

Servant of India

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

VOL. XI, No. 41.

POONA—THURSDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1928.

INDIAN SUBSN. Rs. 6
FOREIGN 15s.

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	549
ARTICLES :—	
The Indian States and the British Crown	551
The Draft Constitution and Communal Representation. By H. C. E. Zacharias, Ph.D.	553
U. T. C. Officer's Pay and Allowances. By H. P. T.	554
OUR EUROPEAN LETTER	555
OUR SOUTH AFRICAN LETTER	556
REVIEWS :—	
Nineteenth Century America. By Miss A. B. Van Doren	558
Black and White in S. Africa. By V. Shiva Ram, M.A., Ph.D., F.R. Hist. S.	558
SHORT NOTICES	560
CORRESPONDENCE :—	
Oppression in Dewas. By R. B. Thompson	560
BOOKS RECEIVED	560

TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

THE Simon Commission is again in our midst, having landed at Bombay on the 11th inst. The manner it was received at Bombay and at Poona where it arrived the next morning made it plain to all unprejudiced observers of current events that they were unwelcome visitors. In Bombay, in the words of the *Pioneer* which cannot be charged with an abundance of partiality for Indians, they were "attended by officials, welcomed by a few odd associations, the waiting representatives of the press and the Government of India's Director of Misinformation, with copious police guards behind locked gates." "It is a strange comment," to borrow again the expressive phraseology of the same paper, "upon the democratic spirit of friendliness which should inspire the relationship today between Great Britain and India, that the inquiring committees of the Mother of Parliaments should be smuggled ashore by zealous policemen, and shepherded by unimaginative officialdom." If they escaped out of Bombay under cover of darkness, and avoided seeing anything of the anti-Commission demonstration outside the gates of the mole station, they could not, much as they would have liked to do, escape the welcome that awaited them at Poona before they reached the Railway station. Here they were greeted by huge crowds of people belonging to all shades of political opinion with cries of "Simon, Go Back" and hundreds of black flags bearing that inscription. The transaction of all business was suspended and there was a fairly complete hartal, such as cannot be arranged without the people as a whole being very resentful. In direct contrast was the reception officially got up for them at the railway station with the help of people who depend for everything upon official favour. No wonder that this welcome lacked all spontaneity and

suffered from lack of enthusiasm. And as for numbers, even with the frantic efforts of local officials and a handful of their henchmen, not more than about three hundred could be got together and these too were mostly Government pensioners, sirdars, and military contractors. But we should not be surprised if some of those that helped that day to swell the numbers of official welcomers of the Commission at the station do not at all feel proud of their conduct. And yet there are not lacking unscrupulous newspaper correspondents, who from interested motives do not hesitate to describe the official welcome of the Commission as having been inspired by the "greatest enthusiasm," and characterise it as "a mammoth public reception." Whether in doing so they wished to deceive others or themselves, we do not know; but we are sure Sir John Simon, a shrewd observer of men and things as he is known to be, cannot have failed to mark the strength of public feeling on the subject of his Commission's visit to this country.

THE main justification of the exclusion of Indians from the Statutory Commission was that the Commission would otherwise become unwieldy, and consequently inefficient as an investigating body by reason of too many representatives of various sections and interests having to be included if any Indian was Lord Birkenhead, who, happily, makes an exit at any rate from the Indian scene, mentioned, we think, the figure 20, which, according to him, was an alarmingly large one. The numerical strength of the Commission, with the Central and Provincial Committees, who, we are assured, are to have in every respect an equal status with the Commission, exceeds this figure. Twenty-three Commissioners are sitting at present to examine witnesses at Poona and the number will remain the same everywhere. What then happens to the reason given by Lord Birkenhead as having made it impossible for him to admit any Indian to the Commission as full member? Representatives of communal and sectional interests are, it must be admitted, going before the Commission in large numbers, and indeed communalism has received a strong impetus by this inquiry. We no longer hear merely of backward classes and depressed classes, but several fragments of them, each setting up a claim to separate representation in the legislatures, local bodies, public service, academic institutions, and what not. And the quality of these representations is usually so extremely poor that one wonders what the Commissioners will make of it all. We do not regret the absence of any helpful evidence being tendered, for the Commission deserve no better. But what is surprising is that most of the written official evidence, which alone counts in the present inquiry, is kept secret from the public. Such are the public sittings which the Statutory Commission is having in India!

ALL misgivings about Bombay's attitude towards the Report issued by the All-Parties' Bombay's Support Conference were set at rest during for Nehru Report last week when a meeting at which speakers from all political parties acclaimed the Report as the joint demand of the nation. Sir Chimanlal Setalvad as President paid a tribute to the judicial fairness and far-sighted statesmanship displayed by the Nehru Committee in dealing with the complex problems of Indian constitutional development. He declared himself as accepting the position of a self-governing Dominion as defined by the Imperial Conference of 1926. He earnestly pleaded with those Muslims who did not agree with some of the proposals in the Report with regard to Muslim representation not to unfurl the banner of revolt but to sit in friendly conference and solve the details. We trust that such an appeal from a leader known to be above communal prejudices would not be lost on those to whom it is addressed. Sir Purshottandas Thakurdas, in sponsoring the principal resolution giving cordial support to the Nehru Report, said that there was no room for a discordant note except from those who believed that India was not fit for the immediate grant of full responsibility and he was sure that there was no thinking Indian in the hall who was not prepared to pass the resolution with unanimity. In his opinion, there was no half-way house to responsibility, and the argument based on the vested interests of the Europeans in India was not valid as the prosperity of all stake-holders depended on the prosperity of the masses which would be furthered by a national Government in India. As for the Commission, he said he had no quarrel with them and would leave them alone. Mr. Jayakar endorsed Sir Chimanlal Setalvad's appeal to dissentient Muslims to try and adjust the differences in a spirit of harmony instead of remaining aloof. We are glad to find that Mr. Jamnadas Mehta, while sounding a slightly jarring note, lent his support to the resolution instead of keeping away like his confrere Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar, whose abstention from the Madras Conference has been a puzzle to everybody. Sir Phiroze Sethna deprecated destructive propaganda against the Nehru Report which, in his opinion, was inspired by those who trotted out the white man's burden as the only safeguard against the neglect of the interests of the minorities. As one belonging to a minority community himself he believed that the Nehru Scheme was the best safeguard of those interests. The support of Mr. Chagla, Mr. Hussainbhai Lalji and Mr. Brelvi, who are representative Muslims, is significant as showing that a large portion of Muslims are willing to stand by the united national demand. It remains for the political associations all over the province to secure support for the scheme by popular exposition of its various items. In the meantime we are glad to learn that efforts are being made to organise an All Parties Conference for the Bombay Presidency during the Simon Commission's stay in this city.

A VERY wrong lead has been given to the Bombay Muslims by Maulana Shafi Daudi, the President of the meeting of the Muslims held under the auspices of the Central Khilafat Committee, during the week. The Resolutions passed at the meeting are so badly worded that we do not think much credit can be given to those who drafted them; however the drift of the resolutions is clear enough. They appeal to the supporters of the Nehru Report not to disregard the claims of the Muslims, and to accept the amendments that may be proposed by the All India Muslim Conference. They further appeal to the Muslims of all parties to consider the Report

from the Muslim point of view and criticize the supporters of the Report for suppressing the public voice of the Muslims and thus causing strained Hindu-Muslim feelings. Now to say that the claims of the Muslims are disregarded simply because joint electorates are proposed and reservation of seats beyond the number proportionate to population is denied is grotesque to a degree. In fact during the discussion there was no definite argument or exposition as Mr. Brelvi pointed out, except a vague denunciation of the supporters of the Nehru Report. Mr. Brelvi had no difficulty in proving that the Nehru Scheme was more favourable to Muslims than the Congress Resolution at Madras and he warned the audience against playing into the hands of the enemies of the country's freedom by opposing the Report and thus failing to present an agreed constitution. The most practical suggestion at the meeting was made by Mr. Hussainbhai Lalji when he said that a Muslim Conference should decide something agreeable to all sections and present their case to the All-Parties Convention. In summing up the President deplored that the reservation of seats was allowed only for ten years; it is clear from this that he expects perpetual reservation in complete disregard of the fact that such a method of protecting minorities was inconsistent with a true democracy. We believe Maulana Shafi Daudi has exaggerated the difficulty of a Muslim candidate capturing an unreserved seat in a joint electorate. As for his inveighing against the "shameless communal mentality of the Hindu majority," it does not come with a good grace from one who bids for perpetual reservation of seats on communal grounds.

