

Servant of India

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

VOL. XI, No. 49. }

POONA—THURSDAY, DECEMBER 20, 1928.

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

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	657
ARTICLES :—	
The Goal of British Policy in India	660
Lord Curzon.—II. By V. N. Godbole, M.A.	661
REVIEWS :—	
Science of Statistics. By Prof. K. B. Madhava, M.A., A.I.A.	664
Relations Between Capital and Labour. By Professor S. V. Ayyar, M.A.	665
Free Trade vs. Protection. By R. G. P.	666
British Imperialism in China. By Professor M. V. Subrahmanyam, M.A., L.T.	666
Hindu Philosophy. By M. Barreira	667
SHORT NOTICES	668
BOOKS RECEIVED	668

TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

THE Supplementary Report of the Nehru Committee carries out the modifications adopted by the Lucknow Conference and makes recommendations for modification in other respects, but these latter are confined to matters of detail, which do not touch the main principles contained in the original Report, and which are such as to meet with universal agreement. For the rest the Report answers the objections urged in various quarters against the original proposals relating to the Hindu-Mahomedan problem and the Indian States, the two most important questions considered by the Committee. The chief objections considered are those proceeding from H. H. the Aga Khan in respect to the first problem and of H. H. the Maharaja of Bikaner in respect to the second. In both cases the answers given are thoroughly convincing; so also is the defence of the proposal to establish adult suffrage against the attacks made in certain quarters on the workability of such a scheme in the existing conditions of the country. As this supplementary Report as well as the original will soon pass through the crucible of the All-Parties Convention at Calcutta, it is unnecessary to examine it at any length at this stage.

TWO more provinces—Bihar and Orissa and C. P. and Berar—have declared their adherence to the Nehru report, which is a matter for satisfaction. Before the Report came into being, British statesmen were fond of saying that if Indians produced an agreed scheme of constitutional reform it would be sympathetically considered. As soon however as the Nehru scheme saw the light, their attitude changed completely and, far from welcoming it as India's response to their challenge, they began to pick holes in it. The fact

was that the almost complete unanimity with which the Report had been welcomed in all parts of the country was quite unexpected to them and a source of much embarrassment and not a little annoyance. As pointed out by the various speakers at the All-Parties Conferences in these two provinces, this was hardly playing the game. Similarly, it was also pointed out, with much force, that the present controversy between those who stood for Dominion Status and those whom nothing short of complete independence would satisfy was quite superfluous. If what mattered was a mere declaration of one's goal, the controversy would perhaps have something to say in its favour. But, as well put by Mr. A. N. Sinha in his presidential address to the All-Parties Conference in Bihar, "The way to reach both the goals was to a very great extent the same. Why not then try to pursue that path instead of needlessly creating bitterness" by continuing the controversy? What was really required was a determined effort on the part of the different parties in the country to build up our own strength, which alone can secure for us the attainment of whichever goal we aim at. His advice to all parties therefore not to fritter away any energy in futile controversies of the nature already referred to, but to set their hands to the practical work of nation-building will, we are sure, find an echo in every patriotic heart. Nearer home the Karnataka All-Parties Conference, which recently met at Bijapur under the chairmanship of the indefatigable Mrs. Besant, has also lent its support to the Report. But the non-official Europeans in this country, as represented by Mr. Chartres, look upon the Report as a great menace to their privileged position. In his recent speech at Calcutta he condemned the Report because its proposals seemed to him to be directed at the disenfranchisement of and denial of representation to Europeans. So far as one has been able to understand the Report, it does nothing of the kind; but it is no use trying to convince those who do not seem open to conviction.

THE excesses of the Lucknow police in connection with the Simon Commission's visit to Lucknow formed the subject of a motion of adjournment in the U. P. Legislative Council. This was moved by Mr. Chintamani in an impressive speech and was carried without division. This fact shows beyond doubt with what abhorrence the public regards the action of the police in assaulting peaceful citizens and should serve as an eye-opener to Government. It was expected that the happenings at Lahore connected with the Commission's arrival would serve as a warning to the U. P. Government; but that was not to be. The incidents were all the more regrettable in view of the fact that an Indian was in charge of law and order in U. P. and make out a conclusive case for the transfer of these departments

to popular control. In their evidence before the Commission the heads of Police in different provinces have with one voice opposed this transfer. The reason is not far to seek. They are afraid that if the transfer really came about, they would not be free to act in the manner they did at Lahore and Lucknow recently and would have to answer for their sins to the Legislative Council. The passage of the adjournment motion without the Government challenging a division also shows that the public regards the statements issued on behalf of Government as so many attempts not at giving a truthful account of the occurrences, but at explaining away the blameworthy conduct of the police. The fact that in their zeal to ensure the safety of the Commission the police did not hesitate to insult even an ex-Home Member like the much respected Maharaja of Mahmudabad would fill all Indians, as it did Mr. Chintamani, with shame and humiliation and make them realise that they are strangers in their own land.

