

THE Servant of India

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

VOL. XI, No. 37. }

POONA—THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 1928.

{ INDIAN SUBSN. Rs. 6.
FOREIGN 15s.

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK ...	493
ARTICLES :—	
Princes' Fears ...	495
Reservation of Coastal Shipping ...	497
The Bolsheviks Bill ...	497
Post-War England. By A Correspondent ...	498
OUR EUROPEAN LETTER ...	500
OUR SOUTH AFRICAN LETTER ...	501
OUR PARLIAMENTARY LETTER ...	502
REVIEW SECTION :—	
Napoleon Bonaparte. By Prof. T. G. P. Spear, M.A. ...	504
A Liberal Theory of the State. By Principal M. Ruthnaswamy ...	505
Hindu Philosophy. By Prof. M. Hiriyanna, M.A. ...	505
Functional Distribution. By Prof. K. B. Madhava, M.A., A.I.A. ...	506
SHORT NOTICE ...	507
CORRESPONDENCE :—	
"Indian Economics" ...	508
BOOKS RECEIVED ...	508

TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

WHETHER the Assembly will be asked during its current session to elect its own committee to cooperate with the Simon Commission is a matter still shrouded in mystery. Perhaps the Government's victory over the Bolsheviks Bill would incline them to that course; but they are probably held back by fear of an adverse ruling from the Chair. Anyway the Upper House can be relied upon to be dutiful and elect their own proportion of the total strength of the Committee, about which Government still seem to be undecided. As regards the Assembly, Sir John Simon has asked the Viceroy to complete the composition of the Committee in any manner he may think proper and the Viceroy will very probably furnish the Assembly's quota by nomination. This in the case of a legislature which has unequivocally expressed its want of confidence in the Commission is, in the words of the manifesto issued by some members of the Assembly last week as a reply to Sir John Simon's cable to Lord Irwin, nothing short of "a grave constitutional impropriety amounting to a slight on its dignity and representative character." The fact that six out of the eight provincial legislatures had gone in for cooperation with the Commission duly finds place in Sir John Simon's cable; but he need not be told that this was made possible almost in every case by the official bloc which helped to turn the scales in favour of Government. Thus the decision of six provincial councils in favour of cooperation can hardly be

taken to reflect correctly political opinion in the country. The only reliable means of gauging the strength of public feeling on the point is, as the manifesto points out, to dissolve the central legislature in order to enable fresh elections to take place on the Simon issue. Government is free to carry on its investigations in defiance of public opinion, if it is so pleased. But if it is its claim to do so with the approval of public opinion, it must accept the challenge thrown down by the Assembly manifesto. Not to take up the challenge is to admit that the Simon inquiry is being forced on the country.

* * *

DR. RAMA RAO recently moved in the Council of State a resolution to the effect that Land Revenue in no revenue or tax be levied on land the Council of State.

except under laws enacted by Legislatures and that Local Governments should complete such legislation before the end of 1929-30. In a way the resolution is supererogatory because the Joint Parliamentary Committee have already laid down the principle. But it will have the effect of reminding local Governments of a serious lapse of duty for which they had better make amends. Dr. Rama Rao made it clear that his resolution was suggested by the no-tax campaign of Bardoli. Sir M. Habibullah pointed out the technical difficulties which came in the way of the Government of India urging on local Governments legislation relating to a provincial subject, and dilated on their financial difficulties which made this an inopportune time for foregoing increased revenue. But this hardly meets the charge of defiance of the Joint Committee's specific instructions. If increased revenue is justifiable, why not induce the Councils to meet it after convincing them by arguments? Although Dr. Rama Rao withdrew the resolution in view of the assurance given on behalf of Government to address local Governments again in order to attempt a solution of outstanding questions on land revenue, we hope his performance will remind the latter of what the representatives of the people regard as a serious evasion of duty. A final settlement of the principles of land revenue is now imperative and by delaying it Provincial Executives would simply be courting fresh discontent and further trouble. It is amply demonstrated now that people do not tolerate the immunity of the land tax from all legislative sanction.

* * *

THERE is hardly any one who will not rejoice at the successful termination of the protracted dispute at the Tata Works at Jamshedpur. The management ought to be heartily congratulated on the liberal terms they have offered to the men. Continuity of service has been promised to the men of the boilers and of sheet mills; increment up to Rs. 700,000 has

been stipulated for; the most important feature is that there is to be no victimisation; in future men will not be dismissed without their grievances being considered by a Central Committee. Excepting wages during the strike period, the men have got substantially everything that they have a right to expect. As "Eaves-dropper" has said in *Indian Finance*, Mr. S. C. Bose has shown himself to be "fair, open-minded and unwilling to pick a quarrel". Frequent strikes are hardly things which a pioneer industry can look on with perfect equanimity and the Jamshedpur works cannot withstand many such shocks. Peace in industry can only be secured by establishing a sympathetic contact with labour and we should like to see the capitalists realize this truth more and more clearly. Formation of committees on the model of Whitley Councils in Great Britain is a prime desideratum and we hope every large concern will copy this reform. It is to be hoped that the settlement at Tata Works will have the result of expediting the adjustment of the outstanding issues between the employers and men in the Bombay Textile Industry.

IN the case of the oil industry the inevitable has happened and the Tariff Board has rejected the industry's claim for protection. Its Report shows how since 1905 up to the time of inquiry the price of kerosine was practically controlled by a Pool, of which the Royal Dutch Shell Group were the contributors. The price war was initiated by the Pool and then followed up by the Standard Oil Company. In order to assist in the price war the Indian companies were offered compensation for losses by the Royal Dutch Shell Group. The Board's finding about sale below the world parity is that the price obtained by the Indian Pool is fourteen annas per unit below the world parity. Considering the financial position of the companies, the Board arrive at the conclusion that there is no possibility of their going under and that any protection given to Indian companies would retard the incentive to secure economy by better methods of production and refining as they have a practical monopoly of the home market. The Board also apprehend a serious loss to the consumers as a result of increased price consequent on the grant of protection. The Board do not find reason to think that the price war could continue for an extended period and they anticipate a slight rise of prices. With regard to petrol, the Board think that the steady advance in the demand will result in a secure market and a fair price and no foreign company has any intention of launching a price war for years to come.

Sir P. P. Ginwalla differing from the majority Report believes that no dumping has been proved since only a very small percentage of imported oil is sold below world parity price. This knocks the bottom out of the main claim of the oil industry for protection. We must thank Sir P. P. Ginwalla for exposing the *mala fides* of the companies claiming protection in withholding material facts from the Board, especially the fact of an agreement for compensation for losses owing to the price war. He is right in saying that the application for protection should have been summarily dismissed on this ground alone. Instead of deserving protection the applicant companies, in the opinion of Sir P. P. Ginwalla, have been realizing heavy prices, imposing a burden of several crores on the consumer. The Indian concerns constitute a powerful monopoly and but for the presence of the Standard Oil Company this monopoly would have been still more powerful and to break this monopoly Sir P. P. Ginwalla suggests the formation of a genuine Indian enterprise with a Rupee capital importing

crude oil and refining it in India. The way in which the applicant companies have made a claim for protection and then suddenly withdrawn it can only be called a huge joke.

The Report of the Unemployment Enquiry Committee in Travancore is likely to be helpful to us in British India who are suffering from the same *malaise* in an acute form. It may be premised that the Report deals only with the unemployment among the educated classes in the State. The eagerness for education displayed by communities which till now were content to follow their traditional occupations is, according to the Report, a part cause of the 'educated unemployment'. In view of the criticism of men like Sir Philip Hartog about the sterilising effects of the present education, it is to be noted that the Report does not agree with them in maintaining that unemployability in the sense of defective education is one of the major causes. The signatories believe that the State is overpopulated under existing economic conditions. As remedies, they suggest agricultural colonies for educated youth, introduction of competitive examinations for every grade of Government service, the teaching of mechanics in schools. But the most effective remedy, according to the Report, is the all round intensive development of the economic resources of the country on modern lines and the Report recommends the carrying out by the State of a vigorous economic policy which should include among other items 'Rural Reconstruction.' As for reforms in secondary and collegiate education the signatories point their finger to the classical Sadler Commission Report on which they bestow high praise. The Report ends with an eloquent appeal to the educated middle class to work harder and become truly productive instead of remaining a parasitical class. With a view to expedite agricultural development as one of the remedies for unemployment the signatories place great reliance on the institution of a Land Mortgage Bank to finance agriculture on the model of institutions in Egypt and Canada. The definition given in the Report of 'Unemployment' is "the failure of young men and women of various educational qualifications to get the kind of work the earnings of which will correspond to the efforts and sacrifices involved in acquiring those qualifications." We agree with the *Indian Social Reformer* in regarding it as too narrow.

IT must be said to the credit of our official experts *Problem Solved?* in railway accounts that they know what head of account should be debited with losses, whether considerable or otherwise, resulting from the disposal of fixed assets; they also know to what head of account should be credited the gains, of *ordinary* size, accruing by the sale of similar assets. But the question which appears to have completely baffled the accounting geniuses available to the Government of India in their own service is whether the realised surplus of any *considerable* amount resulting from the disposal of such an asset should be treated as a receipt on capital account or credited to revenue account. Although, for some unknown reason, there is no trace of this question in the Terms of Reference as published in paragraph 16 of the Railway Administration Report for 1926-27, it was nevertheless actually referred, for report, to Sir A. Lowes Dickinson who was engaged by the Government of India in 1926 to investigate the whole system of railway accounting and to make proposals for its re-

vision; and the recommendation made by him in this behalf is of a highly interesting character. His opinion, which is recorded in paragraph 287 of his report, is that the proper procedure in such a case of obviously rare occurrence would be (1) to credit to capital account the original cost, less accrued depreciation, and (2) to credit the realised surplus over that figure to a "Capital Reserve Account" to which should be charged any losses due to sales of similar assets for sums less than the difference between the original cost and the amount standing to the credit of the depreciation fund in respect of those assets, and that this "Capital Reserve Account" should remain open until the advent of that indefinite moment in futurity when the whole of the capital assets come to be disposed of and a final Profit and Loss Account made up. This recommendation can hardly be given the dignity of a "solution". It only amounts to a postponement of the final adjustment and as though to clothe this postponement with the semblance of a consistent scientific recommendation, it is proposed that, along with surpluses, the adjustment of the losses due to sales of assets should also be similarly postponed, just as the new head of account is proposed to be named "Capital Reserve Account" when in reality it is nothing more nor less than a non-terminable Capital Suspense Account.