AT a time like the present when it has become the fashion with a certain section of the An Oasis in the Mahomedans to demand separate treatment in every respect, for their community the sentiments expressed by Sir Ghulam Hussain Hidayatullah at the recently held Bombay Provincial Muslim Educational Conference are a veritable oasis in the desert. He at any rate does not now stand for separate schools for Mahomedans. Indeed he sees no very great need for them and is of opinion that mixed schools possess many advantages which ought not to be lost to any community. It is in schools that the young men of both communities get to know each other at close quarters and for life-long friendships. The evil of separate schools was that they not only keep the Hindu and Muslim youths apart but promote in them narrow communal feeling, which should be avoided at all costs. Sir Ghulam Hussain hit the mark when he said that misunderstanding was usually the result of the absence of mutual knowledge. There can be no doubt that the proper place to acquire this knowledge is the school room, and that those communalists who looked upon themselves as 100 per cent. Mahomedans because they ask for separate treatment for their community right up from the school were really doing a disservice not only to their own community but to the whole country. It is to be hoped that the liberal views expressed by such a responsible Mahomedan leader and certainly no anti-communalist as Sir Ghulam Hussain will find a ready response from his co-religionists and that from mixed schools to mixed electorates would be but a very short step.

THE *New Leader*, organ of the Independent Labour Party, shows a correct appreciation of the situation in India when on the eve of the departure of the Simon Commission for this country it wrote as follows:—

"The Simon Commission is about to return to India Officially, the position has improved from its point of view. All except one of the Provincial Councils have now decided, with the voting help of their unelected members, to appoint cooperating Committees and, though the decision of the Legislative Assembly has not been reversed, the Viceroy intends to appoint members of a national committee over its head. The members of the Commission should not be misled into thinking, however, that the boycott has broken down. The changed attitude of the Provincial Councils is due to the fact that some sectional interests have come to the conclusion that they are likely to get more for themselves by cooperation. It is always easy to appeal to the sectionalism of such interests, and the publication of the draft constitution of the All-Parties' Conference has made the appeal more attractive, because inevitably in the elaboration of a national policy a compromise of varying sectional claims had to be made. The fact remains, however, that all three of the national elected parties in India, with the support of the Indian Trades Union Congress, remain opposed to the Commission. It was an act of high courage for the Indian parties to risk division by proceeding with constitution-making under the present conditions and time will prove that their work will be of decisive importance for the future. The British Labour Party is committed at least to Dominion status for India, and must give effect to the demand of the All-Parties' Conference, whatever the Simon Commission may recommend."

* * *

WE are glad to congratulate the *Hindu* of Madras Golden Jubilee of on its having lived long enough to celebrate its Golden Jubilee and we the *Hindu*. hope it will enjoy a still longer life to continue the national work to which it has devoted itself all these years. Having been started in 1878 as a weekly, it extended its scope of usefulness by transforming itself into a tri-weekly and later on into a daily paper. There was a time when in the absence of the popular journals of to-day, Northern and Western India looked to the *Hindu* as the leading exponent of Indian nationalism. Whatever may be said of its influence in other provinces there is no gainsaying that the credit of transforming Madras as a benighted presidency into one in the full current of national life and having a well-developed public opinion belongs preeminently to the *Hindu*. The names of Mr. G. Subrahmanya Iyer and Mr. Kasturiranga Iyengar will ever be associated with the journal, which by their combined efforts easily rose to the rank of a national institution. We may well believe the assurances given by the proprietors of the journal and the present editor during the recent Jubilee celebrations that they would continue to uphold the tradition of the paper of fearless criticism of men and measures untainted by personalities, and voicing Indian public opinion "during the storm and the struggle that yet remains before the country in the winning of freedom." Sir T. B. Sapru truly said that when the time comes for dividing the honour between various organs of public opinion, of building up the great edifice of nationalism, the verdict of the impartial judge will assign a large share to the *Hindu*. It will be recalled that Mr. Natarajan and Mr. Chintamani, the two leading exponents of Indian journalism in Bombay and U.P., learnt their first lessons on the staff of the *Hindu*. We may also endorse Mrs. Besant's opinion that in the difficult times that lie before us, the *Hindu* 'will keep the flag of free press flying against whatever storms may come' and say what is true and judge without prejudice to one side or the other in any controversy that may arise. The numerous messages of congratulations that the journal has received already bear testimony to the appreciation of the service that it has rendered to the cause of the Indian national movement for five decades and we earnestly trust that it will continue to deserve these tokens.

* * *

THE INDIAN STATES AND THE BRITISH CROWN.

THE legal advice of Sir Leslie Scott and four other counsel engaged by the Indian Princes is now published (not, H. H. the Maharaja of Bikaner will kindly note, by the pestilential *Sourashtra* but by the friendly Anglo-Indian papers) on the true character of the relationship, subsisting between the Indian States and the British Crown. They admit that all the States have ceded to the Crown "the whole conduct of (their) foreign relations and the whole responsibility of (internal and external) defence." They have also ceded other rights of internal sovereignty, but the extent of this cession must be determined separately in the case of each individual State by its agreement with the Crown. In every case the consent of the States is the only source of the transfer to the Crown of any of their original sovereign powers. This opinion, it need only be observed, is in direct conflict with the pronouncement of Lord Reading as Viceroy (concurred in by His Majesty's Government) that "the sovereignty of the British Crown is supreme in India, and . . . its supremacy is not based only on treaties and engagements, but exists independently of them" (Cmd. 2661).

As a consequence of the rights pertaining to "foreign relations and external and internal security" which vest in it as Paramount Power, the Crown, the counsel further admit, is entitled to interfere with the internal sovereignty of a ruler in certain circumstances, e. g.: in cases of misgovernment likely to imperil the security of his State; but it cannot claim a general discretionary right to interfere in cases in which such interference is not necessary in the interest of the discharge of the responsibilities involved in its paramountcy. In all other cases each State retains its full sovereignty, and is thus on a plane of equality with British India. Lord Reading, in the pronouncement referred to above, dealt with this matter also when rejecting H. E. H. the Nizam's claim to independence in the internal affairs of his State subject to the only exception of questions relating to foreign powers and policies. On this point also Lord Reading was emphatic; for he asserted that "quite apart from its prerogative in matters relating to foreign powers and policies, it is the right and duty of the British Government, while scrupulously respecting all treaties and engagements with the Indian States, to preserve peace and good order throughout India;" and further that "where the general welfare of the people of a State is seriously or grievously affected by the action of its Government, it is with the paramount power that the ultimate responsibility for taking remedial action, if necessary, rests". The responsibility of the suzerain power to maintain "good order" and secure the "general welfare of the people" in Indian States obviously carries with it a much wider power of interference than the Princes' counsel are prepared to allow it. The Government of India must have sent in a memorandum making good its own claims and rebutting the counter-claims of the Princes. In these circumstances it is

hardly necessary for us to elaborate a justification of the British Government's position. We will only make mention here of authoritative pronouncements by other statesmen like Lord Hardinge, Lord Northbrook, Lord Salisbury, Sir T. Munro etc., quoted in the "Memorandum of the Indian States' People"* which give a far more liberal interpretation to the right accruing to the Crown in virtue of its position as paramount power pledged to prevent misrule.