THE evidence of Mr. Hubback contained very little that is constructive and what little there was was reactionary. On the ground of unwieldy constituencies he suggested indirect election not only for the local Council but all round. His cheap gibe at the professional politician has no point in it. He thinks that the great use of the official bloc was to keep the Ministers in office. One bad feature of the Bihar finances was the loss on Irrigation to the extent of Rs. 55 lakhs during the last 16 years. The Inspector-General of Police, Mr. Swain admitted that very few Indians had risen to posts of real responsibility. His opinion is that but for the official bloc in the Council even essential police work would not have been carried on. The reasons given by him against the transfer of Police were practically the same as were advanced in other provinces. His grievance about the police having to do the work of the subordinate revenue agency in other provinces can easily be set right by having such an agency; but this would hardly be made an adequate reason against the transfer of the department. The corruption in the service revealed by him is very serious but in any case it is not such as can be cured by constitutional changes. In his opinion the institution of a second chamber would diminish the apprehension felt by the force about the transfer. The deputation of the Oriya people is so anxious about a separate province that they would rather put up with a less advanced system of government, than be part and parcel of another province with an advanced system and ampler resources. But their suggestions for an inter-provincial autonomy are not calculated to ensure a smooth working of a Province governed on the basis of provincial autonomy. It would create a wheel within a wheel, which would be the source of endless disputes. In case however Sind is made into a separate province it would be difficult to resist the demands of the Oriya-speaking people because every reason in the one case would apply in the case of the new province they are demanding. Besides there is no communal problem in their case while the opposition of Sind Hindus is a factor to be reckoned with.

WE had hoped that Mr. Mahomad Ali would pour oil on troubled waters and suggest some compromise in order to arrive at an agreed constitution. But we are very much disappointed with his speech delivered as President of the All-Parties Muslim Conference. His numerical equation of one Muslim being equal to ten non-Muslims, even assuming it is correct, was hardly the right thing to give out at this

time. His assertion that Swaraj, according to the Nehru Report, would be the rule of the Hindus, is astounding in its misrepresentation. The Hindus are not opposed, as he says, to the insertion of constitutional safeguards but only to Muslims having a representation beyond what is required as a safeguard. Although we are used to such demands by now, still the demand contained in a Resolution that the Muslims of Bihar, though less than 10 p. c. of the population, should be guaranteed 25 p. c. seats in the Legislature, appears to us to be extremely inequitable. The Bihar Conference also stipulates that even in other provinces Muslims should be given a representation in excess of that which is proportionate to their population. If the Sikhs and Hindus make a similar demand in the Punjab we wonder what would happen to the Muslim majority there. And in spite of sponsoring such resolutions he tells us with gusto that it was he who had made the Muslims agree to joint electorates. As for the picture of the Hindu mentality that he has drawn, all we can say is that it is a fanciful picture.

THE general feeling in the country about the work of the Simon Commission is faithfully voiced by the *Pioneer* in the following words:—

"It is time that unparalleled efforts on the parts of Local and Central Governments have secured the nominal cooperation of mysterious bodies of men. But these cooperating bodies cut no ice in India, and no one must know better than Sir John Simon that their so-called assistance is valueless. Weeks have gone by in which hours beyond count have been wasted on farcical meetings, the heart of the problem which faces the British Government has not yet been even remotely approached. Politically educated India still remains aloof from the work of the Commission; the Nehru Report still stands unexamined, not discussed, and for all the good that will be done in the ensuing sessions between the Seven and their local assistants Sir John and his colleagues might just as well return to England."

Further on:

"But is Sir John quite correct in diagnosing the spirit behind the boycott as one of hatred? In our opinion, the strongest feeling that has been manifested by the boycotters is one of contempt... We are sincerely convinced that despite the multitudinous mistakes that have been made, despite the gravest errors in tactics, and the many examples of attempts to break pledges and to act dishonestly towards India, there exists behind the boycotters a fundamental generosity and broad-mindedness which could be directed into mutually beneficial channels. How long this state of affairs will remain is problematical. It is unfortunate that everything is being done day by day to drive moderate thinking men towards the Left, and to curdle what milk of human kindness they do possess. Probably never in the history of politics has a situation been so woefully mismanaged. Sir John Simon and his advisers have behind them an appalling record of devastating blunders, and, as far as we can judge, there seems to stretch before them countless opportunities to excel their own performances."

THE Cochin Legislative Council which opened on the 11th instant discussed an important resolution about the liquor policy in the State. A private member moved that "this Council recommends that there should be at least a distance of not less than half a mile between one liquor shop and another in towns and of one mile in other areas." An amendment that the distance between shops should be two miles in towns and four miles in villages was

also moved. In opposing both the original resolution and the amendment, the Superintendent of Excise had some very interesting things to say, on behalf of the Government. A reduction in the number of shops, he said, would handicap those who wanted to drink and also lead to over-crowding and even rioting. Besides, giving effect to the resolution would mean a great financial loss to the Government. Reformation of people should come from within and not from without. And until people gave up the drinking habit, reduction in the number of shops would be inadvisable. This shows how out of touch the Cochin Government is with the aspirations of the people in these matters, for it is clear as the noon-day sun that nothing short of prohibition within a measurable distance of time will satisfy them. The resolution as amended was passed in the House by an overwhelming majority. But as the constitution stands, its force is only recommendatory and not obligatory, so that the Government can go on making people drink and deriving revenue therefrom. Another important resolution, also moved by a private member, related to the need for the appointment of a Special Officer in charge of Irrigation. The Government opposed this again on the ground that it had not neglected irrigation. To this however the reply came that no exhaustive survey of the irrigation possibilities of the State had so far been made. The Government had been content to do a bit of work here and another bit there as need arose: the irrigation problem of the State had not been fully envisaged. The State had only "an administration and no Government." This resolution also was pressed to division and passed by an overwhelming majority. It seems to us that those who were for the resolution had a strong case to make in favour of a special officer for irrigation. In an agricultural country like ours, it is difficult to exaggerate the importance of irrigation and the Cochin Government would do well to copy Mysore and exhibit some energy in improving water facilities for its ryots.