* * *

THE bill framed by the Bikaner State to provide for compulsory primary education is of a permissive nature and appears to be modelled on the present Bombay Act. It will be made applicable to a particular area only on an application to that effect by the local body concerned. But there is also power reserved to the State Government under which they can, as in the Bombay Act, ask a particular local body to frame a scheme. If a local authority refuses to comply, the State can under the provisions of this Bill get a scheme prepared by appointing any body it likes. The School Committees, which will be responsible for the actual administration of the measure, will consist of a maximum of nine members, four of whom will be elected by the local body concerned and will as far as possible be persons experienced in education, one by the proprietors and managers of recognised schools, and the balance will be appointed by the Government of the State. The Bikaner Bill, it will be noticed, differs from the Bombay Act in this that whereas in the school committees constituted under the latter the elective element dominates the committees, its influence in the Bikaner School Committees will not be so decisive. All children between seven and twelve years of age in the area to which the measure will apply except those exempted for reasonable excuse will have to attend a recognised primary school. It is to be noted that the reasonable excuses include in the case of agriculturists' children the necessity for them to make themselves useful to their parents at harvesting and sowing seasons. The maximum fine for disobedience on the part of a parent of the School Committee's instruction to send his child to school has been laid down at Rs. 5 and the employment for remuneration of children of school age has been made an offence punishable with a fine not exceeding Rs. 25. We observe that the bill says nothing as to the financial responsibility either of the State or the local authority. It is a matter for satisfaction that the bill does not discriminate between boys and girls to the disadvantage of the latter.

* * *

PRINCES' FEARS.

THE hectoring tone of H. H. the Maharaja of Bikaner's speech offers a strong temptation to give him a retort in similar terms, but we shall resist the temptation and confine ourselves strictly to a dispassionate examination of the criticisms which the speech contains of the Nehru Committee's recommendations relating to Indian States. The recommendations are simple enough: an assurance is first given to the Princes that the future responsible Government of India shall abide by all the terms of treaties, engagements, &c. by which the present bureaucratic Government of India is bound; and if, in interpreting these treaties, engagements, &c., a difference of opinion should arise between the India Government and the States a further assurance is given that the matter will be referred to the Supreme Court for decision. It will be clear from this that the States stand to gain by this arrangement inasmuch as the existing rights of the States are expressly secured to them, and a possible injustice in future is provided against by erecting for the first time an independent tribunal which will in cases of conflict judge impartially between the contending parties. The most serious defect of the present system is that even in cases where Princes complain of inroads being made by the Government of India on their rights it is the Government of India itself which decides. This defect will be removed by the institution of the Supreme Court, which is the best possible guarantee a constitution can give against the abridgment of one's rights by a too narrow or a biased interpretation of them.

The Maharaja however is not satisfied with these recommendations. His first complaint is that, if the rights at present accruing to Indian States will be maintained intact in future, the encroachments that have already taken place on these rights will also continue unredressed in future. His second complaint is that, while differences between the Government of India and Indian States on matters arising from treaties &c. will alone be referred to the Supreme Court, those on matters arising from fiscal and other matters will not be so referred, which means that the present unequal and unjust treatment will continue to be meted out to the Princes in future. The Nehru Committee's position however is quite unexceptionable on both counts. The future Government of India will succeed both to the rights and to the obligations which the present Government of India enjoys and has incurred. If the Princes' contention is that the present Government of India has already unjustly enlarged the scope of its powers over them, and that the maintenance of those powers in future will only perpetuate the existing injustices, all that the Nehru Committee or any other body can say in reply is that it is open to the Princes to make good their contentions and secure relief from the future Government of India by the very means by which they can do so from the Government of India as at present constituted. The Butler Committee has been appointed to examine this very question; if its recommenda-

tions in so far as the Government of India decides to give effect to them are acceptable to the Princes, well and good; these decisions will be binding on the future Government of India too. If however they are not acceptable to the Princes, we daresay they will plead further with the present Government of India with a view to obtain the desired modifications. They will be equally free to make the same pleadings with the future Government of India. But in no case was it the concern of the Nehru Committee at the present stage to examine the validity of the Princes' contentions, which in fact the Princes are taking every care to conceal from the world. The Committee says in the report,—and this is a good reply to the second criticism which the Maharaja of Bikaner makes,—“It is not necessary for us to examine what are understood to be the grievances of the Indian States in regard to these matters (customs, excise, &c.). We simply note the fact that responsible Indian rulers and ministers of Indian States have at times raised their voice against what they have described to be the inequitable treatment which they received at the hands of the Government of India. How far those grievances are capable of being remedied, and how best they can be remedied, are matters for investigation and joint consultation, but we venture to think that their solution is not inextricably mixed up with the continuance of the present constitution of the Government, or the establishment of an entirely separate and independent machinery for the exclusive treatment of those subjects. If we refrain from going into this question at greater length, it is only because the public have not hitherto been permitted to know enough of the scheme which has been in the course of incubation for some months.”

The only points of criticism urged in the speech of His Highness are thus in our opinion devoid of any substance. But there are other points which are worthy of note. First, there is the important admission that the Princes' "constructive proposals" recommending changes in the existing constitutional position will be ruled out by the Butler Committee as outside its reference. We have always understood the Butler Committee's function to be to determine the existing constitutional position and not to recommend any changes therein. Secondly, the fantastic scheme put forward by Sir Leslie Scott is not the final scheme which will go before the Committee with the Princes' approval. We must say that the Princes were well advised in their own interest to reject this scheme, if they have decided to do so. It would not have received even a dog's chance at the hands of the Committee. From the new scheme, the Maharaja assures us, the States subjects are not excluded as they were excluded from Sir Leslie Scott's scheme. They are indeed, he says, "most certainly, and most specifically and unequivocally included in our scheme and proposals." In what way they are included we shall learn only when the scheme is published. But if H. H. the Maharaja only means that the States subjects will benefit by any additions to the revenue that the States may derive as a re-

sult of the readjustment of fiscal relations between the Government of India and the States, this will give no satisfaction either to British Indian or States subjects. The only ground for hope that exists at present that the subjects will benefit even in this manner is that the Princes' Chamber passed a resolution recommending its member-Princes to limit their privy purse in some way or other. The resolution of course is worth nothing unless it is backed by deeds, of which there are no indications so far. But when a demand is made for the definite inclusion of the States subjects in the scheme, what is desired is that they should share power in the States to which they belong. To the extent to which States subjects are allowed to participate in government will Indian Princes under the new dispensation be released from the control which the suzerain power is entitled and indeed is bound to exercise over them. The Princes are now endeavouring to obtain perfect freedom from external control. This will be possible only if the whole power is vested in the hands of the subjects and the Princes are reduced to the position of constitutional rulers. The Maharaja of Bikaner refers to the resolution he moved in the Princes' Chamber urging the establishment of a rule of law and so forth. The Maharaja would have won the sympathy of British Indian people better by informing them as to the steps that are being taken in States to inaugurate such a rule of law. There are not perhaps more than half a dozen States among the total 600 or 700 in which there is any kind of freedom of speech or freedom of the press.

The Maharaja complains of ingratitude on the part of the British Indian people, because they seem to him to have forgotten the services rendered by him and his brother-Princes when they supported the Montagu Reforms in 1919. For our own part we have never thought much of this help, for the simple reason that a plea for a constitutional advance in a neighbouring country counts for nothing when it comes from a ruler in whose country constitutional government is conspicuous by its absence. We have said so before and have not yet seen any reason to alter our opinion. By the way the very fact that Indian Princes can legitimately support and have supported British Indian agitation for reforms gives to British Indian subjects a title to support a similar agitation initiated by Indian States subjects. Indian Princes often question this right, and H. H. the Maharaja of Bikaner does it in this very speech. But if the Maharaja can from a feeling of neighbourliness help British India take a further step in constitutional reform, cannot Pandit Motilal Nehru e. g. help Bikaner subjects persuade their Maharaja in taking the first step in constitutional government? This is however by the bye. The Maharaja of Bikaner's help in 1919 consisted, in his own words, in this, that he refrained, when he believed he had the power, from putting a spoke in the wheels of the political progress of British India. For this negative service British Indian subjects have shown, in our opinion, far more recognition than was due; but even this too generous recognition could never go so far as

to allow the Maharaja now "to put a real spoke in the wheels of political India." To concede the Princes' claims is to accept that self-government is not possible in British India till Indian States agree to come into "a sort of federation" with it. The Maharaja's own idea about the future polity has not yet advanced beyond the "sort of federation" stage. No, he and his brother-Princes, whatever their past services, will not be allowed to put a spoke in the wheels of British Indian progress in spite of his threats. He advises British Indian politicians not to wage war on all fronts simultaneously, with the British Indian rulers on the one hand and with the Indian Princes on the other. We would very humbly give the same advice to our Princes. Let them not carry on a fight on all fronts at the same time. If they desire to secure any concession from the Government of India, they had better ensure the support of British Indian and States subjects instead of battling with all the three. In any case if the struggle is between the British Indian subjects and Indian States subjects on the one hand and the Government of India and the Indian Princes on the other we have no doubt as to who will win; and we do hope that the Maharaja does not follow the ostrich policy so much as to imagine that the States subjects side with the Princes rather than with their brethren in British India.

RESERVATION OF COASTAL SHIPPING.

MR. HAJI, by moving that his Bill for the reservation of coastal traffic be referred to a select committee, has practically challenged the opponents to have their say and either to convince the supporters of the Bill or be convinced by them. The reservation of the coastal traffic has been everywhere asserted to be a privilege of the nationals of a country and in trying to assert the same India has done nothing unusual or catastrophic. Mr. Haji made it clear that the Indian Mercantile Marine Committee was a wholly nominated committee on which vested interests were fully represented; the opponents therefore could at least go as far as the Committee. No one need complain also that he has not enough materials on which to base his considered judgment, after being in possession of the report of the Committee for four years. He further dissipated the current notion that the Bill contravened the British Merchant Shipping Act of 1894 by reminding the House that the Law Officers of the Crown reported that the Bill was within the competence of the Assembly. It is clear from the debate on the Bill that the arguments brought against it are a rehash of what Sir Charles Innes, then Commerce Member, said in 1923 in what Mr. Haji calls "the notorious and ex-parte speech."

The principal argument against the Bill is that it proposes what is clearly an act of expropriation since after a century of development British shipping companies were to be given the go bye. Mr. Haji has made short work of all the items of this argument. Reservation of coastal trade is sanctioned by international law and usage and if aliens enjoyed the right in India so far it was only on sufferance.