The "Joint Opinion" of the five counsel reiterates the contention of Sir Leslie Scott in the *Law Quarterly Review*, fully answered by the Nehru-Sapru Committee, that the Princes have relations with the Crown alone, and that the Crown cannot delegate to a popular government the exercise of the rights and the discharge of the obligations attaching to it as Paramount Power. The reasoning adopted in the "Opinion" is somewhat new and it may be briefly examined here. The counsel admit that "the States cannot dictate to the Crown the particular methods by which, or servants through whom, the Crown should carry out its obligations. The Secretary of State, the Viceroy and the present Government of British India are the servants chosen by the Crown to perform the Crown's obligations to the States. So long as those obligations are being fulfilled, and the rights of the States respected, the States have no valid complaint." But when the Crown modifies the constitution and chooses a responsible ministry instead of the present irresponsible government as its instrument for performing its duties and enforcing its rights, the States, according to these eminent counsel, have every reason to complain. For, it is argued, "this liberty (to choose its instruments as it pleases) is necessarily subject to the condition that the agency and machinery, used by the Crown for carrying out its obligations, must not be of such a character, as to make it politically impracticable for the Crown to carry out its obligations in a satisfactory manner", the assumption being that a democratic government is from its very nature unable to redeem these obligations. It is not explained in what respects an autocratic government is necessarily better situated than a democratic one in respect of such matters as "the conduct of the States' foreign relations or the maintenance of their external or internal security." It is apparently too obvious to require any proof. It is further assumed that when cession of sovereignty took place on the part of the Indian States to the British Crown, it was "in reliance on its (the Crown's) special characteristics and reputation". The "special characteristics and reputation" on which the Princes relied are preserved only when an autocratic government is in power and destroyed when a democratic government takes its place! Still another assumption is here made: an autocratic government is under the control of the Crown, but a democratic is "in law or fact independent of the control of the

British Crown". One must exercise restraint in criticising the opinions of legal luminaries like Sir Leslie Scott, but it is difficult to conceive of more arrant non-sense than this. What characteristics has the Crown apart from its executive government? And how does a responsible government cease to be under the control of the Crown? Is it seriously suggested that when once a treaty is entered into in a part of the British Empire under a Crown Colony form of government, the treaty engagements require for their fulfilment the continuance of that form of government either till the crack of doom or till the other party to the treaty agrees to a modification of it? Does the other party by this one act of having entered into a treaty acquire the right to put a perpetual veto upon the constitutional growth of that part of the British Empire? It is passing strange that lawyers of the high eminence of Sir Leslie Scott can weave fantastic theories as this.

It should be noted however that the counsel themselves have declared that the claim put forward e. g. by H. E. H. the Nizam, that all matters in dispute between a State and the British Government should be referred to an independent body for determination instead of Government itself setting up as judge, is not sustainable. They have given it as their opinion that, "disregarding all political considerations, there is no legal obligation upon the Crown to provide machinery for independent adjudication. Each State, when ceding paramountcy, obtained from the Crown by agreement certain undertakings, express or implied, but in our view this was not one, and cannot be implied. The States merely relied upon the Crown to carry out its undertakings." If this is so, can it not be maintained with equal force that the States similarly relied upon the Crown to carry out its obligations without insisting upon what agents it should employ in doing so? Why cannot the Crown choose for this purpose a government responsible to the legislature just as much as a government independent of the legislature?

But all these legal abstractions apart, the hard fact is, and the Princes may well take account of it, that, however unwilling the British Government may be in its own interest to grant self-government to British India, it will never admit the right of the States to interpose a veto on such grant. The *Statesman*, no unfriend of Indian States, makes very telling remarks on this. It says: "Two points are notably absent from all the pronouncements of the lawyers. One is consideration of the position of the subjects of the Princes who are apparently offered the blessings of permanent despotism guaranteed by the British Crown and Parliament. That presumably is because the subjects have not yet obtained legal advice. The other is the tax-payer in British India who alone finds the money to implement this guarantee. Whatever the law may be, if the British taxpayer were asked to find the money to maintain troops permanently for the purpose of guaranteeing the Princes against internal and external aggression, he would soon see that the Crown was relieved of this obligation. Parliament is sovereign and can do as it likes,

* Published under the auspices of the Indian States' People's Conference. (Arya Bhushan Press, Poona.) 1928. 9 x 6½. pp. 253+xxii. Rs. 10.

and it would lose no time in arranging for that. . . . The final arbitrament is still willingness to die for a cause and though the British are as willing as ever to go into the trenches for good reason they are not prepared to back the cause of taxation without representation in modern India." Of the two parties who have been consistently ignored in the consideration of this question, one, the British Indian taxpayer, is now wide awake to the grave danger implicit in the Princes' claim not merely to the maintenance intact of such sovereign powers as yet remain to them, irrespective of the wishes of their subjects, but to the continuance of the present irresponsible form of government in British India for all time to come. His awakening cannot of course be doubted, but we would assure all the Princes that the other party too, viz. the people of the Indian States have been aroused, and they will not allow themselves to be treated as something utterly irrelevant to these discussions. Whatever the law may be in the view of the legal pundits, in future arrangements with Indian States the British Government cannot afford to treat merely with the Princes as representing the sovereigns of those States; they will be compelled to give an increasingly larger place in such arrangements to the people of the States.

THE DRAFT CONSTITUTION AND COMMUNAL REPRESENTATION.

IN commenting on the Nehru-Sapru Constitution, an editorial leader in the SERVANT OF INDIA of Aug. 16th remarked that it could not help

"regretting that the Committee did not explore further the possibilities of the suggestion, made first in the pages of this journal, of giving Cultural Autonomy to every community which has developed a communal consciousness and cherishes its peculiar cultural characteristics which give it the character of an entity distinct from the rest of the population in the State."

This regret is of course very much shared by me: all the more so, as the grounds, on which the All-Parties' Committee base their refusal of incorporating the suggestion I have been putting forward for some time, seem to me weak. There is a reason—and to my mind a very good reason—which might have been put forward for not working the idea of Communal Autonomy into the present scheme: to wit, the tactical one of not loading this first project with anything which British conservatism (or shall we say, stodginess?) might put down as "fanciful". The great advantage of the Constitution, as suggested, lies just in the fact that it is so very British and so devoid of anything unfamiliar to the British, that it puts British statesmen into the very awkward position, of having to explain to a British electorate why they are opposed to so eminently British (and therefore perfect) a Draft Constitution. This reason, however, as I have said already, has not been put forward; it may have been present to the minds of the drafting committee all the same: in that case, I hope sincerely that the suggestions sponsored by me will be reverted to, when the second stage of constitution-making will have been reached.

In the meantime, may I explain why I consider the reasons actually put forward by the Committee to be weak ones? The first one is the fear that Communal Autonomy means creating a State within

a State and therefore will lead to national disintegration. This view of course is eminently that of the 18th century; of Rousseau, of the French Revolution. It may not be antiquated for all that, of course, provided it has proved workable during the intervening century: but it is just the negative result of this proof which has turned people away from this theory and has made them look for something else. The 18th century idea conceived of the State as an omnipotent, omnipresent entity, composed of perfectly equal atoms, the individual citizens, who therefore were not allowed "to have any god beside" the State. The French Revolution, it will be remembered, created the offence called *délit de coalition*, the offence of citizens banding themselves together, as for instance in Trade Unions—and the respective clause remained in the French Penal Code up to the year 1864. Still even France had eventually to repeal this law and even—after a further lapse of 20 years—to acknowledge specifically the legality of Trade Unions: though it is not until after the War (in 1920) that fresh legislation has given them the complete freedom of existence and action, which British trade-unionists for instance have enjoyed since the beginning at any rate of this century. I have chosen this point, in order to illustrate that the French Revolutionary idea has in practice completely broken down—simply because it is not in accordance with the facts. Of these the basic fact is that individuals are not uniform particles like a heap of bricks, but that they are living personalities of great variety; that an individuality has multitudinous aspects, of which citizenship is but one—others for instance being his family, his professional, his religious, interests &c. The Revolutionary French idea of course has no use for all these "lesser" associations: and Communism in its relentless logic for instance has suppressed (or tried to suppress) both Family and Church. It has also suppressed the professional associations, since those that exist are State institutions, which function compulsorily as directed by the Oligarchic Dictatorship of the Communist Party. The Soviet indeed has completed the trend of the French Revolution and out-Hegged Hegel by creating even a new basis for their criminal laws, which no longer consider the "guilt" of an offender, but merely the danger to the State of the act committed. It has thus tried to eliminate every single human attachment to anything "lesser" than the State.