"THE Guardian" of Calcutta extracts a very useful article with the above title from "Why America voted for Prohibition." The author of the article is Dr. H. E. Forick. In his opinion, though there is smuggling going on today in America in consequence of which a large number of people drink, yet the affairs condition of before the passing of the Volstead Act was much worse. And in support of his position he quotes part of a speech delivered in 1912 at a meeting of the Liquor Dealers' Association in Ohio. The quotation runs thus: "We must create the appetite for liquor in the growing boys. Men who drink... will die, and if there is no new appetite created, our counters will be empty as well as our coffers. The open field for the creation of appetite is among the boys. Nickels spent in treats to boys now will return in dollars to your tills after the appetite has been formed". This gives an indication of the strength of the campaign in favour of drink as well as of the drinking habit before the Act. But now things are changed very much for the better. It is wrong to suppose that only prohibition faddists worked for the Law, for business men were no less keen for it. Mr. Henry Ford once said that if prohibition were given up, he might have to close his factories. He has calculated that between 1919 and 1925 the per capita productivity of workers in the automobile business increased by 100 per cent. and in the rubber tyre business by 139 per cent. It is undeniable that prohibition has strong economic bearings and that productivity in the U.S.A. has vastly increased as a result of it. But what do our administrators say?

Afraid of sacrificing even a part of their present gain, they are forfeiting immense possibilities of future moral and economic gain to the country. Nothing can be more suicidal.

* * *

THE Chief of Miraj appears to be determined to throttle the ryots' movement to get justice in the matter of the recent revision survey and it is said that his recent appointment as Joint Karbhari of a gentleman who was actively interested in the movement is made with that end in view. When this functionary recently visited some of the villages concerned, there was such a complete hartal that he could meet nobody except a few children who were there only to hand to him a written representation on behalf of the villagers. This drew his attention to the Chief's promise of an inquiry by himself in association with the ryots' representative Mr. Pundalik given on November 4 and pressed for its being carried out. Who can say that in making this demand they were taking up an unreasonable attitude? But this reasonableness on their part is going to be met by drastic action on the part of the State authorities which is heralded in a proclamation in the approved bureaucratic style for which the Joint Karbhari has made himself responsible. Needless to say, this completely ignores the Chief's promise to inquire into the matter. It charges the leaders of the movement with prejudicing the people against the State authorities. We do not think any outsider was required for the purpose. By going back upon his promise the Chief himself has done more than anybody could possibly do to poison the minds of the subjects against himself. Here was a promise solemnly given by him in the presence of about three thousand of his own subjects, of his solicitude for whose welfare he is fond of making an ostentatious display so often. If he had taken steps to implement this promise all unpleasantness would have been avoided. Far from doing so, he is now threatening the ryots, through his newly found henchman, with dire consequences, their only fault, if it can at all be so called, being that they ask him to show greater respect for his pledged word. To say the least, this is far from statesmanlike and quite unbecoming of the exalted position he holds.

* * *

THE death of the Raja of Panagal removes one of the most outstanding figures in South Indian politics during the last ten years. After the death of Sir P. Thyagaraya Chetty, he was made the leader of the Justice party and it is common knowledge how wise and firm his leadership was. As Chief Minister to the Government of Madras, he was responsible for two measures which are bound to prove highly beneficial to the public. One is the State recognition of indigenous medicine and the other the Hindu Religions Endowments Act. A man of great erudition, his knowledge of men and affairs was profound. And as a tactician he had no equal at any rate in South India. This was clearly seen when, taking advantage of the resignation by Mr. T. R. Venkatarama Sastri of his office of Law Member to the Government of Madras, he most adroitly managed to get his own nominee, Dewan Bahadur Krishnan Nair, appointed to the vacant place. One indeed feels at times that what was meant for the country was used for the party but in Milton's words he also serves who stands and waits. Politics in South India is decidedly the poorer for his death.

THE GOAL OF BRITISH POLICY IN INDIA.

It is a very interesting thesis which Mr. M. Ruthnaswamy, the talented Principal of the Madras Law College, has propounded in his lectures under the "Right Hon'ble V. S. Srinivasa Sastri Foundation."* With the main part of his thesis there will be general agreement, viz. that the idea of establishing representative self-government in India even as the ultimate objective of British rule is of very recent growth. He shows how in the pronouncements of even the most sympathetic and liberal-minded Anglo-Indian administrators the words "liberty" and "self-government" were conspicuous by their absence, and how when these words came to be used at all, it was only to disown them as defining the goal of their policy. The most striking instance of such repudiation is of course that of Lord Morley, who, in introducing reforms which were the penultimate stage of the declaration of August 1917, definitely looking forward to self-government, emphatically disclaimed his intention of inaugurating reforms which would lead to self-government even in the remote future. Throughout the period of British rule till the other day the ruling theory in Indian administration was, as Mr. Ruthnaswamy says, that of "feudal paternalism and enlightened despotism", occasionally tempered by a desire to make political concessions to popular demands. Only in Lord Ripon's régime was a different spirit at work, when self-government in the local sphere was conceded to the people, and the political education of the latter was given precedence over departmental efficiency as the supreme end of government. Except for this brief interval British rulers were occupied in India in promoting the material interests of the people to the neglect of their spiritual development. They established peace and security; they pushed forward public works; they improved public health; they carried on famine relief operations; they introduced a system of law; they induced foreign capital and enterprise to flow in to the immense material advantage of the country. All these are great blessings, which must be assessed at their proper worth; but the activities of the Government of India at this time were directed to securing more of material prosperity than the moral contentment of the people. The Government proceedings of the time were thus informed by what Mr. Ruthnaswamy calls political materialism. It was only within the last dozen years, Mr. Ruthnaswamy avers, that this theory has been abandoned in favour of one of frankly acknowledging the right of the people to determine their own political destiny and consciously working towards self-government, and this radical change in political theory is attributable, according to him, to Lord Chelmsford under the inspiration of the Round Table group. He bases this view on the speeches made by the ex-Viceroy, first, in the Imperial Legislative Council on the 5th September 1917 and, then, in the House of Lords on the 8th November 1927.