It is rather too late in the day to press arguments based on the disturbance of vested rights because every national advance would imply some sort of displacement of existing beneficiaries. Mr. Haji showed how modest the Bill was by giving the

figures of the profits of the coasting trade; out of the total shipping earnings in India which amount to nearly Rs. 50 crores, the coastal trade represents only one-fifth of the sum. It is significant that the majority of the Indian associations concerned with the economic prosperity of India have supported the Bill. As for the exploitation of political and racial feeling, the opponents of the Bill (says Mr. Haji) are more responsible for this sort of appeal than the sponsors of the Bill and there can be no doubt about this after hearing the pronouncements by various Chambers of Commerce representing foreign interests. A minor argument advanced by the opponents was that in India a mercantile marine, which is always as a second line of defence to aid the Navy, was superfluous since the British Navy will be there to protect Indian waters. Mr. Haji has exposed this line of argument by showing the vicious circle which is produced by it: as long as there is no self-government there will be no Navy and without a Navy there is no place for a mercantile marine and unless India possesses these she is not fit for self-government. Mr. Haji's estimate of the capital required for supplying the entire Indian tonnage is Rs. 10 crores and he is confident that it will be forthcoming.

Sir James Simpson's contention, that if British shipping facilities disappeared there might not be Indian capital to provide for all the necessary shipping within five years, may be admitted; but his rhodomontade about confiscation and socialism does not come with grace from a Britisher who in his own country is surrounded by a net-work of socialistic legislation. As for protection, has Sir James Simpson forgotten the Navigation Laws of England or does he think them to be antiquated? As for Sir James Simpson's solicitude for the interests of the consumer, Mr. Birla retorted by showing that the B. I. S. N. Company's profits for the last quarter of a century were computed to be 22 p. c. annually.

It must be admitted that Sir George Rainy's contention that the Bill is discriminatory is valid, since 75 p. c. of the stock is required to be vested in British Indian nationals and 75 p. c. of the Directors of the Board in the case of a joint stock company must be such nationals. We think however these conditions cannot be whittled down to the simple conditions of having a rupee capital and the company being registered in India. In that case the present foreign companies have simply to translate their sterling capital into rupees and the reservation would be meaningless. It is no use denying that the Bill is protectionist in its character and if this issue has to be discussed it should be discussed as such without mixing up other extraneous considerations with the objections based upon the general case for free trade and the interests of the consumer. So far as the latter are concerned, far from regarding the development of an Indian Mercantile Marine as being prejudicial to lower freights for Indian goods, the Indian Fiscal Commission clearly said that such a development would have a favourable effect on coastal shipping rates and assist industrial development. As for free trade, in view of the fact that 88 p. c. of the coastal trade is carried on by non-Indian shipping companies, it is impossible under conditions of perfect competition to develop an indigenous shipping industry for as long a time as one can reasonably look ahead; state-aid thus becomes the inevitable means of resuscitating this vital industry.

THE BOLSHEVIKS BILL.

BY a narrow majority of three votes this panicky piece of legislation aimed at non-Indian Communists has been referred to a select committee. The Government are so bent upon enacting it into law during the

present session of the Indian legislature that the Select Committee has been allowed only three days during which to produce their report. As the Committee consists of none but those who see eye to eye with Government on this point, it would be too much to expect it to introduce any material improvement in the scheme of dealing with foreign Communists embodied in the Bill. Indeed this seems to be definitely beyond its scope, for in reply to a specific question by Pandit Malaviya whether any attempt to retain for the aggrieved person the right of defence and trial by a tribunal would be in order in the Select Committee, the Home Member informed him that that would be inconsistent with the objects and purposes of the Bill. It may thus be taken for granted that the measure as it will emerge from the Select Committee will not be shorn of its most objectionable feature, viz. the provision to empower the executive to deport any foreigner it likes without his having a fair judicial trial. In such circumstances the attitude of Indian opinion toward it can only be one of strong opposition.

In the course of the debate a point was raised by more than one speaker whether the executive cannot achieve its object of getting rid of Communists not belonging to this country by the use of such powers as it at present enjoys under the notorious Bengal Regulation III of 1818. Perhaps there may be other similar obsolete pieces of legislation like the Foreigners Act of 1864 which can be pressed into service. But the point is not whether this can or cannot be done, but whether it would be right to do so, whether the extraordinary powers with which an executive is clothed in times of war or similar emergencies should be given to it in peaceful times like the present. If Government or their supporters could have produced evidence which would have convinced all reasonable people as to the existence of a wide-spread organisation which unless dealt with in the manner proposed would subvert the existing social and economic order in the land, it would have been a different matter. But this was not done and we have no more than the statement of the Home Member that the recent industrial trouble was engineered by Communists.

But assuming that Communists are very active in India, are there no other means, more in accord with well recognised legal canons of equity and fair play to the aggrieved party, of dealing with the menace? In this connection it was stated by Government's supporters that America deals with undesirable aliens in a far more drastic manner. That may be so. But we have never been advocates of American liberty for this country; we want British liberty to prevail in India. And if we have properly followed the debates on this Bill, it was not asserted by any body that the executive in Great Britain were in enjoyment of the kind of summary powers of dealing with aliens as were asked for in the Bill. Now we do not say that the British executive have no power to deport aliens they may regard as undesirable; but it should be noted that this has nothing to do with the politics of the deportee. Nor can it be denied that there is an increasing tendency on their part to make their own opinion about an individual do duty for a judicial decision arrived at after proper inquiry by well understood legal processes; they do possess such powers, but this tendency is a relic of war times through which we have passed and must be kept within due bounds. The exceptional powers enjoyed by the British executive during the late war of alien control have, it is true, been renewed every year since 1919 and an attempt was also made last year to find for them a permanent place on the British Statute book. But it must not

be forgotten that the last year's Aliens Bill has not yet become law, having only passed the Upper House though not without much opposition. But whatever that be, the idea underlying that Bill is different, as can be seen from the following remarks of Lord Desborough on May 5, 1927, in moving its second reading:—

"The general principle of alien control is no longer seriously disputed. Experience has made it clear that some method of regulating the flow of foreigners into this country is essential and that there must be power to order the deportation of those who abuse our hospitality. In the first place, it will, I think, be generally admitted that we ought to exclude those aliens who as individuals can be definitely classed as undesirable—for example, those who are suffering from infectious and contagious diseases, those who have criminal records and those who have no means of livelihood and would, if admitted here, become dependent for their maintenance on public funds."

We are of course far from implying that Government should simply look on while a powerful organisation is busy trying to overthrow it. We do want it to protect itself from such activities, but cannot persuade ourselves that for that purpose it is necessary to arm it with those drastic powers which they demand in the Public Safety Bill. Our position in this matter is fortified by the eminent authority of Prof. H. J. Laski, who writes as follows in his "Grammar of Politics" on the point:—

"The situation is, of course, different when an association aims at, and proposes to act towards, the overthrow of the State. The problems raised by this issue belong rather to the art than to the theory of politics. Every government must assume that its continued orderly existence is, within the ambit of such a system of rights as that here outlined, a desirable thing; every government is, within that ambit, entitled as a consequence, to take steps to protect itself. It is, therefore, entitled to destroy any group which seeks *definitely and presently* to usurp its authority. But no government ought, in its purely executive aspect, to be the sole judge of whether its action is right. *It ought always to be compelled to the submission of proof and it ought always to be compelled to the submission of proof under the fullest judicial safeguards.*" (Italics ours.)

It is just because the proposed measure releases Government from the obligation of submitting their actions in regard to foreign Communists to judicial tests that Indian opinion is so stoutly opposed to it.

POST-WAR ENGLAND.

COMING to England again after three years I can perceive changes—and these may be summed up in the one word—*anxiety*. All the outward signs are those of a prosperous community. The countryside is dotted with groups of new villas, and more and more of them are coming up. The towns are expanding and the process of urbanisation in this highly urbanised country is still proceeding. The roads are overflowing with cars in this holiday time, and the number of new garages and the long waits before passing through the narrow country bridges are indications of their popularity. Men and women are well dressed and among the young people there is a freedom of manner and expression which bespeaks a perceptible falling away of the legendary British reserve. The young men affect Byron collars almost as much as on the Continent, which is a detail with a significance. In more ways than one there is more of barrier and less of continuity between the coming and passing generations in Great Britain. The outlook of the former is essentially that of the British Public Schools sport. Life to them is largely play where one has to make good, but the elders do not

look at it in the same way. To them the times are out of joint, and instinctively they perceive that the age calls for premeditation and other things to which they are not accustomed. In railway carriages and hotels and inns there is much anxious discussion of the great problems the country is facing, often faltering uncertain discussions. There can hardly be greater contrast than between this deliberation on the part of the older folk and the gaiety of the younger in the dance halls and music halls and picture places which also are multiplying. Politically the mood of the country is sheerly negative, one of great weariness. There is no enthusiasm about the present Government, but there is still less of it for either Labour or Lloyd George. For this the press is responsible. It is largely hostile to and distrustful of Labour and leaves Liberalism severely alone.

Britain's position, unlike America's, rests on two factors, diplomatic importance and commercial supremacy. In both these respects the British predominance was due not so much to any innate miraculous powers of British people, great as they are (as it was so often assumed), but to natural causes. If character and destiny are the twin influences determining the life of a nation as of an individual, it is safe to predict that the historians of the future will reverse the verdict of their predecessors and attribute the remarkable rôle of Britain in the world's history more to destiny. The British doctrine of free trade, though Liberal in conception, was in effect, restrictive. At a time when industrialisation had been effected so much in Great Britain and so little elsewhere, Liberal economic principles had the additional advantage of being profitable. Similarly, the political predominance of Europe in the world's affairs gave England the whip hand in diplomacy on account of her peculiar position in Europe. In both these respects conditions have changed. Different qualities are now called for in leadership and the thoughtful section in the country is quite alive to this necessity. Mr. H. A. L. Fisher said in his inaugural lecture of the City of London Vacation Course in Education:

"We are apt to suppose that because we have been lucky in the past and are not so badly off as some in the present, we shall inevitably continue to prosper in the future. We must remember, however, that we have not always been, either in our own estimation or in the estimation of the world, a prosperous or important people."

Introspection is a difficult virtue for an active people to practise, but it is noteworthy that if England suffers a change to-day, it is because the world conditions have changed. Also, an important and prosperous people are not a great people any more than a rich and influential man is a great man. Not even the worst of Britain's enemies can deny that the British are a serious people; they may still have new contributions to make to human culture.

