the institutional. It is probable that we ought now to add a fourth element to this classification, the social—an element

which may be less formally "religious" yet as genuinely spiritual as any of the others. Before the wrongs and sufferings of the people, before too the vision of what might be in the way of a righteous social life in fellowship, "Social Christianity is adding to the variety of religious experience, and is creating a new type of Christian man who bears a striking family likeness to Jesus of Galilee.

Dr. Rauschenbusch, himself a pioneer of social theory and reform, feels keenly that this renaissance of social righteousness should find its background in a spiritual realm of perfect values and its expression in formulated prayer. "If the moral demands of our higher social thought could find adequate expression in prayer, it would have a profound influence on the social movement. Many good men have given up the habit of praying, partly through philosophic doubt, partly because they feel it is useless or even harmful to their spiritual nature... But prayer before battle is another thing. That has been the greatest breeder of revolutionary heroism in history. All our bravest desires stiffen into fighting temper when they are affirmed before God." This is almost an echo of Mahatma Gandhi's words: "I would develop that irresistible courage which comes from waiting upon God."

Dr. Rauschenbusch sees in the Lord's Prayer the universal charter of all social prayer. "Our Father" is spoken out of that consciousness of human solidarity which was a matter of course in all Christ's thinking. "Thy will be done, as in heaven so on earth"—the words look forward to the duplication of heaven upon earth through the moral and spiritual transformation of humanity. The prayer for daily bread reminds us that "we sit at the common table in God's great house, and the supply of each depends on the security of all." How ashamed, therefore, ought anyone to be if he habitually takes more than his fair share and leaves others hungry that he may surfeit. The petition for mutual forgiveness reminds us that we have to be socially right if we want to be religiously right. "Jesus will not suffer us to be pious towards God and merciless towards men." Finally, the phrase "Deliver us from the evil one" has in it the ring of battle, appreciated by all who are "pitted against the terrible powers of organised covetousness and institutionalised oppression." Thus the Lord's Prayer gives us the spiritual background for all our social thinking and insists on "the social basis of all moral and religious life even in the most intimate personal relations to God."

The little book before us is a collection of original prayers on all the great social issues of the day. There are prayers for women and children who labour, for immigrants, for employers, business men, great magnates, inventors, journalists, judges, lawyers, teachers, public officers, for mothers and babies and for all true lovers. There are some touching prayers for use in prisons, for those suffering from tuberculosis, for those about to die. And there are some striking "Prayers of Wrath" against War, Alcoholism, Impurity and the Servants of Mammon. They are prayers which could be used by any community, and we earnestly commend them to the heads of all institutions which try to develop a social conscience in their members. For no lesson is so readily translated into action as that which is learnt at the feet of God in prayer.

This prayer, "For our City" may be quoted as a typical example. "Grant us a vision of our city, fair as she might be: a city of justice, where none shall prey on others; a city of plenty, where vice and poverty shall cease to fester; a city of brotherhood, where all success shall be founded on service, and honour shall be given to nobleness alone; a city of

peace, where order shall not rest on force, but on the love of all for the city, the great mother of the common life and weal. Hear thou, O Lord, the silent prayer of all our hearts as we each pledge our time and strength and thought to speed the day of her coming beauty and righteousness."

H. V. ELWIN.

### PRINCIPLES OF INDIAN ECONOMICS.

**ECONOMIC PRINCIPLES FOR INDIAN READERS.** By PRAPHULLA CHANDRA BASU. (Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, Ltd., London.) 1927. 8¾ × 5½. pp. 348. 7s. 6d.

MR. BASU'S book is an interesting presentation of the fundamental ideas of economics. The author in his preface complains rightly that "Indian students have primarily to depend on books written by American or English authors where the principles are explained with a background of social conditions and institutions which are alien to the experience of Indian students." Dr. Basu tries to remedy this defect.

The book follows the orthodox classification of ordinary text-books on the subject, but the language is clear and simple. The author is of opinion that it is futile to construct a science of Indian economics as distinct from economic science in general.

The author claims to have formulated a 'law of consumption.' He defines the law thus:—

"A unit of consumption is a necessary, comfort, or luxury, according as its consumption and deprivation bring about respectively an increase and decrease, no increase and a decrease, or no increase and no decrease, in the productive efficiency of the particular consumer at a given time and a given place."

This can hardly be called a law, though we can well appreciate its value as a definition of necessities, comforts or luxuries. We fail to see any originality about this conception.

The treatment of 'co-operation' in chapter VIII could have been easily improved. As it is, it is much too sketchy. Further the author has not touched upon the question of the managing agent system, which is playing such an important part in the industrial organization of India.