*The Political Theory of the Government of India. By M. RUTHNASWAMY. (Minerva Press, Madras.) 1928. pp. 40.

Whatever there is in these speeches lends support to Mr. Ruthnaswamy's view, but it requires further corroboration before it can be accepted as correctly representing the real extent of the influence of the Round Table thinkers on the course of modern India history. Whatever that be, it is beyond question that rulers of British India generally carried on the administration without troubling to think what the end of it all was to be.

The history of the Philippine Islands under the U.S. throws this English policy into strong relief. If British administrators sedulously refrained from employing language which was capable of being interpreted as a promise of eventual self-government, the American administrators from the moment the conquest was accomplished were lavish in promising, not merely internal autonomy, but *de jure* as well as *de facto* independence to the point of severing the connection with the U.S. President McKinley, the man most responsible for the acquisition of the Philippines, said in the very beginning of American occupation, i. e. in 1899:—

The Philippines are ours not to exploit, but to develop, to civilize, to educate, to train in the science of self-government.

President McKinley's successor, Mr. Roosevelt, in his message to Congress in 1904, said:—

We are endeavouring to develop the natives themselves so that they shall take an ever-increasing share in their own government, and as far as is prudent we are already admitting their representatives to a governmental equality with our own. . . . If they show that they are capable of electing a legislature which in its turn is capable of taking a sane and efficient part in the actual work of the government, they can rest assured that a full and increasing measure of recognition will be given to them.

In 1907 Mr. Taft, then Secretary of War, said:—

(The avowed policy of the National Administration) looks to the improvement of the people both industrially and in self-governing capacity. As this policy of extending control continues, it must logically reduce and finally end the sovereignty of the U.S. in the Islands, unless it shall seem wise to the American and the Filipino peoples, on account of mutually beneficial trade relations and possible advantages to the Islands in their foreign relations, that the bond shall not be completely severed.

In 1908 President Roosevelt said:—

I trust that within a generation the time will arrive when the Filipinos can decide for themselves whether it is well for them to become independent or to continue under the protection of a strong and disinterested power, able to guarantee to the Islands order at home and protection from foreign invasion.

We regard ourselves as trustees acting not for the advantage of the U.S. but for the benefit of the people of the Philippine Islands. Every step we take will be taken with a view to the ultimate independence of the Islands and as a preparation for that independence.

Again:—

By their counsel and experience, rather than by our own, we shall learn how best to serve them and how soon it will be possible and wise to withdraw our supervision.

These and suchlike declarations culminated in the Autonomy Act of 1916, which is "an Act to declare the purpose of the U.S. as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands" and the purpose is authoritatively declared therein to be as follows:—

To withdraw their sovereignty over the Philippine Islands and to recognise their independence as soon as a stable government can be established therein.

It is of course possible to declare independence to be the goal of Government policy and yet to carry on the administration in such a way as not to make a beginning in self-government, not to speak of its successive accelerations. On the contrary it is equally possible to avoid declaring the goal but quietly lay the foundations on which self-governing institutions can be reared. The British Government in India may, as Mr. Ruthnaswamy says in one place, be better than its word, but the U. S. Government too, at any rate till recently, has not been slack in implementing the policy enunciated in the utterances given above. "Step by step institutions of self-government were given to the people. At first municipal governments were established; then came provincial governments; the Filipinos were then given participation in the Central Government with the appointment of Filipino members in the Commission and in the Supreme Court; then an elective Lower House was established composed entirely of Filipinos." (Maximo M. Kalaw in *The Present Government of the Philippines*.) Under the Democratic Administration (1913 to 1921) the policy of extending self-government was more rapidly pursued, and the results were observable in all departments. First as to the civil service. On the 1st January 1913 there were in the service 6,363 Filipinos as against 2,623 Americans; and on the 1st July 1921 there were 13,240 Filipinos as against 614 Americans. The respective percentages of Filipinos and Americans in the Government service, which had stood at 72 as against 28 in 1913, therefore came to stand at 96 as against 4 in 1921. By Act 2666 of the Philippine Legislature it was provided that the Secretaries of all Government Departments must be Filipinos. Between 1914 and 1921 the enrolment in the national schools was doubled and by the latter year the proportion of the population attending school had risen to 10 per cent. In 1915 there were in the Philippines 621,115 pupils in 4,291 schools. By 1920 the number had risen to 791,626 pupils in 5,944 schools, and by February 1927 to 1,130,366 pupils in 7,789 schools. The financial contribution of the Philippine State towards education amounted to 27½ per cent. of insular revenues in 1926. (Taken from the *Survey of International Affairs*, 1926, pp. 411, 413.) This is an achievement to which nothing in British Indian history can be paralleled.