The present anxiety in the country largely arises out of the recent increase in unemployment. The problem has come to a head with the report of the Industrial Transference Board appointed by the Government for the purpose of "facilitating the transference of workers, and in particular of miners, for whom opportunities of employment in their own district or occupation are no longer available". The facts which the Board had to face are simple enough, and stated simply meant that there are more than 200,000 workmen of all ages unemployed at present. What is more, they will continue to remain so unless hitherto untried measures are taken, because their industries have reached the limit of absorption. The alarm is the result of the realisation that this limit

is permanent, and not merely a phase of temporary industrial depression. The solution which the Board offers is summed up in one word, emigration. Two kinds of emigration are recommended, emigration from one part of the country to another, and emigration to the Dominions. Of both Adam Smith's saying that man of all goods is the most difficult to transport still remains true, all the progress in transport notwithstanding. The men of one county are very different from those of another, and it would take a generation to overcome differences in dialect, in habits of life, in methods of work, and to eradicate local jealousies incidental to such transference. The emigration to the Dominions is similarly beset with obstacles. An analysis of the figures relating to emigration shows, that in spite of all encouragement that has been given, the number of Britons who have gone to Canada since 1925 is only half the number before 1914. The Briton of to-day does not seem to want to emigrate, and even if he were more ready, the Dominions apply a rigorous system of selection with regard to the incoming emigrants. They want only the very best, in fact, only such of those as will be able to find work in Britain. Canada declares that she has already too many workmen, and the Australian Premier says frankly, "We are not disposed to transfer from Britain to Australia a problem of unemployment which the British Government cannot solve for itself".

Another question which has caused a great deal of searching to take place in the country and whose scope extends beyond the Conservative Party which has been split on account of it is the policy of "safeguarding." Half the members of the ruling party demand safeguarding of iron and steel. They quote the figures for imports in the two commodities and say that if these industries were safeguarded and if these imports were to be produced at home, there will be remarkable improvement in unemployment. The Prime Minister who leads the other half is adamant in his refusal for fear that by trying to please half his party he will displease the whole nation. Safeguarding of iron and steel cannot be long pursued without being followed by the safeguarding of agriculture, and such a fundamental change in the national policy can hardly be effected without a mandate from the nation. The party in power is a permanent minority in the nation and the newly widened franchise is still untried. A Government's last year is not the best year for taking a bold step. The main difficulty here is to drive home to the people the idea that safeguarding has become a vital necessity. That idea amounts to the declaration that Britain must face a changing world and revise her standards.

In English politics, unlike in French, foreign policy rarely counts for much. The Foreign Office enjoys an extraordinary amount of popular confidence and an exceptional amount of autonomy. This is also true of colonial affairs. Otherwise the country as such will give more attention to the Kellogg Pact than it now would seem to do. Nevertheless there is a vague and disturbing feeling that British leadership in diplomatic affairs is decreasing. There is an instinctive dread that the recent movements in the diplomatic world might lead to a conflict and to be caught in it would spell ruin to the country. The men who make war obviously know this.

These are a curious people, the British. Their constitution has become a by-word for democracy and yet not until very recently did the political rule of the great aristocratic families break down in this country. It is only in our day we see the leaders of

society turning away to business and the first signs of the government of the country passing into the control of another social class. A democratic country, and yet a notable Englishman recently said of his people, "Our social gradations are so numerous and delicate that while most people ape the manners of the class just above them, there are few so poor as to be deprived of the luxury of looking down upon a fellow human beings." Free trade has been Britain's traditional economic policy, and yet in the changed conditions of to-day we know how near protection it was for British trade. The times pass and, as the German philosophers are fond of saying, the logic in each system lays itself bare in the long run. Democratic ideal and aristocratic rule, political liberalism and imperialism, these and such other contradictions can be made to work for a time by a clever people and can be made to produce magnificent results. But they have their reactions and after-effects, as we in India with the splendid contradictions of our philosophy know.

A CORRESPONDENT.

OUR EUROPEAN LETTER.

(From Our Own Correspondent.)

PARIS, AUGUST 28.

THE KELLOGG PACT.

TEN years after the Treaty which settled practical politics, the Western world indulged in a moral sacrament yesterday afternoon, to wipe away its sins. Auspicious weather favoured the signing of the Peace Pact and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs was under a canopy of slowly-drifting clouds floating through a blue heaven. A gentle breeze made the numerous flags which decked the building stand out, and an expectant crowd in which the German and American elements predominated watched the comings and goings of the prominent visitors to the French capital. The excellent reception which the German Foreign Minister received on arrival on the previous day had served to give a fitting touch to the occasion, and for the rest, the gracefulness and courtesy of the people in whose city the Pact was signed was a guarantee of its success. Monsieur Briand was at his best and did not fail to move even the distinguished audience he addressed, accustomed as it was to such ceremonies. Mr. Kellogg maintained silence which was also the mood of the crowd, for the simple declaration of peace calls for none of the dramatics of war. The actual signing took little more than ten minutes and the entire function lasted for scarcely an hour. By 4 p. m. yesterday the historic deed was over; fifteen nations had solemnly declared that they would "renounce war as a national policy." Even putting the interpretation which Monsieur Briand was careful enough to mention in his speech preliminary to the signing, it was doubtless a historic occasion. According to the French Foreign Minister, it meant that the legality of War had suffered diminution; far from being the ultimate right, war, as such, had become no right at all. The most moderately-minded will agree that even if it still happens to be the ultimate fact, here is as near an approach between morals and international politics as they have ever attained. "Aspiration, not realisation" was the comment of the *Journal des Débats*; "moral disarmament" called a Swiss journal familiar with the Geneva language.

Morality is the domain of the ideal, and while it may be admitted that those who criticise the Pact for its being just a glorified "Thou shalt not kill" without any of the compelling force of facts would be hard put to define their demands, should they be asked what would satisfy them in this regard, a

little skepticism on such an occasion is all for the good. Such an aspiration for peace is no new thing in Europe. Thirty years ago Tsar Nicholas II talked in surprisingly same language as the Pact, and on the very eve of the last War, peace made or seemed to make great strides through the establishment of the Hague Court. The Kaiser had come to be regarded among the pillars of peace. In the post-war world the divergence between appearances and reality in political phenomena has widened rather than the contrary, and as certain sections of the British and the French press are never tired of suggesting, the exigencies of American home politics no doubt account a great deal for the Peace Pact. It must also be acknowledged that its reservations and interpretations are perilously remindful of a formidable conspiracy to guild over present difficulties and maintain the *status quo* pleasant or flattering to the Great Powers. The whole effort smacks of making what is pleasant also right and desirable.

One definite aspect of the pact, it may be claimed, is the triumph of democracy. An American newspaper draws attention to the number of businessmen in the Assembly at the Quai d'Orsay yesterday and asserts that the Treaty marks the epoch when business takes over the direction of politics from professional diplomatists. It contrasts the new ideal of open covenants openly arrived at to the old method of intrigues; the new enthusiasm for broad moral principles to the old spirit of cunning. There is no doubt some truth in this and there is no doubt that democracy is responsible for the triumph of peace yesterday. Such a ceremony would have been and still is devoid of any meaning to men of the older tradition. But what is not at all clear at the moment is to what extent democracy is capable of controlling its stewards and to what extent business will prove worthy of its new dignities.

I came over to Paris from England where the newspapers were filled with the accounts of the air manoeuvres in London and the "realistic" battles in a Wiltshire village. In the one place I heard of the horrors of "the next war", and in the other I see there is much speculation about the new peace. In neither, can I say that I have been at all convinced that there was a realisation of all that was said. To the ordinary Englishman, and even more so to the ordinary Englishwoman, who is no negligible factor in the present-day politics in her country, serious thinking involving some measure of visualisation is a formidable affair. The act is rendered more difficult by the fact that for as long as they can remember their island home has proved a castle to them. Add to this a deep-rooted instinct never to "trouble till trouble troubles you," and it will be understood how the moral of the air manoeuvres, that London cannot even in broad daylight be defended against hostile aeroplanes and the prediction that in the next war all England will be shelled, blockaded, and starved, sounds little more terrifying than the anticipations in a Wellsian romance. It is not the momentary terrors of a few air raids which create sufficient impression to necessitate forethought, and in the Great War, neither in France nor in England was there such great suffering among the civilians as in Russia, Germany and Austria. Hence a proper realisation of war and all its dangers, and peace and all its blessings, exists only in central Europe. In Paris peace means little more than the perpetuation of the present order of politics in Europe and in England, just good business. There is no general enthusiasm for peace as a principle nor general loathsomeness for war as such. Indeed the latter would be regarded as unworthy both in England and France.

ANOTHER BLOW TO INDIA.

An Indian visitor to Paris yesterday could not help

asking himself why Lord Cushendun should sign for India, while New Zealand, Australia, Canada and South Africa had each a native representative to mark their adhesion to the Peace Treaty. Ten years earlier when in the same city a similar instrument was registered our country was represented by our own men. Why then this set-back? It was not merely that no Indian was deputed for the task but also that no one representing India as such was entrusted with the authority. The conclusion is irresistible that the same principle which actuated the composition of the Simon Commission has decided this step. There can be no other interpretation of it but as an open challenge to us.

OUR SOUTH AFRICAN LETTER.

(From Our Own Correspondent.)

DURBAN, AUGUST 24.

CONDONATION.

SOON after the Department of the Interior assured immunity to the abettors of the illegal entry of the would-be condonees, and the last substantial obstacle was removed, the Congress authorities decided on a campaign to induce illegal entrants to take condonation. Two meetings were held in Natal, one in Durban and the other in Pietermaritzburg, both of which were addressed by Mr. Sastri. At the Durban meeting, after the Congress officials had explained the scheme in great detail, the oppositionists were invited to put their case. Mr. John L. Roberts readily responded to the invitation and urged among other things that, as Indians were British subjects, and as such entitled to enter South Africa, the question of illegal entry did not arise. He was asked why, if Indians claimed the right to enter South Africa, so many of them sneaked into the country by the back-door instead of knocking honestly at the front door. In an impassioned address Mr. Sastri appealed to the illegal entrants to do the honourable thing now, and clean up their records by going in for condonation. The honour of India, the interests of the illegal entrants and of their wives and children pointed that way.