Now it is not likely that any of my objectors have thought out the matter to such logical extremities: but, the logic being really faultless, that surely only shows, that they have started from an altogether false premiss. In other words, their psychology is altogether wrong, man not being a *robot*, but a personality endowed with intellect, will and emotions. Human nature being what it is (fortunately!), the Communist scheme of things does not work. It does not work in Russia, it has never worked anywhere at any time. The theory thus having proved wrong, commonsense demands that it be abandoned and that the facts be faced as they are, not as they might be in an oversimplified world of diagrams. These facts are awkward—a single interest, a single loyalty, would be so very much easier to cope with, than a multitude of them, which necessarily clash, if not properly ordered; just as the stars would clash, if they had not got each its proper orbit. But let us here remember, that the various interests and loyalties of man were ordered, i. e. coordinated and subordinated in the centuries before French Revolutionary thought smashed that order: and that there is no reason why order should not be re-established. Of course, if these different loyalties of the citizen, the worker, the family-man, the devotee, are simply left to go

their own sweet way ; if one says to them *laissez faire, laissez aller* : then of course one must not be surprised if there are collisions. But the very fact of such collisions occurring—as they do in India communally, as they have done in Europe religiously—should lead the statesman, not to demand that one of the colliding bodies should be treated as non-existent but to so regulate the orbits that collisions cannot occur. As regards religion, that has largely, though certainly not yet universally, been achieved, by granting to each body of devotees religious autonomy. Church and State can live in perfect harmony, neither abating one iota of loyalty due to each : that much has certainly been proved again and again. Similarly man's loyalties to family and profession are capable of equal harmonization with the loyalty due by man, *qua* citizen, to the state. Similarly, it seems to me the task of the statesman in India, not to desire the annihilation of the communal spirit, but its harmonious functioning within the body politic. It is the attempt at suppressing it altogether, which merely serves to stimulate its growth and thus actually is "leading to national disintegration": admit frankly its right to live in its proper sphere and you will at once have drawn its teeth. The obvious alternative to national disintegration by communal loyalties, is to integrate these loyalties into the framework of the national life.

Such integration is possible by granting "cultural autonomy" to communities, just as "religious autonomy" is granted to religious bodies. The All-Parties' Committee of course provide that

all citizens, or nationals of the country, belonging to a racial, religious, or linguistic minority shall be guaranteed equality in civil and political rights, that is, they can vote and hold office upon the same basis as the dominant nationality. They may freely use their mother language &c. &c.

—provisions taken from the Minority Treaties of post-war Europe : and they seem to think that these clauses ought to suffice in India, as they do in Europe. There, once more the Committee are not in accordance with fact : for these League of Nations' clauses for the Protection of Minorities do not suffice in Europe, and they are one and all rejected as insufficient by the Minorities, which on the contrary are fighting for this very thing, Cultural Autonomy, which I have tried to show in previous articles is equally applicable to our Communal Problem in India. In my last, I exemplified the working of such Cultural Autonomy by a description of the Estonian system : and if this system works so smoothly and satisfies all minorities concerned so completely, it is because difference of culture in Estonia is not just "tolerated" but actually integrated into, made part and parcel of, the constitutional framework of the country. Such integration of course is as old as the hills—Switzerland has thus solved its problem of comprehending French, German and Italian culture within one political entity : but there of course the three cultures are geographically separate, whilst Estonia has had to harmonize the claims of State and Community in a country where the three cultures concerned are mingled in one and the same area just as they are with us in India. But Switzerland anyhow shows, how integration serves, not to weaken, but to strengthen the political unity of the country. As long as India is considered as Hindu, all non-Hindu communities will feel insecure and resentful, however much "protection" may be guaranteed to them : that again is human nature, for nobody wants to be just "tolerated". If loyalty to India as a political entity is to be expected from every Indian National, the Indian State must form a framework containing everything common to

every Indian *qua* citizen, in which framework cultural and religious autonomy must find an organic place. Cultural autonomy therefore seems to me to be required, not only for Moslems or Sikhs, but to demand an extension to all communities, Brahmaus and Non-Brahmans and whoever else may want it, so that nobody in India may feel that he is being treated as in any way exceptional. The question is a psychological one : which is only to say, that it cannot be trifled with. Once more, we have to take man as he is.

There remains the question of ordering cultural autonomy into a system of plural chambers. On the face of it, there is no inherent necessary connection between the two : cultural autonomy, as much as religious autonomy, can well exist without having a "Second Chamber" allotted to it in the parliamentary system of the country. But I still think that very much can be said for the desirability of such a system, especially in India, where communal fears have to be so carefully allayed. Of course I am not partizan of a multiplicity of chambers, each with the same functions and powers. I am a convinced One-Chamber man, as far as the State and the citizen are concerned. The territorial unit is fundamental and in the end must rightly prevail. Second Chambers have their use in making second thoughts possible and in seeing to it that the Legislature at all events has all the facts and relevant views before it, when reaching its divisions. These divisions, I repeat, seem to me to be ultimate : all the more reason for having other Chambers as well, though of an advisory nature with delaying powers only. The idea is not simply an eccentricity of my own conceiving : I was glad to find that Sir C. P. Ramaswamy Iyer at Mysore the other day suggesting that

the idea of a second chamber, which will provide all the essential knowledge and prepare the ground for legislation, instead of being merely revising, is worthy of serious consideration.

And Prof. N. C. Sen-Gupta (in the SERVANT OF INDIA of August 16th) simply voices my own conviction when he says that

The remedy for the communal problem does not, to my mind, lie in the communal representation to the Council. What is wanted is to isolate the problems which have a communal bearing and to place them out of the reach of the Councils and build up for their administration other bodies in which the communities will be able to make their will felt. The evolution of such a constitution on a pluralistic basis would involve much more patient research and investigation than our publicists have given to the problem hitherto.

Such "pluralistic basis", I would add in conclusion, is very much in the air in Europe just now (and has been since the War) and forward-looking minds are everywhere turning to it : not least in France, which, having led the world astray in the 18th, may well atone for it by calling it back to right lines in the 20th, century.

H. C. E. ZACHARIAS.

U.T.C. OFFICER'S PAY AND ALLOWANCES.

IT was represented to the Auxiliary and Territorial Forces Committee, that the recruitment of suitable candidates for the officers' ranks in the U.T.C. was suffering on account of the unattractive character of the dual commission and of the heavy expenses involved in the efficient discharge of officers' duties without officers' pay. The Committee, therefore, made the following recommendation :—

"In order to attract suitable men to become officers and to enable them to make themselves efficient without pecuniary loss officers of the University Training Corps

units should on first appointment receive commissions as Second Lieutenants on a special list of the Indian Territorial Force, or in the case of Europeans and Anglo-Indians, of the Auxiliary Force, and should be subsequently seconded for duty with the University Training Corps; they should be paid as such for any period spent in camp or at a course of instruction." (Vide Report of the Auxiliary and Territorial Forces Committee, p. 24 (iv) (ii) (c).)

A resolution of the Army Department published in the Gazette of India of August 19, 1927, announced that the Secretary of State for India had sanctioned the proposals of the Government of India on the Report of the Auxiliary and Territorial Forces Committee. The proposals of the Government of India consisted of the acceptance of all the recommendations of the Committee with a few exceptions specifically stated in the resolution. As the recommendation above referred to was not included in the exceptions it was presumed that the status of officers of the U.T.C. and their pays and allowances would in future be governed by the recommendation of the Shea Committee in this respect. Accordingly there was not a little surprise felt when in the March session of the Assembly this year the Government came forth with an amending bill which did not refer to the position of the officers of the U.T.C. at all. The attention of the Government was drawn to this lapse on its part by the present writer in these columns and by Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru in the Indian Legislative Assembly debate on March 21 this year. Pandit Kunzru quoted the abovementioned recommendation of the Committee and in particular emphasised the point regarding the status of U.T.C. officers. Mr. G. M. Young, the Army secretary, in his concluding speech assured Pandit Kunzru that there would be only one type of Commission in the U.T.C. and that the British one. The point regarding the pay of officers remained unanswered, presumably because it was not so pointedly pressed upon the attention of the Army Secretary. It was hoped, however, that this and other matters would be provided for in the rules to be made under the Act.