Latterly there is drastic reaction in the Filipinization policy of the U. S., due no doubt to the realization, which was lacking before, first, that the Philippines in the changed circumstances of the Pacific have acquired a new strategic importance and, second, that the Islands are capable of being economically exploited to the great advantage of the States. American promises of independence had been given "somewhat thoughtlessly", as Professor Toynbee says euphemistically, "in the comfortable assurance which prevailed during the first phase of American rule, that in the Philippines the U.S. had

no vital interests of her own at stake." The U.S. however discovered later that she had vital interests, both political and economic in the Islands, and the discovery has made the fulfilment of the promises very tardy on her part. It is therefore a question how far such promises really facilitate early advent of self-government; and the question is rendered very poignant by the course events have taken in Egypt to which similar promises of independence have been made, and with worse results. Nonetheless it cannot be gainsaid that the American policy in the Philippines has been on the whole more liberal both in fact and theory than the British policy in India.

Mr. Ruthnaswamy's lecture raises the further question as to how far the extent of self-government to be conferred on a people is really determined by the capacity of the latter to shoulder its responsibilities and how far by the capacity of the rulers to part with power. But a consideration of this cannot be entered upon here.

LORD CURZON.—II.*

ON the termination of the War Lord Curzon moved in the House of Lords that an address be presented to His Majesty congratulating him on the conclusion of the War. The subject lent itself to the peculiar style of oratory which he affected, and his speech, we are told, was worthy of the occasion. Referring to the causes of the enemy's failure, he said,

"Among the many miscalculations of the enemy was the profound conviction not only that we had a contemptible little army but that we are a doomed and decadent nation. The trident was to be struck from our palsied grasp; the Empire was to crumble at the first shock."

It was to Lord Curzon with his innate love of pageantry that the Prime Minister turned to direct the series of demonstrations of popular feeling that took place during the next two years. In January 1919 he agreed to take charge of the Foreign Office in the absence of Mr. Balfour in Paris and work poured on him in a never-ending stream. With the best will in the world it was difficult for two men of such different temperaments to share control of foreign policy and in October Lord Curzon was installed in the place of Mr. Balfour and the auspices under which he embarked on the task were favourable. Persia, "that had provided him with material for the most monumental of all his books", attracted his attention as he gazed curiously over the constantly changing kaleidoscope of the Near and Middle East. In an address to the Imperial War Cabinet, he had asked them to consider the trend of the German policy as directed by the German Emperor; all his gestures were made in pursuance of a policy designed to place Turkey in ultimate political and economic bondage to Germany; and he pointed out that Germany, if she were baffled in the West as the result of peace, would turn towards the East. Germany's ultimate objective, in his opinion, was the destruction of the British Empire by striking at India along these lines of advance. As a bulwark against this penetration "we must endeavour," he said, "by every means in our power to secure a friendly Persia and a loyal Afghanistan." He thought that the policy of withdrawing from Persia after the War would be "immoral, feeble and disastrous;" and he embarked

* *The Life of Lord Curzon*. Vol. III. By the Rt. Hon. the Earl of Ronaldshay. (Ernest Benn, London.) 1928. 9½ x 6. pp. 457.

upon negotiations which had led already to the signing to the Anglo-Persian Treaty. According to this Great Britain was to assist Persia by means of a loan of money to be secured on Persian Customs and a loan of officers and equipment required for the creation of a national army; at the same she promised to respect the independence and integrity of Persia. It is remarkable as his biographer points out, that the views which he had formed about Persia's place and the policy which Great Britain should adopt towards her while still a boy at Eton were repeated by him in his book on Persia; he attempted to give effect to them as Viceroy and he carried them out as Foreign Secretary—a striking example of the fixity of ideas which was one of his outstanding characteristics. But his dreams of a rejuvenated Persia supported by Great Britain were shattered by the Treaty between Persia and the Soviet authorities in 1921 after a period of chaos in Persia. Thus the policy which had been the pre-occupation of a life-time with Lord Curzon had been finally brought down to the ground.

ANGLO-FRENCH RELATIONSHIP.

Nearer home he had to solve the question of Anglo-French relations. England wished to maintain closest possible union with France; at the same she was expected to exercise a restraining influence upon France who was inclined to follow a policy of aggression. At successive conferences Lord Curzon found there were radical differences between the points of view of Great Britain and France, the former anxious that the Allies should act in combination while the latter ready to act independently in a manner incompatible with the mutual understanding upon which the stability of the Alliance depended. He believed that cooperation with France must remain the sheet-anchor of British Foreign policy and to maintain the unity, he had to find a *modus vivendi* every time that a rupture was threatened. Lord Ronaldshay tells us, and we may well believe it, that in his conduct of affairs as Foreign Secretary Lord Curzon clung with an almost blind tenacity to the righteousness and justice of the case and the honesty with which the cause itself was pursued. His diplomacy was not of the crooked type but was straight and aboveboard and his real greatness, as a force in world politics according to his biographer, lay in his instinctive recognition of the power of moral rectitude in the field of international politics. In 1920 the problem of Egypt had been made acute by the demand made by Egyptian nationalists for complete independence. After the Milner Commission had presented their report, Lord Curzon, while accepting the broad principles upon which the recommendations in the report rested, did not hesitate to call the attention of the Cabinet to the dangers which seemed to him to lurk behind the proposals of Lord Milner. In view of the Indian problem it is interesting to note his warning to the Cabinet that in coming to a decision on the Egyptian question they would not merely be solving a difficulty but creating a precedent. After long-drawn negotiations the British Government declared Egypt to be an independent sovereign State. In the whole of this affair his biographer says that he displayed a surprising diffidence in pressing his views against opposition in the Cabinet—in contrast with the vigour with which as Viceroy of India he had invariably pressed his views and uncompromisingly rejected anything that fell short of his demands; this new-found pliancy is attributed in his biography to a subtle change in Lord Curzon's psychology, namely, a loss of the assurance and hilarious optimism of the earlier days and possibly to mental depression. The mental conflict between continuing his laborious task out of a sense of duty and voluntary with-

drawal from a position full of painful and humiliating situations has been described by Lord Ronaldshay with remarkable insight and in a sympathetic vein.