Soon after the meeting the first batch of illegal entrants in Natal sought condonation at the local Immigration Office. They were asked not only to fill in the application form prescribed by the new Regulation, and give their thumb-impressions, but also three sets of *all finger prints*, some sixty in all. The Congress officials were alarmed at this demand which was to be found neither in the Regulations nor in the understanding that preceded the settlement. It seems such finger impressions of Indians are nowadays taken in Natal soon after they are declared prohibited immigrants. This created suspicion and uneasiness. At the instance of the Congress, Mr. Sastri made an immediate reference to Pretoria. A prompt reply was received that thumb impressions would be required only if the person was unable to sign, and finger impressions when the Department had no record of the person before the 5th July 1924. The Congress is satisfied with the reply.

The Indian community, particularly that in the Transvaal, has been anxious to minimise the number of illegal entrants that would be required to take out protection certificates. For that purpose they were trying to get a line drawn somewhere and to secure absolute immunity to the illegal entrants who entered prior to that date. They pressed for that line to be drawn at 1914, the Smuts-Gandhi settlement. Failing that, they wished 1908 to be the critical year. The Department gave Mr. Sastri and the Congress to understand that holders of Peace Preservation permits who exchanged them for registration

certificates in the year 1908 would not have to apply for condonation even if their title to the permit itself might have been open to doubt. Subsequently, the Department gave a reply to the Congress enquiry that was rather vague, inasmuch as it said that a hard and fast 1908 line could not be drawn but in practice they would not be able, or desire, to go beyond that date. This left the illegal entrant of 1908 and earlier in doubt as to whether he should apply for condonation or not. Many such who are now in India were informed by their friends here that they need not take out protection certificates and that, therefore, they need not hurry back to South Africa. The latest ruling of the Department upset these calculations and created a wave of disappointment and restlessness. Since then it has been ascertained that they need not apply for condonation who had Peace Preservation certificates issued *in their own names*, whether they were entitled to them or not and subsequently exchanged them for Registration Certificates; but they should apply who got hold of permits issued to *others* and exchanged them for certificates. This has cleared the situation and though it does not give the 1908 line desired by the Indians, it removes all uncertainties as to the intentions of the Department. The Congress officials are satisfied with it.

ENTRY OF WIVES AND CHILDREN OF CONDONEES.

In a previous Letter it was stated that some confusion was likely to arise from the fact that according to the understanding between the Minister and the Congress Deputation, the wives and children of prospective condonees who were not already in the country by the 24th of February 1928 were not entitled to be introduced, and from the fact that the Protection Certificate did not mention this particular date, but merely said "at date hereof"—the date of the issue of the Certificate, the last date for applying for which is 30th September 1928. This discrepancy was taken advantage of by some Indians who understood that prospective condonees were free to introduce their wives and minor children right up to 30th September 1928, by the simple expedient of not applying for condonation till that date. The Department stands by the understanding between the Congress deputation and the Minister; while some Indians stand by the wording of the Protection Certificate. Congress and Mr. Sastri have advised the community to stick to the understanding as men of honour, and not to try to take advantage of what was obviously an oversight or mistake of the Government in drafting the Protection Certificate.

When this discrepancy was pointed out, Mr. Sastri was given to understand that it was the policy of the Department for some time past not to issue D. I. 91 forms—forms necessary for introducing wives and children—to applicants whom it suspected to be illegal entrants; and that, therefore, the entry of the families of prospective condonees was guarded against, though indirectly. The presumption is that all those to whom the Department has in the past issued D. I. 91 forms were legal entrants, and that their families should be freely admitted. The Department, however, decline to admit them, on the ground that since they were not here on the critical date, they are debarred from entering. Among those to whom D. I. 91 forms have been issued there may be some who are illegal entrants but whom the Department did not suspect; and there may be some whom the Department knew to be illegal entrants but to whom D. I. 91 forms were issued long before the condonation scheme was thought of. Such cases must be very few, and may well be overlooked by the Department. They have however taken a different attitude, and the Indians are sore about it.

Upto the 23rd inst. 97 applications have been made for Protection Certificates: 54 in the Transvaal, 39 in Natal, and 4 in the Cape. The Congress officials are giving every assistance to the applicants.

The oppositionists are in the meanwhile assailing the scheme in all manner of ways. The Cape Vigilance Committee has called a conference of Indians in that Province to consider the scheme and other matters including the conduct of the Agent of the Government of India. In Pretoria the redoubtable Secretary of the Transvaal British Indian Association, Mr. N. A. Camay, addressed an Indian meeting against the scheme and did not come off with flying colours.

INDIAN LICENSES IN NATAL.

The local Indian community was thrown into agitation by the publication in the *Indian Views* of certain instructions said to have been issued to local officials to the effect that every Asiatic licensee should be required to produce his domicile certificate and that the number thereof and the annual declarations that he has to make in applying for licenses should be communicated to the Immigration Department. It is not every Indian in Natal that has a domicile certificate, or for the matter of that, any document either. It is not understood how these instructions can be worked in Natal. The full implications and the justification for these are not yet clear.

THE INDIAN SOCIAL SERVICE COMMITTEE.

This Committee, formed last year under the inspiration of Mr. Sastri, celebrated its first anniversary on the 23rd inst. The new Mayor, Mr. A. Eaton, presided and was supported by several Town Councillors and Mr. Sastri on the platform. Mr. V. Lawrence, the chairman of the Committee, read the annual report which was acclaimed a "remarkable document". The Committee of twelve loyal and steady workers put in a very remarkable amount of sustained work. Not one Sunday did they miss going out on their rounds, visiting the homes of Indians in and around Durban, preaching the gospel of cleanliness and hygiene and distributing handbills on sanitation. Their reports revealing the unsatisfactory nature of the housing of Indian employees by the Municipality, the Railways and the big Hotels succeeded in drawing public attention to these conditions and some improvements are already in view. The Mayor promised his full and active sympathy in improving the housing conditions of municipal employees.

MR. EATON ON SEGREGATION.

In his remarks at the Social Service meeting, the Mayor propounded his doctrine of segregation. His ideal was a separate village for Indians for residential purposes somewhere outside the borough of Durban, where they could give full expression to their national ideals of civic life and government. He avowed that it was for that reason that he opposed the grant of the site within the borough which Mr. Sastri desired for his College. The Indians are not without hope that given a chance to influence him, they will be able to get him to shed his idea of segregation.

SASTRI COLLEGE.

On the 24th inst. the Administrator, Mr. Gordon Watson, laid the foundation stone of the building intended for the Indian Training College and High School, in Durban. There was a large assembly of representative and distinguished Europeans and Indians. Mr. Sastri, in requesting the Administrator to lay the foundation stone, made a statement regarding the origin and progress of the scheme. He ended up with a fervent

appeal that whatever be the political vicissitudes through which Indians may in future pass, never again let the education of their children be starved: "They surely are innocent, and may not be punished for the real or fancied sins of their parents."

On the request of the donors, the Administrator christened the institution the "Sastri College", and paid high tributes to the work of Mr. Sastri in humanising the European and uplifting the Indian. Of the institution he said,

"We see before us today the beginning of Mr. Sastri's work. Soon from this spot will rise a great institution for the education of Indians in South Africa. Today it is a training college and high school, in a few years' time it may develop into a university college with its academic and professional branches."

He complimented the Indian community on its public spirit in raising this College and assured that the Administration would regard it as "a trust to be administered with the sole object of furthering the educational aspirations of the Indian community in this Province."

WAGES OF SHOP ASSISTANTS.

The Natal Indian Congress sent in its comments on the preliminary recommendations made by the Wage Board regarding the wages and conditions of work of shop assistants. Congress recognises that it is impossible for the Wage Board to make racial discrimination, but points out the difficulties and disabilities under which Indian commercial enterprise suffers in South Africa. Indian trade is confined to and cramped in the poorer areas; Indian employees have no educational facilities, general or technical; Indian women shop assistants are not available; Indian shop assistants recognise the limitations of their employees and themselves, and ask for a lower wage than that recommended by the Board. Congress points out that if the rates suggested by the Board were carried out, the Indian will have to pay more than his European competitor for the same business, because the latter can employ the cheaper female labour. Congress asks the ratio of the cheaper unqualified assistants to qualified assistants be increased in establishments where no females are employed.

RACIALISM IN TRADE UNIONS.

The Indian hotel employees in Durban are members of a trade union, which is already registered under the Trades Union Act. The European employees in hotels and in bars want to form a separate trade union for themselves but so far their request had been turned down by the Registrar on the ground that a trade union already exists which according to its constitution is capable of admitting to membership all races and classes of employees. The Indian Union is opposed to racial distinction on principle and refuse to consent to confine it to Indians only. Until a definite line of policy in regard to race distinction is adopted, the Registrar refuses to register the European union. The South African Indian Congress has the matter under consideration.

OUR PARLIAMENTARY LETTER.

(From Our Own Correspondent.)

SIMLA, SEPTEMBER 14.

THE SIMON ISSUE.

SINCE Sir John Simon asked the Viceroy to complete the composition of the central Legislature's committee in any manner he liked, the question of appointment of a Committee of the Central Legislature to co-operate with the Simon Commission has

again been to the fore. The elected members of the Assembly have replied to this invitation by their manifesto in which they characterise such a procedure as a grave constitutional impropriety amounting to a slight on the Assembly's dignity and representative character. They have asked for the dissolution of the central Legislature and fresh election on the Simon issue so that a clear verdict of the country might be recorded on the subject. This is a well-planned gesture, but there seems no possibility of the Government accepting the challenge. On the contrary, if rumour speaks true, a motion for the election of a committee may be made by Government at the end of next week. Considering the weakness of the Opposition owing to the absence of some members, the motion, for aught one knows, may even, be passed. But so far there is no sign of any movement on the part of the Government in that direction. But we had better wait and see.

NON-OFFICIAL BILLS.

Non-official bills did not fare well on Saturday last, Mr. Sarda alone being successful. He moved that his bill for the prevention of child marriages be recommitted to Select Committee to make some necessary changes in view of the public criticism passed on it. Mr. Acharya pressed for safeguarding the orthodox point of view but could not carry the House with him. He strongly objected that the original bill intended to regulate child marriage had been altered into one of imposing restraints upon the solemnisation of child marriages. He tabled an amendment to add to the Select Committee, two members who shared his views but forgot formally to move it though he spoke for half an hour. The Bill was, as is known to your readers by now, re-committed to the Select Committee which has since presented its report.