The rules have now been made and published in the Gazette of India dated September 1. These do not in any wise refer to either of the two points contained in the recommendation of the Shea Committee above quoted. There is no definite provision yet made for replacing the present dual and illusory commissions of U.T.C. officers by the single dominion commission. Regarding pay and allowances matters are still worse. Clause 11 of the amending rules now published provides as follows:—

"Every person subject to the Act other than a person enrolled in a university Corps shall be entitled to such pay, allowances and bounties as are specified in Schedule iii."

There is no other reference to this subject either in the course of the amending act or of the amending rules. The position to-day is therefore this, that the status of the U.T.C. officers remains as dubious and unattractive as in the past and their pockets will continue to suffer heavily in future as has without doubt been the case till now.

Such a state of things is to be regretted on various grounds. It constitutes a breach of promise on the part of Government and a very flagrant violation of an important recommendation of the Shea Committee. Those who have any firsthand experience of the working of the U.T.C. know well enough that the real difficulty in the path of the progress of those units, apart from the unsympathetic attitude of the Government, is the paucity of suitable candidates for officers' ranks in the U.T.C. If the present decision of the Government of India in regard to the position and pay of the U.T.C. officers is allowed

to stand, not only will further recruiting for their ranks be affected for the worse, but even the present incumbents will take the first convenient opportunity to give up a job which does not satisfy their or anybody's sense of self-respect and which puts them out of pocket each year to an extent which many of them can bear only at the very serious cost of themselves and their families.

H. P. T.

OUR EUROPEAN LETTER.

(From Our Own Correspondent.)

GENEVA, September 27.

AS THE NINTH ASSEMBLY ENDS.

LAST night the last batch of the delegates to the Assembly went away. Many of them looked jaded, avowedly due to ennui rather than work. Everybody was complaining that there was too much talking in Geneva. Talking, and a good deal of it, there always is at Geneva. People come here to talk, and it is sometimes well to remember that by the very constitution of the League, practical action is for the States-Members to take. There is some significance, therefore, in this specific feeling which seems to have been the experience of the larger part of the delegates at any rate. It is a feeling which is reflected in the various capitals about which the fact should never be lost sight of, that it is the currents of opinion flowing in these which really matter, which make and unmake policies, and which settle the destiny of Europe. As yet it is not the capitals of Europe which have got to be sensitive about what is happening at Geneva, but Geneva which must watch the pulse of the outer world. In the latter, for the moment, the definite feeling is that the League is passing through a crucial period, and is far from faring well. The dread of war which exists in Europe cannot be realised elsewhere without the utmost stress of imagination and without psycho-analysing all the peace talk that is now going on. There never was any very great enthusiasm about the Paris Peace Pact—the Security Committee of the League decided to reject even a reference to it—and the one moment in the League's history when its star shone brightest was during and after Locarno. Locarno, regarded as the first fruit of the League policy, was in its turn expected to yield more of its kind. Instead what we are now experiencing is the reaction. In the two vital questions of Western politics, naval armaments and the question of security, failure is writ large upon both. The newspaper scoop about the Anglo-French naval accord has come not like a press sensation but like a political storm. No less significant is the bitterness now prevailing between France and Germany. As Mr. Philip Kerr put it in the *Observer*, "Some acute observers have become quite pessimistic about the prospects of European peace."

THE DISARMAMENT MUDDLE.

Even though the preliminary "quiet of the meetings of the Ninth Assembly" lent colour to the view that Europe was "settling down," the effect created by the final phase of the Session was quite contrary. On naval disarmament as well as general disarmament acute differences arose. It is true that the resolution indicating that the Preparatory Disarmament Commission may again meet early next year, which was passed in the Assembly, means that for the first time the League has gone on record believing that present conditions of security are such as to justify the immediate conclusion of a first convention for the reduction and limitation of armaments. But how empty and devoid of content is that resolution! Germany refrained from noting, abstaining from actu-

ally voting against it only as a matter of grace, and the British delegate said that he doubted whether the procedure suggested would lead to good results; Monsieur Paul-Boncour speaking for France, saying that security must be a pre-requisite of disarmament according to the treaty of Versailles, and France, in signing the Protocol of 1924, thought that sufficient security was about to be realised, it was not the fault of France if other nations refused to sign the Protocol. The scheme of Monsieur Loudon, President of the Preparatory Commission, to get the five Naval Powers to send representatives to meet with him in Paris and draft a naval agreement which would make it possible for the Preparatory Commission to resume its work, did not fare any better, for not only did Lord Cushendun immediately warn that "while he had no instructions on the proposal and imagined that his Government had not been informed of it, he felt sure that it would not be accepted," but a Washington message also states: "Washington does not believe that any useful result would be attained by such a Conference." How often, even within the last three months, have we not had direct proofs of diplomatic tension between Washington and London?

THE LEAGUE'S EXOHEQUER.

It is quite natural that in such an atmosphere the cost of the League which was rather pointedly raised in the concluding meetings of the Assembly had a restrictive appearance. This was emphasised by the proposal of the Italian delegate that the budget should be stabilised. There has been an increase of expenditure of 1,500,000 gold francs this year, and two-thirds of it is accounted for by the new central opium board which is to be set up, the coming conference on the codification of international law, the transit section, economic conferences, and works consequent thereon. Of the increase of 30% of the total expenditure of the League, the Labour Office and the Court at the Hague, since 1924, by far the largest percentage has been incurred by holding an increased number of conferences annually. In his campaign for economy the Italian delegate had an opportunity for criticism of the British delegation, which put forward an appeal for the reduction of the budget, and yet pressed for a credit for an opium enquiry. The British delegation showed itself anxious for economy particularly where the budget of the Labour Office was concerned, but the victory rested with Monsieur Albert Thomas, the Director. The creation of a commission to enquire into the opium problem of the Far East was also passed, but considering that there were seventeen abstentions in a possible total of thirty-one votes, and in face of the campaign for economy, the project may be abandoned. Among the projects which have been approved or which exist already and whose work is to be continued or extended are the study of the protection of youth, the study of the proposal of a Concerted tariff for the reduction of rights on certain products of international importance, the International Institute in Rome, and the Society for Refugees. A definite attempt for the reduction of expenditure will no doubt be made, for the Secretary-General, Sir Eric Drummond, himself declared that while there is no question of the value of the work done by most of the conferences and enquiries, they may be too frequent.

THE INDIAN DELEGATION.

Thus ended the Ninth Assembly, in which, as Lord Lytton had anticipated, there was hardly any vital issue in which India was directly concerned. What is India's record in the season of international politics just ended? Here in the Assembly the Indian

delegation was still led by a non-Indian, however amiable and worthy he might be, and in Paris the Peace Pact was signed for India by the Foreign Minister of Britain! Not even a British official representing India was deputed for the purpose. Alone of all British signatories to be in this predicament. India's circumstance was marked, and equally marked is, year after year, the nature of the lead of the Indian delegation that come here in September. No Indian who comes to Geneva, whatever his official reticence may be, but feels the delicacy—to put it mildly—of this position. In the heat of international politics it is well not to forget that justice has yet to be done to India at the tribunal of nations.

OUR SOUTH AFRICAN LETTER.

(From Our Own Correspondent.)

JOHANNESBURG, September 19.

MR. SASTRI IN THE TRANSVAAL.

MR. SASTRI'S visit to several of the important towns in the Transvaal has been a great success. He was everywhere received by the Mayor, and the leading citizens, European and Indian, banquetted and toasted him. At some banquets the guests rose to their feet and sang lustily "For he is a jolly good fellow". The meetings were crowded and in fact drew record audiences, who listened to Mr. Sastri's exposition of the Cape Town Agreement, its implications and obligations. At the big Town Hall meeting at Johannesburg Mr. Sastri made a fervent appeal to Indians not to reopen the question of free and unrestricted emigration within the Commonwealth, and at the same time made an equally fervent appeal to the Europeans to redeem their promise to treat the domiciled Indians with justice and fairplay.

AN UGLY INCIDENT.