In the matter of the classification of monopoly, Mr. Basu gives three classifications, but fails to indicate the bases of such classification. He does not even indicate his own preferences. On pp. 137-139 the author seems to indicate that vertical combinations in industry are absolutely different from trusts and cartels. In our opinion, they need not necessarily be.

The treatment of Public Finance requires a better and more elaborate attention from the author. As it is, it reflects only too closely the common neglect of this part of the subject in the B. A. Classes of many of the Indian Universities.

The language of the writer in certain places might have been better as e. g. when he says on p. 136 'monopolies may be classified variously.'

The book is likely to be of great assistance to B. A. students of Indian Universities to whom we heartily recommend this book.

S. V. AYYAR.

### A SOCIAL SURVEY.

**A STUDY IN SOCIAL ECONOMICS.** By F. R. E. MOULDON. (Robinson & Mullens, Ltd., Melbourne.) 1927. 8¾ × 5½. pp. 201. 12s. 6d.

THE book is an outcome of patient and commendable research carried on by the author during his

activities as University District Tutor for the Workers' Educational Association. The Hunter River Valley is a small district in Australia and Mr. Mouldon, while professorially connected with the W.E.A., collected valuable materials bearing on the problems of sociology and economics. This is highly creditable to the lecturers of the Association; for they were obviously not content with merely laying before their hearers large but ineffective platitudes. They prudently realized the necessity of gathering first-hand material; for without it it is futile to dogmatise in social and economic sciences.

The aim of the book is evidently to describe and analyse the industrial life of the people of the Hunter River Valley. It may be pointed out that the investigation does not reveal any features which are either uncommon or peculiar to the valley itself. The topography, geology and geography, which may be said to be the basic factors of physiography, have determined the direction of all human activities in the Hunter River Valley as anywhere else. Lands were abandoned or neglected and people clustered about the rich resources of manufacturing power. This is the tale which is told everywhere. The student of social economics necessarily directs his attention in the first place to ascertain what the permanent factors of physiography are which prescribe the extent and quality of the material gifts which the people use and which also determine the types of livelihood-getting in the locality. And in so doing he has necessarily to trace the necessary relationship between the people and the material conditions encircling them. It must be remembered that material conditions of a locality influence the whole life of the people inhabiting it. But under certain circumstances it is human ingenuity which modifies the environment. The author has succeeded in a large measure in discovering the influence of physical conditions on human activities, but the same cannot be said of the other aspect of the question. It is however just possible that the physical conditions which compel a man to devise measures for overcoming them and making them suit his own requirements do not exist in the Hunter River Valley. We also wish that the other equally interesting problem of the influence of occupations on the habits, outlook and general character of the people had been handled in greater detail; for after all that is what counts if any society is to be useful or serviceable to humanity generally. Though the book is of local importance, it will serve as a guide to those who aspire to work in similar fields and on parallel lines.

N. G. CHAPEKAR.

### SHORT NOTICES.

**I SPEAK OF AFRICA.** By WILLIAM PLOMER. (Hogarth Press, London.) 1927. 7½ × 5. pp. 230. 7s. 6d.

"AFRICA, Africa, Africa! when the white man came here, we had the land and he brought the Bible. Now we've got the Bible and he's got the land. He calls himself a Christian, but he isn't...." This heart-rending and pathetic cry comes from a negro who is sitting outside before a white man's house. So runs a story in the book. The white man comes out and thunders like any white man in the East, "You're a very impudent and insolent boy! Why the hell don't you take off your hat and say 'Good morning' to me." But the poor negro has no hat to take off. Again after a few more curses the white man comes out with "Shut up, you stinking black heathen! If I didn't want to keep my hands clean, I'd come and slap your dirty black face". After some time appears the white man's wife and says, "Why don't you get a gun, darling, and blow his dirty brains

out". The white man runs to fetch a judge. The negro and the white wife are left alone. "You're so handsome," says the white woman plaintively. "I wish you were my husband. Really I do . . . . Come along in now . . . . Make hay while the sun shines . . . . Well come in and give me a kiss". But the poor negro is only a savage and a heathen and confesses his weakness! "I don't kiss other men's wives, white or black". But the white woman is aggressively in love with the black man. "Body and soul I love you, come in, Lovey. It's not every nigger can get a white wife for the taking". But all overtures are of no avail. Then she comes out with her trump card. "I'll have you run in for indecent assault . . . . I tell the judge you tried to assault me. They'll hang you, you nigger". The white man with a judge and a policeman reappears. The judge asks the negro's name and address. "Negro, Africa" is the reply. "What do you mean?" "Exactly what I say. *Civis Africanus sum*". And the story goes on.