Sir Hari Sing Gour sustained two defeats on the same day. His solicitude for Anglo-Indians, Indian Christians and others who married under the Special Marriage Act evoked no response, but strong opposition from those quarters. Government too opposed it because the communities affected showed no desire to have the contemplated reform and Col. Crawford and Rev. Chatterjee wanted to wait till the English Law was reformed. The motion to refer the Bill to select committee was lost without a division. Dr. Gour's other Bill to entitle a Hindu woman to obtain a declaration of invalidity of her marriage or its dissolution on grounds of impotency or imbecility of her husband had to be withdrawn. He said custom in the country had made dissolution of marriage impossible, in cases where it was necessary. The Bill was attacked on the ground that courts already enjoyed jurisdiction in cases arising out of such matters.

THE BOLSHEVIKS BILL.

When Mr. Crerar moved for the consideration of the Public Safety Bill, Pandit Motilal raised a point of order, that the Assembly had no power to enact a law, which affected the allegiance of British subjects to the Crown by depriving them of the right granted to them by various charters, and that under section

65 of the Government of India Act Parliament had definitely excluded the Legislative Assembly from undertaking any such legislation. The President wanted time to decide the point and allowed further consideration of the Bill, reserving to himself full freedom to disallow the Bill at a later stage if he felt it was *ultra vires* of the Assembly. Government had of course to justify their plea of urgency put forward at an earlier meeting, which the Home Member, Mr. Crerar, tried to do without success. His was an unimpressive speech. He relied on the alleged letter of Mr. M. N. Roy to prove that India's safety was being menaced by Communist propaganda. In this connection, the *Pioneer* aptly remarks:—

"To convince the country at large that permanent extraordinary repressive legislation is necessary, because there are two mad Englishmen at work, something more is required than a sixth form essay on political extremism."

Mr. Amarnath Gutt moved for the circulation of the Bill for eliciting public opinion and Sir Hari Sing Gour for referring it to Select Committee. The situation with regard to the Bill is full of uncertainty, but Government are very keen on its passage this session and must be feeling keen disappointment at its dragging on in the way it is doing. In the debate on the Bill Sir Victor Sassoon made a powerful plea for its reference to select committee on the ground that the Bill was a necessity, in view of the threatened spread of Bolshevik ideas, which would not only destroy capitalists and religious leaders but even the present Trade Unionists in India. He feared the cultured classes would also suffer and a measure of protection with adequate safeguards was, in his view, urgently required. His view was hotly contested by the Opposition benches who questioned how one or two men could bring about all the strikes and disturbances taking place in the country. They contended that there really was no need for investing Government with those fresh powers which the Bill would confer upon them, their armoury being full of weapons with which they could satisfactorily cope with the situation. Lala Lajpat Rai voiced the general fear that though the Bill was directed against foreigners, it may even be used against Indians themselves, because clause two, empowering as it proposed to do the Government to deport any person who would directly or indirectly advocate the overthrow of the present Government was sufficiently comprehensive. Sir Purshottamdas refused to be a party to the dangerous legislation unless Government took the Assembly into their confidence in the matter, Mr. Joshi strongly repudiated the charge that the present labour unrest was due to communist propaganda and showed how it was action on the part of Government itself that sometimes prolonged the industrial trouble.

INCREASED SALARIES FOR JUDGES.

Mr. Ghuznavi's resolution recommending an increase in the salary of High Court Judges met with strong opposition. The mover held that with the increase in salaries of other services, it was necessary to revise Judges' salaries which underwent no improvement during the last forty years. Mr. Neogy opposed it strongly, saying that Judges' salaries were paid by Provincial Governments and it would be improper to be charitable at others' expense. He also wondered how the mover thought of it, when the Lee Commission had no recommendation to make in the matter. A comparison with foreign countries showed that India still led in the matter. Government remaining neutral, the proposition was lost by 22 to 47 votes.

REVIEW SECTION.

NAPOLEON BONAPARTE.

NAPOLEON. By EMIL LUDWIG. (Allen & Unwin.)
1927. 9½ × 6¼. pp. 707. 21s.

IN this book Herr Ludwig continues the biographic method which has already proved so successful in his studies of the Kaiser and Bismarck. His biographies are neither the old style panegyric, the heavily documented narratives from the cradle to the grave, nor the new style bucket method of Mr. Strachey which consists in dipping into the well of a life to bring up a random collection of facts in the hope that some of the mud at the bottom may stick to the bucket. Herr Ludwig's method is to attempt an intuitive comprehension of his subject's mind, and thus to unlock the whole life with the key of this inner secret. The old biographers portrayed the subjects in public, Mr. Strachey pursued them into the privacy of their studies, but Herr Ludwig tries to enter into their minds, to see with their eyes and to think their thoughts. The success of such a method clearly depends, not on any special methods or critical apparatus, but on the quality of the writer's imagination; he either understands his subject or does not, and all else is secondary.

In our opinion Herr Ludwig conspicuously succeeds in his attempt to understand Napoleon by intuitive imagination. We will not say that the secret of the most complex personality of modern times is now finally revealed, but the book goes far to unveil a character which is too often obscured in narratives of campaigns and descriptions of diplomacy. From this it follows that the book is no detailed record of Napoleon's achievements; it is a study of his developing personality, and facts are only introduced as they illuminate that theme. For this reason the book assumes a certain knowledge of the facts of Napoleon's career, and can only be read with most enjoyment when those facts are already familiar. The book is an interpretation of character, not a narrative of events. It would be doubtful wisdom to read it as a first book on Napoleon, but as an interpretation of facts already known it is admirable.

Herr Ludwig is very illuminating on the subject of Josephine. He brings out to the full her irresponsibility and indifference, her preference for the homage of Paris to the provincial society of Milan, her fear of the fiery ardour of a young Bonaparte's love. She could not see that one day she would be an Empress, and her later devotion was insufficient to soften the rigours of political necessity. Though Napoleon loved her to the end, as his visit to Malmaison on his return in 1812 shows, his early disillusionment of Josephine's character may well have helped to stifle his idealism, which had always been mixed with inordinate ambition and was already threatened by unprecedented success. The one person upon whom he lavished an entirely unselfish and unstinted affection failed him, and henceforth

there was nothing to counteract an increasingly cynical view of mankind.

The egoism thus developed, together with his ambition, had much to do with his ultimate catastrophic fall. He grew so used to relying on himself, alone, and so accustomed to political success, that finally he came to regard himself, at any rate subconsciously, as invincible, and he became psychologically incapable of saving himself as he might have done at any time in 1813 and 1814. Belief in his star, in youth a pleasing fantasy, became a fixed idea, and he finally failed to succeed because he believed too much in success. The same belief in his own power, as it gradually gained the supremacy in his mind, caused him to neglect one by one the forces which had helped him to supreme power—nationalism, democracy, enthusiasm for a cause. Up till 1806 no one was more careful to draw all possible psychological as well as military forces on his side; from that time he more and more disregarded them until they finally arose and overwhelmed him. Such was the "Spanish ulcer," whose nationalism so tied up 200,000 French troops for seven years that more than 40,000 could rarely be assembled at any one point to oppose the small Anglo-Portuguese army. Again, Polish nationalism, which he had successfully exploited in 1807, he neglected in 1812 with the result that a potentially friendly countryside, which could have supplied the Grand Army with ample provisions half way to Moscow, was as sullen and barren as Russia proper itself. So too, in Germany itself, the French, who had originally been welcomed as the destroyers of feudal anomalies and the harbingers of modern Government and ideas, came to be hated as foreign oppressors. The annexation of the north German coast, which could be justified on no other ground than imperialism, symbolised this change. When Napoleon so repeatedly in 1813 said that the Empire could not survive a defeat or contraction of its boundaries, although it survived both Moscow and Leipzig without *internal* collapse, he was really saying that his own conception of himself as invincible could not survive a defeat.

The interaction of his ambition and his growing egoism is well brought out by Herr Ludwig as contributing to his ruin. Napoleon could never rest on his laurels. As one apparently wild ambition was fulfilled it was succeeded by another, and each in turn was realised with such regularity that his judgment of the possible and impossible was gradually blurred. His early success as a general led him to aspire to the headship of the state, from Consulship he proceeded to Empire, from nationalism to European supremacy, and from European supremacy to world dominion, which finally led him to Moscow. Charlemagne and Alexander were never far from his mind, and his early dream of Oriental empire, diverted by the repulse of Acre, returned when he talked of using Russia as a base for a campaign against India by way of Persia. But by this time

his old realism had deserted him, he had become a visionary believer in his own invincibility. He fell because he had ceased to take account of actualities; the very forces he had used as levers to raise himself up turned against him to overthrow him. As a realist he climbed to supreme power, as an idealist he fell; he had forgotten the world and become a self-worshipper. Elba dispelled the illusion, for he was still quite sane, but it was then too late, and at St. Helena he could only prepare for the return of his heir by the invention of the doctrine of Bonapartism.

Herr Ludwig gives a vivid picture of those last days of the cramped and querulous society, of the wooden-headed governor who addressed the Emperor as General Bonaparte and refused to allow a regiment to accept a gift of books because they had on them the imperial monogram, and he does not forget their significance as the incubator of Bonapartism. The secret of Napoleon may never be fully understood, as Lord Rosebery has said, perhaps because it is too complex, or perhaps because there is no secret to understand. He will continue to fascinate and puzzle and exasperate future generations as the past. Herr Ludwig has shot a white beam of intuition into that dark mine of perplexities, and if he has not provided a final explanation, he has at any rate given us a glimpse of some, at least, of its dark places.

T. G. P. SPEAR.

A LIBERAL THEORY OF THE STATE.

THE LIBERAL STATE. BY THOMAS WHITTAKER.

(Watts.) 1928. 8 x 5 1/4. pp. 159. 6s.