THE TURKISH QUESTION.

On the Turkish question his recommendations were the ejection of the Turk from Europe, the establishment of a compact Turkish State in Asia Minor and the administration of Constantinople and the Bosphorus by an International Commission. His warning about not delaying the settlement fell on deaf ears and in the absence of definite decision by the Powers, individual nations had begun to act independently. Instead of supporting him the Cabinet defeated his proposal of ejecting the Turk from Europe and in August 1920 the treaty of Sevres was signed. Lord Curzon had used his influence up to the last moment against the provisional occupation of Smyrna by the Greeks, which was an item of the Treaty; and in view of the additional revelation that Mr. Lloyd George encouraged the Greeks to continue their venture Lord Ronaldshay thinks that no greater injustice could have been done to Lord Curzon than to hold him responsible for the consequent disaster. The attitude of the Turks was now stiffened by the belief that the French sympathy was on their side. By October the Greeks had been sobered and had agreed to place themselves in the hands of Lord Curzon and he began a further attempt to reach a settlement by a modification of the Treaty of Sevres. A change of government in France as well as Italy caused inevitable delay; a complication interesting from the Indian point of view was the representation by the Viceroy that the factor of the effect of a treaty humiliating to Turkey on Indian Muslims should never be ignored. Lord Curzon was embarrassed by this Turko-phil policy of the Indian Government but persisted in his negotiations. During the ten sittings of the Paris Conference in March 1922 he took the lead but the pronouncement issued at the conclusion and the suggested settlement were contingent on the acceptance of them by Greece and Turkey.

Although he was not present at the Genoa Conference and thus escaped the ordeal, he disliked the idea of having a parley with the representatives of Soviet Russia. Knowing the trend of Mr. Lloyd George's policy for the last few years, he was not certain that England may not be committed to something pregnant with political disaster. Fortunately the Conference was abortive and the Russian question remained in abeyance. But the victories of the Turks and the possible attack on the neutral zone had created a critical situation which demanded the attention of the Cabinet. France had withdrawn her contingent and Lord Curzon induced the French Premier to agree to dispatch an invitation to the Angora Government. Curiously enough, in this affair Lord Curzon was for caution while the other Ministers in the Cabinet were war-mongers insisting on prompt military action instead of trusting to conferences. Another rupture due to the action of the French General was avoided by Lord Curzon by means of a personal Conference with the French Premier as a result of which fresh terms were offered to the Turks. At this very time the leading Unionist members of the Cabinet decided in favour of an appeal to the country before the end of November. Lord Curzon himself was dissatisfied with Mr. Lloyd George for settling things without the knowledge of the Foreign Office and making promises running counter to the policy pursued by the Foreign Secretary. The result was, as Lord Curzon himself said in a protest which was never sent owing to the fall of the Coalition Government, "the Foreign Office and myself in particular have been held up to contempt for hav-

ing abdicated our functions or allowed them to be stolen away." It is interesting to see that Lord Curzon did not question the paramount influence of the Prime Minister, but only asked for due co-ordination. And Lord Curzon shared this feeling with many others including Liberals; at this time Mr. Asquith commented in a speech upon "the substitution for our old and well tried constitutional procedure of the improvisations of an intermittent and incalculable dictatorship." With all this, within a few days he changed his views and refused to support an immediate appeal to the country and refused to attend any further conferences of the Coalition leaders.

THE PEACE TREATY.

In the Peace Conference assembled in November 1922 Lord Curzon took a very important part as Chairman of the Commission on Territorial and Military Questions, which with two others was entrusted with the work of the Conference. Before the Conference met Lord Curzon brought about an understanding between the principal Allies on the main provisions of the Treaty to be negotiated. For the first time after the War a peace was not dictated but an agreement arrived at by argument, persuasion and compromise. As divergences came to the surface, Lord Curzon realized that it would be a long struggle; in spite of this he got on with the Conference better than he expected. In fact he was everywhere praised for his conciliation, courtesy and tact and he had won the respect and admiration of the delegates within a very few days. Soon however he found the Turks impossible and at times he threatened to leave Lausanne. The end of the year did not bring the Treaty of Peace in sight. At this time Lord Curzon was hurried by Mr. Bonar Law who was not very happy at the holding of the Mandate for Mesopotamia and would have liked to clear out of Mosul, the Straits and Constantinople rather than have a breakdown in the negotiations. Lord Curzon had not the least intention of handing over to Turkey a large province like Mosul and in a statement issued at the sitting of the Territorial Commission he dealt with all the arguments, ethnographical, economic and strategical, on which the Turkish case was based with the authority derived from exact knowledge. He showed how a Turkish army based on Mosul would have Baghdad at its mercy. Lastly he expressed his willingness to submit the Mosul case to the decision of the League of Nations. The statement by the French Government informing the Angora Government that they did not regard the text of the Treaty submitted at the Conference as final, encouraged the Turks in the game of playing for further time and after so much travail, the world was informed that no treaty had been signed. That however does not obscure the personal triumph of Lord Curzon; so says his biographer and he quotes from a letter from Mr. Strachey an appreciation of Lord Curzon's achievement, which says: "It was one of those miracles of statesmanship which deserves to stand with the work that Talleyrand did at the Congress of Vienna." Later on in July 1923 a treaty of peace was signed, which with all its defects was a great achievement. Lord Curzon specially emphasised that the final restoration of peace in the Near East and the appeasement in all Moslem countries following on the reconciliation between Great Britain and Turkey were sufficient to justify the labours at Lausanne. The decision of the League of Nations in December 1925, justified the case presented by Lord Curzon at Lausanne, with regard to the retention of Mosul as part of the kingdom of Irak.