There was one exception however to the otherwise uniformly courteous reception that Mr. Sastri received. The Deputy Mayor of Klerksdorp would not reconcile himself to the upliftment section of the Agreement. He organised a public meeting the night previous to Mr. Sastri's visit and condemned the upliftment policy of the present Government, opposed the condonation scheme and asked the Mayor and the other leading citizens not to attend the banquet in honour of Mr. Sastri. Nevertheless, over 130 guests, almost all the leading European citizens, including the Mayor and the Magistrate, attended the banquet, gave Mr. Sastri an ovation and sang "For he is a jolly good fellow". The chagrined Dy. Mayor, Mr. Morgan Evans, stood in his car in front of the hotel and exhibited a hysterical placard against "coolie uplift". He then marched to the Railway Institute with his handful of juvenile followers, broke open the doors and stationed his gang inside. When Mr. Sastri had spoken for about ten minutes he exchanged occasional interruptions for a dead set against the continuance of the meeting, and said that he had not come there to listen to the speech of Mr. Sastri. The lights were switched off and a stink-bomb was flung on the coir matting on the floor, which soon burst into flames and emitted sulphurous and suffocating fumes. The flame was soon put out, but the panic lasted a few minutes. The lights soon returned, but Mr. Evans and his gang had disappeared. There were general calls for Mr. Sastri to continue his speech. Mr. Sastri remained absolutely calm and unruffled, quite prepared to proceed with his speech. The irritating fumes still hung about the hall, and therefore the meeting was adjourned to the open, and Mr. Sastri completed his speech.

The Mayor and the leading citizens expressed their abhorrence of the dastardly conduct of the Dy.

Mayor and apologised for it, and acclaimed Mr. Sastri's speech. Immediately the news appeared in the press, Dr. Malan hastened with an expression of regret on behalf of himself and the Government, and since then the Prime Minister and Mr. Havenga have also apologised. The unfortunate episode has incidentally revealed the esteem in which Mr. Sastri is held in all circles in the country. The press and the leading men have publicly denounced the conduct of the Dy. Mayor and borne testimony to their regard for Mr. Sastri and to the splendid services he has rendered to the cause of Indo-South African friendship. The following concluding paragraph from the leading article in the *Rand Daily Mail* of the 18th inst. is typical:—

"It is however not only as the friend and protector of the Indians resident in our midst that Mr. Sastri has impressed his personality upon the South African community. During his stay he has given his time ungrudgingly to the furtherance of intellectual causes, and we are in consequence the richer for the ripe wisdom and high idealism which have been the distinguishing features of the many addresses he has delivered throughout the country. Even when he has dealt with political issues he has done so with a nobility and dignity rarely to be met with on a political platform anywhere in the world today, and it is not too much to say that his influence will be felt in our midst long after he has left the Union. It is a real pleasure to us to be able to pay this tribute, inadequate though it be, to a great gentleman, statesman and scholar, but the episode of Klerksdorp is a bitter humiliation under which the whole of South Africa must bow its head in shame".

In shocking contrast to this is the letter of Mr. Oswald Pirow, K.C., M.L.A., published in the Africans' paper, *Ons Vaderland* of Pretoria, in which, while deploring disorder at public meetings, he makes a violent attack on Dr. Malan for apologising to Mr. Sastri, and once again expresses his great regret that the Nationalist Government gave the "coolie" in South Africa a leader and that Nationalist leaders act as chairmen at dinners in honour of that leader. The *Ons Vaderland* in an editorial admits that it is bound by the Agreement, but cannot stomach the round of entertainments in honour of Mr. Sastri and the compliments paid to him, "things to which we in the Transvaal are not accustomed". It "recalls that no apologies were forthcoming for similar incidents in the past in the case of Mr. Gandhi, a man more important than Mr. Sastri, Mr. Gokhale and Mrs. Naidu. It asks the Attorney-General not to take any action against the miscreants when the Police report against them! In an interview published in the *Natal Advertiser* the Dy. Mayor of Klerksdorp is reported to have said that he did not regret his share in the transaction, that something of that nature was necessary to draw public attention to the "serious development in favour of the Asiatic and to the detriment of the European." And he has promised to hold protest meetings in various towns in the Transvaal.

ANTI-INDIAN AGITATION.

A few days prior to the Klerksdorp incident the Women's Agricultural Association in Pretoria passed a resolution to boycott the Indian trader. A new association, called the Bramfontein Vigilance Association, has been inaugurated in order to eradicate the Asiatic living and trading in Bramfontein. It was suggested that the clause in the title-deeds of the stands forbidding the letting of the stands to Asiatics should be strictly enforced.

THE INDIAN OPPOSITIONISTS.

The Indians who are opposed to the condonation scheme have held a Conference in Cape Town early this month. The Dy. Mayor and a few Europeans

were also present and counselled moderation. They passed resolutions condemning the condonation scheme as a "diabolical" method of chasing Indians out of the country, called the South African Indian Congress a "traitorous body", characterised Mr. Sastri as a "puppet" in the hands of Dr. Malan and as one who was responsible for the reduction to manageable compass of Indians in Australia (!) and one who is bent on a similar feat in South Africa, accused him of being inaccessible and high-handed, deplored his attitude on the Indian question in general and on condonation in particular, and accused the Union Government of a breach of the Cape Town Agreement in view of the Colour Bar Act, the Liquor Act, the Old Age Pensions Act, the Union Nationality Act, and Sec. 5 of the amending Act of last year, and resolved to let the Government know what the Conference thought of it. A resolution that there was no need for an Indian Agent in South Africa was postponed for consideration till the next meeting in Durban. It was also thought that a warning to future Agents-General would be a sufficient safeguard for their interests.

The local Congress organisation, the Cape British Indian Council, met simultaneously and voted confidence in Mr. Sastri and the Congress and approved and recommended the condonation scheme.

AGITATION IN NATAL.

It will be recalled that the Government gave a concession that those who exchanged Peace Preservation Ordinance permits for registration certificates are exempt from condonation, provided the thumb impressions on both the documents agreed. This means that those illegals are excused who committed any illegality in obtaining the P.P.O. permits. This concession has led Natal to ask for a somewhat similar concession for Natal. The Congress requested that all Domicile Certificates issued with thumb prints be accepted as legal, provided thumb prints thereon agreed with the thumb prints of the holder. It appears that Indians who held Domicile Certificates issued under the Natal Acts of 1897 and 1903 exchanged them for Domicile Certificates with thumb impressions issued under the Act of 1906. The issue of the latter certificates was stopped about 1910 or 1911. It is contended by the Congress that the number of such Domicile Certificates issued could not be large and must have dwindled a great deal by the death or return to India of the holders thereof. The request amounts to the plea that all those who came in illegally before 1910 or 1911 should be excused from the necessity of taking out Protection Certificates.

The Department regretted its inability to accede to the request. The Indians in Natal are greatly agitated over the question; they find that the Transvaal was given a concession but not Natal. The Congress officials are greatly depressed over it. The Natal Congress officials are being mercilessly assailed and attacked for failing to secure the concession for Natal. Hard indeed and often thankless is the task of the public worker!

CONDONATION FIGURES.

In the Transvaal 184 Protection Certificates have so far been issued, and over 40 applications are pending; in Natal 160 certificates have been issued and over 50 are pending; and in the Cape 38 certificates have been issued.

ASSISTED EMIGRANTS.

According to the *Natal Mercury*, some 2,357 Indians have left the country during the first eight months of this year. In the first five months of last year before the new assisted emigration scheme came into operation, 1,320 Indians left the country; during

the subsequent seven months the number rose to 1,655. Only two applications for return seem to have been made.

REVIEWS.

NINETEENTH CENTURY AMERICA.

OUR TIMES—AMERICA FINDING HERSELF.

By MARK SULLIVAN. (Scribner's Sons, New York.) 1927. 9¼ × 6. pp. 668. \$5.00.

A PERSON whose childhood and youth were spent in the United States of America during the last two decades of the twentieth century after reading this book can but echo the sentiment inscribed on the dust cover, "This is not a book, it is one's own past." To readers without this childhood background, while the appeal will probably be less intense, the real value of the book may be even greater. America is undoubtedly a misunderstood country. She has all the faults of youth, and of wealth. The combination produces unpleasant qualities which are often so prominent as to obscure the less conspicuous virtues that lie at the roots of character.