IN the year before a General Election in England one would on opening a book entitled "The Liberal State" expect to find some discussion of Liberalism as a modern political programme. But the book is a reprint (with a few modifications) of one published in 1907. And the author expressly intimates to his reader that he is dealing with "political philosophy, not with practical politics". But is it possible to write of Liberalism as a political theory apart from Liberal parties and programmes? For if you say with Mr. Whittaker that Liberalism stands for liberty, there are few political parties that will allow a monopoly of this commodity to Liberalism. In fact Mr. Whittaker's use of the epithet 'Liberal' is unusual, for he applies it as "the generalised name for a new political system which arose spontaneously in the cities around the Mediterranean from the 7th to the 5th century B. C.". But history, it may be noted in passing, is not his strong point, for he makes the astounding statement which is typical "that the eastern system of Government (i. e. absolute monarchy) conquered Europe in the middle ages (i. e. the Europe of feudalism, Canon Law, Corporations and city states.)" Nor is he much happier in his choice of philosophical guides to Liberalism. He chooses Auguste Comte who, in the opinion of J. S. Mill (quoted by Mr. J. M. Robertson who writes a foreword) would have led to the most complete spiritual tyranny ever achieved among men. But he soon abandons his guide and places "Justice and Freedom" as the ideals of his Liberalism as against "Order and Progress." Legal equality, the principle of discrimination, personal merit, he regards as the means towards the end of Liberalism. But so was it of Napoleonic rule. If justice and liberty are the ends of Liberalism, which of them shall prevail when a conflict arises between them as it often

arises in modern circumstances? Socialism offers one such cause and occasion of conflict. Although he argues against socialism that suppression of property means suppression of liberty, yet he is socialistic enough like most Liberals of today to advocate state control of industry going so far as to ask the State to fix a legal maximum of income as the only permanently effective measure against the extremely wealthy class, the "practical tyrants of a nominal democracy." He shares the usual liberal belief that religion is only next best to philosophy and looks forward to a consensus of all the great religions in some ultimate philosophic synthesis. His idea of a free church in a free state is like the idea of most continental Liberals and some English Liberals i. e., of a free church only so far as a free State will allow it, for he would reduce the "free churches to the legal position of the philosophical schools of antiquity." But we must be thankful that in respect of education he, unlike Liberal utilitarians, would find a place for literature and the arts by the side of science. In fact he is not a doctrinaire Liberal for he would retain monarchy and the House of Lords in England. And that he does mean what he says when he asserts Justice and Liberty to be the guiding stars of Liberalism is proved when he inveighs against Prohibition as "a means of setting democracy against liberty in the service of new fanaticisms." Altogether, although Mr. Whittaker will disappoint those who go to find in his book the programme and prospects of English Liberals in the next few years, he has written a stimulating book which will make the reader meditate on his own political ideas because he will find much in it with which he will disagree,

M. RUTHNASWAMY.

HINDU PHILOSOPHY.

ESSAYS ON THE GITA. First and Second Series.

By SRI AUROBINDO GHOSE. (Arya Publishing House, Calcutta.) 1926, 1928. 9 x 5 1/2. pp. 379, 501.

BROADLY speaking, the Gita may be studied from one or two standpoints, the historical or the philosophical. The present study is not of the former kind and does not concern itself with questions like the age of the work or the sources from which it may have drawn its teaching. Nor is it strictly to be described as a study from the latter point of view, for it does not attempt to set forth, in all its detail, the ethical or the metaphysical doctrine of the Gita. Such an attempt, our author thinks, is hardly worth making in the case of an old work like this for it is sure to contain ideas, peculiar to the age in which it was produced, whose exact significance we can no longer understand. His aim in these Essays is rather to unfold the central theme of the work, disengaging it from all accidental features and thus to derive from it what is of permanent value to mankind. If any scripture lends itself to such a study, it is surely the Gita for there is so little of the local and the temporal in it. Yet it is a difficult task that the author has set himself; and we may say at once that it has been accomplished exceedingly well. The book gives abundant evidence of deep thinking and, as a work of interpretation, is of great and lasting value.

There are, as is well known, three elements in the teaching of the Gita—*Karma*, *Jnana* and *Bhakti*. While commentators are generally agreed that all these are inculcated there, they differ considerably from one another in regard to the value of, each as means of salvation and its precise place in a scheme of religious discipline. Our author does not approve of any of the old or even of the modern interpretations for they lay stress on one of these means at the

expense of the other two. It is the peculiarity of the method of the Gita to emphasize now one element of its teaching, now another, so that anybody that has a pet theory to advocate can easily find support for it there. But to take such emphasis as absolute is only to misrepresent the teaching. The Gita should be studied as a 'developing argument' and viewed as a whole before we can decide the character of its final teaching. Judged in this way, it will be seen to synthesize all the three means of action, knowledge and devotion. The larger part of the two volumes before us is taken up in expounding the nature of this synthesis. To begin with, there is *Karma-yoga* or disinterested activity, which means that the devotee, while believing that he is the doer, willingly renounces all claim for the fruit of the deed. What he does, he does in the spirit of a sacrifice to the Supreme, although he is yet far from realising his true relation to it. The modern interpreter is apt to attach undue importance to this aspect of the teaching, owing chiefly to his belief in social service as the highest ideal and his general distrust of asceticism. The Gita is undoubtedly a gospel of duty, but it is duty that culminates in knowledge and not duty dictated by mere social or even humanitarian considerations. The fact is that *Karma-yoga* marks only the initial step of the discipline and it is to be followed by *Jnana-yoga*, where not merely the desire of fruit but also the claim to be the doer is given up. For the Purusha is passive and what works through him is Prakriti or 'Universal Force'. In other words, our duty is determined for us and not by us. The significance of this step is that, realising our helplessness we should cultivate an "inner poise" which may be described as the foundation of true freedom. Some, especially among the old commentators, have held this up as the goal of existence according to the Gita; and have commended a life of isolation in preference to a life of activity as pointed to by *Karma-yoga*. Our author criticises this view also, for though the Gita teaches renunciation, it means by renunciation only detachment and not inaction. We must continue to do our duty even in the second stage, but in that state of poise to which we have just alluded. Cessation from activity may appear to us as the necessary consequence of a belief in the passivity of the self. The question here, however, is not whether one should or should not act but whether one can avoid acting. "Man is powerless against Prakriti which drives him to act and he cannot stand aloof even for one moment" (iii, 5). So *Jnana* does not exclude *Karma*. They are not two separate means of discipline but a lower and a higher one. The lower leads to the higher; it is at the same time included in it and purified by it. But this blend of *Karma* and *Jnana* is not the last word of the Gita, for it yet presents a difficulty which demands a solution. The reason assigned for the continuance of activity is negative: it is constraint from without, not an impulse from within. If that were the whole truth, it would tend to reduce the activity to a minimum; and, what is worse, it would lead to indifference towards the nature of the action done. Such a result would rob the Gita of all its meaning. Hence *Jnana* is to be supplemented by *Bhakti*, the essential point about which is the recognition of Purushottama, the Supreme Person as the sole Reality—the self dwelling in Him and Prakriti representing His infinite power in manifestation. The opposition between the last two is here resolved and the constraint of Prakriti is transformed into the divine will working through the self. When, knowing this, the devotee turns in loving adoration and surrenders his being to the Highest, he discovers a new meaning

for his existence. But he does not give up action even then; only it now becomes one with divine action, which is not merely doing social or other duties as such, but becoming "the willing and understanding instrument" of God in the fulfilment of His purpose. That marks the final synthesis and it shows that the Gita is not, as it is often taken to be, a book of practical ethics but of spiritual life.

We cannot in the space at our disposal even mention by name the large number of topics that are incidentally discussed in the forty and odd essays comprising these two bulky volumes. We shall refer briefly to but one of them—the idea of *avatar*—as a specimen of the illuminating treatment they receive here. The occasion for discussing this topic here is the explicit reference to it in the Gita. It is first pointed out how in India, with its belief in the unity of Being and the immanence of God in the universe, the concept of *avatar* ceases to be a mere metaphor. "Far from the unborn being unable to assume birth, all beings are even in their individuality, unborn spirits, eternal without beginning or end". The possibility of *avatar* being indicated, its purpose is next discussed. An *avatar* which means a descent of God, 'the birth of God in humanity', implies an ascent of man, 'the birth of man into the godhead'; and it is the helping of this ascent that is its chief purpose, the upholding of *dharma* mentioned in the Gita (iv. 8) in this connection being only the necessary condition for it. "It is the manifestation from above of that which we have to develop from below". Every *avatar* accordingly liberates forces that tend to take mankind nearer to God. The specific work in which an *avatar* is engaged depends upon the circumstances in which it manifests itself and it may not always exhibit this purpose clearly. But whatever its immediate work, it is sure to leave a spiritual influence behind, as may be seen for instance in the case of Buddha. Hinduism rejected his teaching but yet bears upon it the impress of more than one salutary doctrine he taught.

There are, as we have said, various other discussions of importance here but we must refer the lover of the Gita to the book itself where he may read them in the author's lucid and fluent style.

M. HIRIYANNA.

FUNCTIONAL DISTRIBUTION.

THE PRINCIPLES OF WAGES. By WILLEM L. VALK. (King.) 1928. 9¾ x 5½. pp. 139. 8s. 6d.

SOME two years ago a cash prize of \$5,000 was offered through the generosity of Messrs. Hart Schaffner and Marx of Chicago "for the best original treatise on the subject of the *Theory of Wages*", and among the contributions submitted was this essay, to which, in addition to two others, the Committee of Judges "asked the donors to award honourable mention".

This essay bears evidence of all the usual characteristics of a competition essay. First, the footnotes and references are as copious as they are ample in representing the author's "toil and trouble", and from a passing count it appears that 34 pages only of this small treatise of 136 pages are spared, room having been found for over 250 footnotes on the remaining pages. Secondly, there is a bibliography extending over 3 pages and reciting nearly 100 names. Thirdly, the form of a journal article or a competition essay probably justifies the want of an index. Nextly, there are also long quotations in French and German (pp. 43, 48-49, 6, 92, 102-4, etc.), besides the accommodation for foreign phrases and ideas like, "passe-partout", "Aufteilung", "einstufig" v. "zweistufig", "Kosten productivemittel" and longer ones alongside with their English equivalents, a habit

natural to a foreigner writing in English. One can sympathise with Dr. Valk of Scheveningen for his use of the English idiom, but cannot escape being mystified at passages like "This quantity can therefore be considered as a function of all the prices, which procures Prof. Cassel the following series of equations" (p. 109), and again "Another peculiarity of Prof. Clark's theory and which has caused very many misunderstandings is that he calls the marginal product of a given quantity of interchangeable agents of production the amount of wealth created by each unit of this agent" (p. 32). Lastly, the research aspect of the essay finds emphasis in the "critical comparisons of the principles of wages of the different groups of economists", and in the examination of the several "logical" possibilities and of various "theories" of wages, reference to which will be made in the next paragraph. Quite naturally therefore Prof. Laughlin, the Chairman of the Committee of Judges writes in his short introduction that "It is with great pleasure that the Committee herewith express their high regard of the scholarship and economic ability shown by Dr. Valk in this book".