MISSING OF THE PREMIERSHIP.

After his return from Lausanne the resignation

of the Prime Minister on the ground of ill-health created a situation which provided inevitable anxieties and uncertainties of situation. The crowning ambition of Lord Curzon's life was about to see fulfilment, so his friends thought. Ever since his Oxford days or perhaps earlier he had set before himself the ambition of holding the two offices of the Viceroy of India and the Prime Minister. And Lord Ronaldshay describes the pathos of one of the most cruel disappointments of a man of inordinate ambition but afflicted with a "highly strung emotional temperament," a defect which was the cause of half the mental agonies that he experienced. Lord Curzon had not the least doubt about the superiority of his claims to those of Mr. Baldwin and yet it turned out that the very place in the House of Lords which he had coveted after his return from India became the impediment to his cherished ambition. He was informed of the decision of the King that the objections to a Prime Minister in the Upper Chamber were insuperable. He could not bring himself to believe that with his long record of public service he could be passed over. And his biographer appreciates the moral greatness which in spite of his deep disappointment he displayed by consenting to remain at his post, in order to carry through unfinished programmes and knowing that his retirement involved distrust in the new administration to avoid causing embarrassment.

In view of the violation, of the stipulations of the Agreement of 1921 by Russia Lord Curzon presented his demands as an ultimatum and the Soviet Government complied substantially with all these. On the question of the occupation of the Ruhr, there was as usual a wide divergence between Lord Curzon and the French Government and he had to impress on the latter that by intensifying the disorder of German finance and currency the occupation would have the gravest reactions upon trade; the latter firmly refused to admit the necessity of an enquiry into Germany's capacity to pay. In a dispatch presented to Parliament in August he critically analysed the claims put forward by France and Belgium to increase their percentages at the expense of Great Britain and emphasized the fact that Great Britain alone among the Allies was paying interest on debts incurred during the War and that the British people were more heavily burdened with taxes than the French and the Belgian. He urged therefore an impartial fixation of the Reparations at a figure not inconsistent with Germany's capacity to pay. The dispatch was widely spoken of as one of Lord Curzon's masterpieces. This problem was ultimately solved by the Dawes Committee in the spring of 1924, with the cooperation of U.S. and Lord Curzon is equally entitled to the credit for having constantly urged and finally secured this cooperation.

UNEMPLOYMENT AND TRADE DEPRESSION.

The problem of unemployment and trade depression once more raised the issue of protection and the Prime Minister made up his mind to appeal to the country. Lord Curzon's enthusiasm for tariff reform had never been very great and he deeply deplored what he thought a premature dissolution on an issue which was certain to weaken the party. After the defeat of the Government on January 21st, Lord Curzon handed over the seals of the Foreign Office. Lord Ronaldshay thinks that the dust of controversy hangs too thick over the scene at present to admit of a dispassionate judgment on the success or failure of his administration at the Foreign Office and yet he says that an attempt to focus contemporary opinion should not be shirked. The comparative poverty of the results of his amazing industry and ability are to be explained by the indecisiveness of his advice as to the action to be taken in a situation, which he had brilliantly expounded and thoroughly analysed with

regard to the factors leading up to it. But allowance has to be made for the fact that in the post-War conditions he was subordinate to an unusual degree to the dominant figure of Mr. Lloyd George and was precluded from taking finally binding decisions and it is speculated that if he had been himself Prime Minister he would have loomed far larger upon the international stage. Autocratic by nature, he was not fitted to play a subordinate part. He was conscious that the qualities which the British had now to cultivate were those of endless patience, never-failing equanimity and tact, but Lord Ronaldshay believes that he was not so quick to realize that he was not himself so well equipped by nature to play such a part. Lord Curzon's own idea that the Ambassadors of foreign powers being easy to get on with was in his biographer's opinion not well-founded. He was never proficient in the art of *finesse* and his distaste for pretence of any sort dissuaded him from any attempt to disguise his own feelings, and he was frank to the point of rudeness in giving expression to his opinions. And yet even with the times out of joint, his biographer thinks that "it may be said with confidence that to the student of some future day Lord Curzon will stand out as a great and arresting figure against the shifting background of his age"—an opinion with which even the most carping critic will, we think, readily agree. As for his biographer's judgment that he was a statesman whose conduct was based on the loftiest conception of international morality, many would question its correctness, and opinions are bound to differ; it all depends on the connotation of that hackneyed but much misunderstood phrase.

It was to Kedleston that he turned in all the crises of his life and so he did now; here once again he indulged his passion for reconstructing the past and showing his veneration for the ancient social order that sprang from feudal England. A vision of life at Kedleston, amid whose peaceful surroundings he might spend long joyous hours plying his pen not on official memoranda but on those many other subjects which he loved, was one which had grown in attractiveness all these years. As Fate would have it, he was not destined to enjoy this happiness very long after his retirement.