The first part of Sullivan's volume deals with the educational system and the religious and social customs that prevailed in the 80's and 90's—those sterner days before electricity, motors, and movies changed the face of the earth. In those days the Puritan tradition to some extent still prevailed; life was simple and in many ways severe; in the rural home money was scarce and luxuries few; the church and the district school, on the one hand, and the "saloon" on the other, were still the centres of community life; black was black, and white was white, and there were fewer intermediate shades of gray. A foreigner who wants to understand not the America of the newspaper, the cinema and the problem novel, but that of the farmer, the pioneer and the country doctor, the self-made minister, the rocky New England farm, the newly reclaimed prairie, will gain from this book a growing understanding and a new quality of sympathy with the traditions that have gone to the making of a nation.

The one-teacher, one-district school, with its twenty or thirty pupils, both boys and girls, was the unit of early rural education in America. To one who attended it, the memory has an indescribable quality of charm never effaced by later experiences of high school and college days. The bare unlovely room, cold in winter and hot in summer; the crude desks, deeply carved with initials; the Friday spelling matches; the cold lunch brought in the tin pail; the bucket of drinking water in the entry with its one tin "dipper"; the morning and afternoon "recess" with coasting in winter and "play-houses" in summer; the red wool mittens, and snow tracked in and melting in wet patches near the iron stove; "Arbor Day" with its crude decorations and tree planting; the occasional fight to establish supremacy between the big bully of the school and the teacher—these are some of the memories Sullivan's book calls back to be relieved with the glamour of childhood upon them, the "light that never was" illuminating the dim outlines. They were all such crude conditions, unhygienic, unpedagogic, and all-to-be-condemned in the light of the present day. Yet there was in them something sturdy and self-reliant and fine. Will the child of today carry away such tender memories of the Dalton School, the Project Method, the Montessori Class? I doubt it.

In the second part, the author turns from memories of autograph albums, Fifth Readers, lunch baskets, and singing games to America's social,

economic, and political developments. The railroad, the Standard Oil Company, the Chicago Stock Yards; Wall Street and Roosevelt with the Big Stick point the moral and adorn the tale.

America's industrial revolution has been accompanied and followed by great upheavals, social and economic. As the factory displaced and absorbed home industries, so the "trust" absorbed the separate factory. The building of railroads; the discovery of oil, and the development of the modern methods of "high finance" led to grave abuses. "Money for use" degenerated into "money for power". The Standard Oil Company, the railroads, and the Chicago Stock Yards are quoted as horrible examples of abuse of power, while over against them we find the reforming groups of the "muck-raising" magazines, Upton Sinclair in the "Jungle", and above all, the successful political house cleaning of Roosevelt and the Progressive Republicans. Roosevelt's history is traced from the time that he entered politics as a much ridiculed amateur, through the achievements of his presidential administration. The fight put up by the Labour Unions during the great Coal Strike of 1902-3, the struggle that achieved pure food and exposed "faked" patent medicines, lead up to the dramatic climax of the book—a detailed and yet impressionist account of the development of the aeroplane. The plucky attempts and failure of Langley, the plucky attempts and successes of the Wright brothers—those two bodies tenanted by a single mind—recall to us who take the conquest of the air as a matter of course the romance of those pioneers who turned fairy tale into fact.

The fascination of the printed page is enhanced by the large collection of cartoons and photographs, ranging all the way from likenesses of Coolidge at the age of seven and Roosevelt as the cartoonists saw him, to late Victorian advertisements of stockings and styles for women. To those who want to know America, not as a completed product but as a growing and evolving organism, this book is highly recommended.

A. B. VAN DOREN.

BLACK AND WHITE IN SOUTH AFRICA.

THE ANATOMY OF AFRICAN MISERY. By LORD OLIVIER. (Hogarth Press.) 1927. 7¾ × 5. pp. 234.

SOUTH AFRICA, WHITE AND BLACK—OR BROWN? By P. A. SILBURN. (Allen & Unwin.) 1927. 7½ × 5¼. pp. 192. 6s.

THE SOUTH AFRICANS. By SARAH GERTRUDE MILLIN. (Constable.) 1926. 8 × 5¼. pp. 280. 7s. 6d.

SOUTH AFRICA FROM WITHIN. By MANFRED NATHAN. (John Murray.) 1926. 8¾ × 5½. pp. 324. 12s.

THE BRITISH WEST AFRICAN SETTLEMENTS, 1750-1821. By EVELINE C. MARTIN. (Longmans.) 1927. 8¾ × 5½. pp. 186. 7s. 6d.

NOTHING in the twentieth century is more remarkable than the economic development of Africa. The commerce of the African territories has assumed a place in the British economic world which the most ardent imperialist in his most expansive moments would not have predicted thirty years ago. Moreover, there is every reason to suppose that their importance, both as markets and as sources of supply, is capable of being immensely enhanced in the future. The riches of Africa, both mineral and agricultural, are still largely untouched. The extent of its territory is enormous, and

much of it even now is economically unexplored. Africa is, in fact, becoming more and more indispensable to the rest of the world. What is happening in its British territories is being paralleled in the French and Belgian colonies and but for want of capital would be happening likewise in the Portuguese possessions. But there is one condition upon which the whole of its future development must entirely depend—the solution of its labour problem. Practically the whole of its growing wealth has been produced by native or Indian labour. It is no doubt true that the initiative, the capital, the organization and the directing supervision have all been furnished by the white man, but it is also equally true that but for the manual work and labour of the Negro and the Indian, the recent expansion and development would never have taken place. The difficult and complicated problem of the economic co-operation of Black and White in Africa is the theme of all these five books under review.

"The Anatomy of African Misery" by Lord Olivier is the most important of these five. His Lordship is an authority on the problem of the coloured races, his first work on this subject having been published in 1905 on "White Capital and Coloured Labour." Taking the British African Empire (excepting S. Africa), there are only 6,1,000 Whites as against a total Black population of nearly 13 millions, a proportion of about 1 to 203. The Union of S. Africa on the other hand comprises 1,500,000 Europeans as against about 5,400,000 natives, a proportion of nearly 1 to 3½. It will at once be evident that the proportion between the two races is a vital factor in the labour problem. Three main causes may be discerned as tending to create a new relationship between Black and White in Africa. They are first, the growth of the "Poor White" class; secondly, the insufficiency of the native lands for a growing population; thirdly, the rising capacity and ambition of the native himself. As for the last point, the experience of West Africa has shown that the native is capable of learning the arts of agriculture and industry and that with education he very quickly becomes susceptible to the ordinary economic motives which impel human beings to work. The same phenomenon is found in other parts of Africa. On the Congo, the native drives locomotives and motor vehicles as he does in Nigeria. He is being taught all the trades. But he is equally debarred from employment in the skilled trades by custom and trade union interdict, and in the mines by legislation. For instance, the Transvaal Provincial Council recently issued an order prohibiting natives from driving motor vehicles containing Europeans. As the court pointed out in declaring the order *ultra vires*, nothing could be more artificial. Such "Colour Bar" Acts and orders of segregation have created a world of unrest, resulting in the formation of the Industrial and Commercial Workers' Union, usually known as the I.C.U. It is recruited almost entirely from the detribalised Natives, claiming equal wages for equal work with the Whites and also the benefits of industrial legislation hitherto applicable to the European worker only. Thus equality of economic opportunity between the White and Black races is becoming inevitable. The growing inability of the reserves to support their population is steadily forcing more and more natives out of their tribal state into industrial and agricultural employment. Though the allocation of further land to their use may slow down this movement, it cannot arrest it. There are many who fear and oppose this doctrine of economic equality, for they see in it the road towards social and political equality—not in the immediate future, perhaps not for five or ten generations but in the end inevitably. With social equality, they see

the extinction of the White race, with political equality the disappearance of White ideals. Others fear that five hundred years from now Sir Harry Johnston's prophecy may be fulfilled and it may have been shown that the colonization of Africa by alien peoples produces a compromise—"a dark-skinned race with a White man's features and a White man's brains". What seems certain, however, is that the co-operation of the two races must be based on the gradual elevation of the native from the ignorant serf to the intelligent worker, if the development of Africa is to be pursued peacefully. Lord Olivier in his splendid book pleads for such a co-operation of the two races and for the gradual elevation of the Native from the ignorant serf to a free worker. The translation of the principle of the colour bar into industrial legislation in Africa would be a menace to the peace of the world according to Lord Olivier and other intelligent critics of African problems. Lord Olivier concludes his masterly survey of the situation in S. Africa as follows:—

"If the attempt to maintain the repressionist and colour bar policy is persisted in, it is not the Natives that in the long run are likely to be defeated. It is not they, but the Whites, that have shown the first symptoms of degeneration—a degeneration entirely due to their own perverse social theory... Those who know and understand the Native best, and those of his own race who can handle the ideas of Western enlightenment, are perfectly clear that although his patience is long, it is not likely to prove eternal in the face of the repressionist policy of which the Colour Bar law is so outspoken a declaration."