The book consists of short stories on the social life of the whites with reference to their relation with negroes. The author knows the negro and his character perfectly well. Some of the stories are brutally frank; and however one may dislike the nude social picture of the whites as depicted by the author, it is a piece of remarkable work written with rare boldness. People interested in the primitive races all over the world will find this book very interesting and instructive.

S. A. WAIZ.

**THE IDEA OF SOCIAL JUSTICE.** By CHARLES W. PIPKIN. (The Macmillan Company, New York.) 1927. 8½ × 5½. pp. 595. 15s.

THE sub-title of this book fully describes its purpose: it is "a study of legislation and administration and the labour movement in England and France between 1900 and 1926." It is a most useful survey of the industrial and broadly social legislation of the first quarter of this century in the two great democracies of England and France, and it is preceded by a historical review of the Labour movement in the two countries down to 1900, so that the conditions in which attempts at betterment were subsequently made may be correctly appreciated. It furnishes the best short compendium we have come across of facts and references not easily accessible elsewhere. Especially can this be said of the French section which remains to a large proportion of Indians almost a sealed book on account of their unfamiliarity with French. From this point of view alone the value of the book, so far as Indians are concerned, can hardly be exaggerated. Those who would keep their libraries up-to-date may usefully consult the extensive bibliography given at the end. If a library contains half the number of books referred to therein, it can well be called a good library. We have ourselves used it to great advantage in order to fill certain gaps in the Servants of India Society's Library.

**YOUNG INDIA.** By LAJPAT RAI. (Servants of the People Society, Lahore.) 1927. 7¼ × 4¾. pp. 252. Rs. 3.

THIS is the fourth reprint of a book written by Lala Lajpat Rai while he was in enforced exile in the United States. We have reviewed before an earlier edition and therefore a very brief notice ought now to suffice. It is, as Lalaji says, "an interpretation

and a history of the Nationalist Movement from within". Col. Wedgwood did not know the author when he wrote the foreword to the English edition of this book, but how truly he hits off the great leader when he says that Lala Lajpat Rai "is not a Nationalist as we know the species; he is a hater of injustice and oppression, a living flame of which Liberalism of all ages will justly be proud". No greater eulogy could be uttered and there is not a page in the book but bears an impress of this sound quality of Nationalism and Liberalism.

**SOME WORLD PROBLEMS.** By A. F. W. INGRAM. D. D. (Longmans Green & Co. Ltd., London.) 1927. 7¾ × 5. pp. 90. 4s.

THE book deals with problems which attracted the attention of the Bishop of London during his last world tour. All of these are neither religious nor ecclesiastical. E. g. such secular ones as how to make colonisation in Australia and Canada more attractive and how to promote better understanding between America and England are also treated in the book. Bishop Ingram's solution for the latter is simple—so simple indeed that one wonders how it should have occurred to no one before this. It is that misunderstandings between these two countries should be cleared up by mutual explanations on disputed points. Bishop Ingram is apparently not yet a convert to co-education, of which he found enough in America. This he regards as "distinctly risky." Though personally opposed to Prohibition in Great Britain, his attitude towards the great American experiment is one of sympathetic non-interference. He has also the frankness to admit:

"I saw enough to see what lies are sent across to us by interested parties about the effect of prohibition, and also to see the terrible handicap a wet country which spends £316,000,000 on drink has in commercial competition against a dry one."

Coming to Japan, the author is not one of those who think that the race problems of the Pacific cannot be solved without a war between Japan and America. He thinks that the necessity for this conflict will be avoided if only the League of Nations took up early enough the question as to what is to be done with the superabundant population of Japan. It is to be hoped that his wise counsel is not entirely lost upon quarters for which it is intended. One cannot however note without regret that the Bishop's attitude towards Eastern peoples is hardly distinguishable from that of British Imperialists; for in writing about China, he pleads for firmness "with these Eastern people." His world tour did not include India and we are denied the benefit of his views about the Indian problem both here and in South Africa, which too was left out of his itinerary. All the same the questions to which he draws attention in the book deserve careful consideration from all lovers of peace; and there is no doubt he has done a public service by writing about them.

D. V. A.

#### BOOKS RECEIVED.

**MODERN JAPAN AND ITS PROBLEMS.** By G. C. ALLEN. (George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., London.) 1928. 8½ × 5½. pp. 226. 10s.

**SOCIAL PROGRESS.** By U. G. WEATHERLY. (J. B. Lippincott Co., London.) 1926. 7½ × 5. pp. 388. 12s. 6d.

**STATE SECURITY AND THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.** By BRUCE WILLIAMS. (The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore.) 1927. 7½ × 5½. pp. 346. \$2.75.