The book is entitled 'the Principles of Wages' and even according to the author's own admission (p. 131) "only rarely have we referred to the special case of wages", and in fact we are told "that there is no such thing as a separate theory of wages". It may be said that the author is chiefly concerned with a problem in distribution, known as *functional* distribution as contrasted with *personal* distribution, the latter of which, relating as it does to the incomes of private individuals, is not determined merely by economic factors. Further limitations to a static society, to an invariable supply, and to an unfettered competition greatly restrict the scope of the subject, the actual problem examined being the determination of "the general relation between the prices of the means of production and those of the consumers' goods which they create". In this propositional form it is easy to argue that of the two prices neither is derivable solely or explicitly from the other, but that the two are mutually correlated or are expressible, as mathematicians say, as an implicit function of both the unknowns.

The method of analysis employed is in the nature of a *reductio ad absurdum*. For, firstly, the value of an article is measured by the loss of utility which results from its withdrawal, according to what is called the loss-principle of Gossen, Menger, and Bohm-Bawrek. Although this may be eminently satisfactory for consumers' goods, yet the application to producers' goods fails on account of the latter's "complementary" character, whereby they must always be combined with other producers' goods in order to create utilities and cannot be considered in isolation. Moreover this loss-principle leads to its natural implication—the theory of marginal productivity. Secondly, as an extension of the complementary use of goods, we have the thought of a valuation by replacing or substituting some elements to produce at minimum costs a theory emphasised largely by Bohm-Bawrek and Schumpeter. Even here it will be noticed "that separate values of complementary goods are in reality again complementary values, and therefore amounts to reasoning in a circle and in a way that points in the direction of the theory of marginal productivity." Next, therefore this theory of marginal productivity, so attractive to Clark, Marshall, Jevons, Pigou and all the rest of modern writers, is inevitable. The principle of this theory as applied to wages is that "the effective importance to his employer of any of the interchangeable men employed by him is measured by the absolute importance of the one that does the least necessary work" (p. 25). "This requires the ideal

conditions of "an imaginary, static, frictionless state, in which profits do not exist, and in which competition is perfectly "unobstructed" (p. 31). Besides these unreal factors there is the unfortunate objection that "When the prices of the means of production are equal to marginal productivity, the sum of these prices would exceed the sum available for distribution" (p. 134). And so on the process of *reductio ad absurdum* is continued through the 'residual theory', the 'bargain theory' and others, in the philosophic style of "not-this-not-this", until we are taken to the shrine of mathematics by Wieser, Walras and Cassel, wherein an unerring, even if an unreal, solution is ever available for any problem.

The method consists in writing down all the possible factors that enter into production under the usual economic implications, viz., (1) the condition of demand for consumers' goods, (2) the technical circumstances of production, (3) the available supply of the means of production, (4) the valuation of producers' goods and (5) the condition that a state of equilibrium is attained under these circumstances. The equations connecting them can thus be added on until we arrive at a number which is equivalent to the number of variables admitted, so that the theoretical possibility of determining all the unknowns (in the present case of $(2n+r)$) is indicated. Obviously no academic objection can be made against this (if any, only that of elimination), as indeed against any such mathematical comprehensiveness. The mathematical economist however feels the omission in this book of any reference to the factor of wages among those who earn them (Pigou, *Economics of Welfare*, p. 623), and to the correction for transfer elements in supply (Pigou, *Royal Economic Journal*, June 1928). These however refer to functional distribution and variable supply and are perhaps omitted on that account. Also the author has deliberately passed over Moore's classical investigation on the statistical laws of Wages.

It is the exact nature of the five considerations mentioned just now and the possible form in which they may appear in any actual problem that are the real unknowns, and no mathematical demonstration will or can take the subjective or psychological perspective. The author has chosen only a limited field for investigation and has emphatically declared (p. 111) that he is solving only an 'academic', 'natural' problem, and not one 'for labourers', nor 'for their many friends', nor 'for Marxism' nor 'for Utopianism' nor 'for social reconstruction'. How the present disturbed society all the world over, which is confused over a medley of terms—nominal wage, real wage, economic wage, efficiency wage, standard wage, minimum wage, living wage, proper wage, etc., etc.—and is seeking the most proper among the methods of remunerating labour, will be satisfied with this thesis it is difficult to say. It is a book essentially for the mathematical economist, concise but clear, incomplete but instructive.

K. B. MADHAVA.

SHORT NOTICE.

EVOLUTION DISPROVED. BY WILLIAM A. WILLIAMS. (The Author, New Jersey.) 1928. 7½ x 5. pp. 125. \$1.00.

THIS Reverend gentleman, Ex-President of Franklin College, ranks along with Mark Twain, Jerome K. Jerome and P. G. Wodehouse among the world's greatest humorists. The only pity is that the humour is absolutely unconscious. He is a believer in the literal truth of the story of the genesis and according to him 5077 years have elapsed since the flood and that Noah and his wife lived 5177 years ago and

were the sole ancestors of the present human race I am unable to resist the temptation of quoting a few passages from this wonderful book.

"It staggers one to think of the countless and difficult calculations that are made instantly by the divine mind in every part of the Universe. The path of every snowflake that lazily pursues its tortuous course, and rests upon the lap of the earth, is marked out not by law or agent but by God himself... Every second about 16,000,000 tons of rain and snow fall to the earth; and God calculates the paths of the myriad flakes of snow and drops of rain instantly and unerringly" (p. 37)... and one asks oneself "what for?"

"Gravitation requires the computation of countless millions of the most complex and difficult problems, every instant, by the divine mind. The attraction of all matter for all other matter is in proportion directly to the mass and inversely to the square of the distance. The exact weight of every object is determined by the attraction by the earth and every particle thereof, the mountain that may be nearby, the elevation and altitude of the place, the attraction of the sun and the moon, and every star in the heaven, even though too small to be computed by man,—all these are computed precisely by the divine mind. These innumerable calculations prove that God is everywhere."

Contemptible atheists! Go and hide your faces; do not try to fight such unanswerable arguments. By the way, we heartily recommend God to a professorship of mathematical physics.

"Many evolutionists are atheists. Some believe in the eternity of matter. This cannot be. Both mind and matter cannot be eternal. Mind controls matter; and not matter, mind. Hence the mind of God created matter" (p. 48).

What wonderfully cogent argument! And may one enquire what the *body* of God was doing?

The author summarises:

"Evolution carried to a logical conclusion would destroy everything precious to the heart of a Christian. It denies the real inspiration of the Bible. It makes Moses a liar. It denies the story of creation and substitutes an impossible guess. It denies miracles, the providence of God, the creation of man and beast, and God's government and control of the world. It laughs at the Virgin Birth and makes Christ a descendant of the brute on both sides. It denies his deity, his miracles, his resurrection from the dead. It joins hands with agnosticism, modernism and other forms of infidelity and atheism and gives them the strongest support they have ever had..."

And one unconsciously says, "if this is really so then three cheers for evolution!"

The book was first published in 1925 and the authorities of the Mental Hospital in Camden apparently do not yet consider the case ripe enough for their intervention, for a second edition has been published this year—and you can buy two copies for the price of one by becoming an agent and therefore getting 50% commission!

D. D. KARVE.

CORRESPONDENCE.

"INDIAN ECONOMICS."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SERVANT OF INDIA.

SIR, In your issue of August 16 last a review of our book on Indian Economics appeared which was so flattering that it almost made us purr with self-

satisfaction. We hate even the appearance of complaining but with your permission we would like to refer to one little point with regard to which your reviewer seems to have misunderstood us. Referring to our argument that for practical purposes it does not much matter whether we admit individual property in land or state landlordism, the reviewer states correctly that we "do not apprehend arbitrary enhancement or rack-renting by government on the basis of that theory" (i. e. the theory of state landlordism). In advancing this view we are not displaying any "touching faith in civilized governments." We are not denying that "governments all the world over are found to pick out any loophole for raising their revenues." But we do say that this process will not be rendered any easier merely because the state's claim to be considered landlord is accepted. Government in this country cannot think of meeting complaints against their revenue assessments with the mere assertion that, as landlords, they are perfectly within their legal rights in pitching the rent as high as they like. They would have to justify their policy by trying to prove that the assessment is not in fact heavy and oppressive as it is made out to be and in doing so the appeal would be to principles which have nothing to do with state landlordism. Yours, etc.

G. B. JATHAR.

S. G. BERI.

Poona, September 2.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION. By JAMES MAVOR. (Allen & Unwin.) 1928. 10 x 6½. pp. 470. 21s.
- SOCIAL ECONOMICS. By FRIEDERICH VON WIESER. (Allen & Unwin.) 1927. 9½ x 6½. pp. 470. 20s.
- THE BRITISH LIBERAL PARTY. By HAMILTON FYFE. (Allen & Unwin.) 1928. 8½ x 5½. pp. 272. 10s. 6d.
- THE SOCIAL SCIENCES AND THEIR INTERRELATIONS. Ed. by WILLIAM FIELDING OGBURN AND ALEXANDER GOLDENWEISER. (Allen & Unwin.) 8½ x 5½. pp. 506. 16s.
- THE DAWES PLAN AND THE NEW ECONOMICS. By GEORGE P. AULD. (Allen & Unwin.) 1927. 8½ x 5½. pp. 317. 10s. 6d.
- LENINISM. By JOSEPH STALIN. (Allen & Unwin.) 1928. 8½ x 5½. pp. 472. 7s. 6d.
- THE PAYMENT OF WAGES. By G. D. H. COLE. (Allen & Unwin.) 1928. 8½ x 5½. pp. 155. 6s.
- THE MODERN CASE FOR SOCIALISM. By A. W. HUMPHREY. (Allen & Unwin.) 8½ x 5½. pp. 272. 12s. 6d.
- BOLSHEVISM, FASCISM AND DEMOCRACY. By FRANCESCO NITTI. (Allen & Unwin.) 1927. 8½ x 5½. pp. 223. 7s. 6d.
- CHAITANYA TO VIVEKANANDA. (Natesan & Co., Madras.) 1928. 7 x 4½. pp. 152. Rs. 1-8.
- HANDBOOK OF SUGGESTIONS ON HEALTH EDUCATION. (Board of Education, London.) 1928. 7½ x 4½. pp. 83. 6d.
- NOTES ON KOLHAPUR. By R. V. SABNIS. (The Times Press, Bombay.) 1928. 8½ x 5½. pp. 88. Rs. 3.

WANTED Candidates for Telegraph and Station Master's Classes. Full particulars and Railway Fare Certificate on two annas stamp.

Apply to:—

Central Telegraph College, Nai Sarak, DELHI.