Altogether Lord Olivier's book is indispensable to those who wish to have a correct analysis of the South African situation.

Colonel Silburn's book on South Africa frankly recognizes that the Native races of South Africa did not receive a 'square deal' in the past from the Whites and proposes a scheme of territorial segregation for the natives, though he does not give details as to the methods he would employ to carry it into effect. The practicability of the scheme also is open to question even if it were desirable. Col. Silburn advocates territorial segregation not only for the good of the Native, but also for securing purity of the White race about which he is every apprehensive. Col. Silburn's book is written from the point view of the Whites of South Africa, though professing solicitude for the welfare of the natives.

Mrs. Millin's book "The South Africans" is another one written in the style of Colonel Silburn, though more descriptive of the geography, climate, geology and history of South Africa. It must be admitted, however, that a novelist is not necessarily a good student of politics and her analysis of the South African situation is poor, though her description is a little better. Her conclusions are in the main the same as those of Col. Silburn—racial and territorial segregation of the Native and the supremacy of the White man with the corollary of the integrity of the White race.

Dr Nathan's "South Africa from Within" is a little better than the two preceding books as it endeavours to give an account of the history and political development of South Africa more specially since 1910. The second part of the book is descriptive of the country, the people, the Government, and the industries and commerce of South Africa. It also discusses the political parties and problems of South Africa and the last chapter is a useful guide on travel and social life in the Union of South Africa. Dr. Nathan makes no attempt to suggest any solution for the native problem and his book is frankly a descriptive and historical work which may be useful

to one who is unacquainted with South Africa, its people and history.

"The British West African Settlements, 1750-1821," by Eveline C. Martin is a thesis for the Ph. D. degree in London, and gives an account of the administration of the British holdings in West Africa in the second half of the eighteenth century. The work under review forms the second volume in the series of Imperial studies monographs of the Royal Colonial Institute. The various experiments in administration that were made in British West Africa between 1750 and 1821 are described carefully in this book, such as control by a regulated company, the company of merchants trading to Africa which was established in 1750, Crown control which was introduced by the erection of the province of Senegambia in 1765, and which ceased after the American War, and an experiment in self-government by freed Negroes begun at Sierra Leone in 1787. The work under review is a scholarly piece of research in eighteenth century history.

V. SHIVA RAM.

SHORT NOTICES.

STUDY OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AND ITS RELATION TO COGNATE STUDIES.

By ERNEST BARKER. (Cambridge University Press.) 1928. 7½ x 5, pp. 51. 2s. 6d.

WITH a pen which has the cadence of Pater in it, Prof. Barker argues that Political Science as such has "no definite basis in history," least of all, in a whimsical social psychology. He thinks that it is inspired by biology, has legal ideas for its "supporting vertebrae" and only its dress in historical experience. In his own words, "Political Science is always new as well as always old and it is constantly changing even while it remains the same."

An unconventional "defense" of Political Science! The essay is profound reading.

K. V. R.

SQVIET UNION YEAR BOOK, 1928. Compiled and edited by A. A. SANTALOV and LOUIS SEGAL. (Allen & Unwin, London.) 1928. 7¼ x 5, pp. 587. 7s. 6d.

THIS publication first made its appearance in 1925 since when it has grown in usefulness. Its fourth edition recently issued gives up to date information about Russia and contains, we are assured, a great deal of entirely new material, particularly about Foreign Trade and Finance. The book is exceedingly useful as a reference book to publicists generally, and indispensable to social and labour workers, as showing how much a Government really founded on the people's will does for the common people. The Russian constitution with which the book opens adds greatly to its utility. We trust the publication will go some way to dispel misunderstanding and ignorance prevailing in different countries about Russia, to which owing to the great economic experiment now being tried there all eyes are turned.

I. J. K.

CORRESPONDENCE.

OPPRESSION IN DEWAS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SERVANT OF INDIA.

Indore, Sept. 28.

SIR,—Deep discontent prevails among the subjects of Dewas State, Junior Branch, for several reasons one

of which is the *Dewas Mundi*. This is a depot for the disposal of cultivators' products, brought into existence by Mr. Govind Rao Mysoreker during the great war. All cultivators are compelled to bring their wheat, juar, cotton, etc. to this Mundi where the same are purchased at low prices and afterwards sold by the State at big profits. There is a report that accounts at the Mundi are not properly kept, and large sums of money are from time to time withdrawn from this Department with the result that claims for products purchased by the State are kept pending indefinitely.

The so-called Cabinet in this small State is a myth and a farce established apparently with a view to throw dust in the eyes of the Agency authorities, or to secure a firm grip on the State.

It seems superfluous to say that budgets are a *sine qua non* in every well-organised State, meant to show at the end of a year the real financial condition of the State. Mr. Mysoreker, who is in charge of the Finance portfolio, has not put up any budget before His Highness the Maharaja for some years past, so that no single authority in the State can say in what direction the financial ship of the State is sailing.

Judicial and State administration exists only in name and cannot bear scrutiny. Most of the State departments are at present manned, not by Dewas subjects, but outsiders. How completely the State is now under Mr. Mysorekar's control may be seen from the fact that he is President of the Cabinet, Chief Minister, and Chief Adviser to the Maharaja; and also holds charge of the Finance portfolio. In other words he is all in all. The subjects of the States are groaning under the tyranny of the State officials and wonder why the Paramount Power does not step in and prevent the State from total ruin.

—Yours, etc.

R. B. THOMSON.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

FIELD-MARSHAL SIR HENRY WILSON. His Life and Services. Vols. 1 & 2. By C. E. CALLWELL. (Cassell.) 1927. 9¼ x 6½. pp. 363, 389.

READINGS IN SOCIOLOGY. Ed. by JEROME DAVIS AND HARRY ELMER BARNES. (D. C. Heath & Co., New York.) 1927. 9 x 6. pp. 1065. \$6 00.

INDIAN FINANCE IN THE DAYS OF THE COMPANY. By PRAMATHANATH BANERJEA. (Macmillan.) 1928. 8¼ x 5¼. pp. 392. 12s. 6d.

SIR ASUTOSH MOOKERJEE. By PROBODH CHANDRA SINHA. (The Book Co., Ltd. Calcutta.) 1928. 7¼ x 5. pp. 532. Rs. 4.

THE CHINA OF TO-DAY. By STEPHEN KING-HALL. (Hogarth Press.) 1927. 7¼ x 5. pp. 44.

FOR DIPAVALI.

Book orders for the following choicest perfumes etc.

Ruh-Aghar, Ruh-Khas, Istambol, Keora, Gulab, Muskh-Hina, Mogra, Kastoori, Chambeli, Bakul, Bela, Panch, Raj-Champa, etc. etc. @ Rs. 2, 3, 4, & 5 per tola of 13 mashas.

Rose-water, Keora water, and Oils Gulab, Bela, Chambeli and Hina @ Rs. 4, 5, 6 & 8 per seer of Rs. 110 in weight,

Tastefully decorated fancy Itardans @ Rs. 3/8, 4/8, & 6/8 each,

to CHHEDIRAM MOOLCHAND,

Tele. Add.

Kothi No. 32,

"PERFUMES."

Kanauj (India).