In the Epilogue Lord Ronaldshay sets down reflections prompted by a consideration of Lord Curzon's life. It is hard to decide, he says, whether to applaud or deprecate the breathless activity of his days, and his ceaseless striving after accomplishment; and he speculates whether Lord Curzon's performances would have been greater if he had been capable of recognizing the essential wisdom of the golden mean. Quoting Buddha who said "Energy too much strained tends to excessive zeal" he sustains the moral drawn above. As for the question 'Qui bono' there is no doubt that Lord Curzon lived and worked that he might serve his fellowmen. But Lord Ronaldshay's presentation of the philosophic teaching of the West as being against a life of action and creative work is open to question. Another characteristic of Lord Curzon's personality which he notes was its amazing contradictions. While he was capable of great affection, he was ruthless in his animosity; and it is this which explains the extraordinary variation in the estimates formed of him. These strange inconsistencies were due to the sensitiveness of his nervous system to psychic as well physical surroundings. The fact that in spite of this he was not like a rudderless bark tossed hither and thither on a tempestuous sea was due to a simple and religious faith that the universe was an expression of divine purpose and man was a vital element in a divinely ordered plan; and it was this belief which was the basis of his Imperialism. At the

same time he admitted that if Imperialism was to weld the parts of the Empire into a great World State it must be animated by the sense of sacrifice and the idea of duty. The only difficulty is how to practise this genuine preaching. In addition to his 'Ethical Theism' he had an unalterable belief in the persistence of personality beyond the grave. It is this theistic belief that enabled Lord Curzon to rise superior to the disabilities of a vivid temperament and dedicate his life and talents to the service of State.

V. N. GODBOLE.

REVIEWS.

SCIENCE OF STATISTICS.

THE MAKING OF INDEX NUMBERS. (3rd Edition Revised). By IRVING FISHER. (Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston.) 1927. 8 $\frac{3}{4}$ x 6. pp. 538. \$7.50.

IRVING FISHER, the famous professor of Political Economy, Yale University, brought out in 1922 as the opening volume among the publications of the Pollak Foundation of Economic Research, this monumental study on the "Making of Index Numbers, their varieties, tests and reliability" which was designed to play a valuable part in bringing about the abandonment of faulty methods of constructing index numbers, the general adoption of a dependable method, and the consequent substitution, wherever measurement is possible, of scientific method for personal opinion. The book immediately called forth much comment, both favourable and unfavourable, and Prof. Udny Yule reviewing it in the May 1923 issue of the *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* concluded (p. 430): "the volume will serve as a useful encyclopædia of formulæ and collection of arithmetical tests of such formulæ. From the standpoint of principle it is wholly disappointing." In the meanwhile another edition of the book was called for within five months, and the author who was busy writing replies to learned societies, maintaining his views against the criticisms they expressed, ushered in the second edition suggesting that his "replies may be considered as addenda to this book" and informing that his "own belief is that every essential conclusion of the book stands unshaken." The third edition issued in 1927, now under review, is "an exact reprint of the second, except for Appendix IX beginning on p. 421, which records and discusses the literature appearing since the first edition."

Prof. Fisher's book is a bulky one extending over 530 pages divided into 17 chapters, and comprising 9 or 10 appendices, together with heaps of tables, charts and formulæ and freely interspersed with peculiar coined words and with extracts from personal correspondence with, or references to, published writings of, a large number of writers from all quarters of the globe. Truly this is a mystifying volume and the author himself has tried to select "cutlets" as it were for the easy consumption of (1) the specialist, (2) the non-mathematical reader, (3) the non-specialist, (4) the general reader and (5) the skimmer; but to take my readers a little into confidence, I might say that I am not quite at ease to find where I personally come in in the above scheme. For nearly five years now, I believe, I have had occasion to come across the book but never before could I "get through" it. It has always been "learned lumber" to me even as it may have been to others before me. For nearly the same time too, it has been part my of duties in my University to

lecture upon this subject, but I have always exhibited it in the show case and I know it had a very "rapid circulation."

Nevertheless I think the book contains a number of very important ideas, and I permit myself to select the following leading ideas from my note-book for the purposes of this review and trust that I shall then have fairly represented (to those readers who want to judge the author or his book from only the reviews) the author of such learning, fame and enthusiasm among the living mathematical economists of the present day.

First, an index number being essentially an indicating number, a variety of such indicators can be devised (a) by selecting one of six different types of averages; (b) by adopting one of four (or six) different methods of weighting, and (c) by taking them either directly or antithetically; and finally (d) by rectification by some process of 'crossing'—either individually or jointly such as crossing two crosses and so on.

Secondly, out of the formulæ so evolved, some 134 I believe, may be considered "reasonable," and their fairness or appropriateness may be checked by two chief tests of reversibility—called "time reversal" and "factor reversal"—in that the forward and backward indexes of the same two numbers shall be the reciprocal of each other, and in that the resulting value is the product of the values of the elements (usually price and quantity) that make it up.

Thirdly, while a large number of formulæ is thrown out by these two acid tests, further means of discovering bias—of type and of weight—by base shifting and other circular tests, eliminate a large number of the remaining freakish formulæ from the arena of practical statistics, until some eight most practical formulæ only remain.

Finally, while one "ideal" index number is held up, these eight are classified according to accuracy, speed, simplicity, etc., and are recommended for lighter performances, even as one would prefer as against a Lick telescope some "smaller, cheap telescopes, spy glasses, opera glasses, on the porch of his summer house or at the theatre."

The book is thus a great book—thorough and comprehensive. It will always remain a great book, although like other great classic books, it will also perhaps never be read thoroughly and comprehensively.

K. B. MADHAVA.

RELATIONS BETWEEN CAPITAL AND LABOUR.

MODERN INDUSTRIAL TENDENCIES. By CHARLES W. MACARA. (Author, Manchester.) 1927. 7½ x 5. pp. 414.

THIS is a volume of articles by Sir Charles Macara which have been written mostly at the request of many leading journals. The articles cover a variety of subjects but predominantly have reference to the history and progress of the Cotton Industry and Trade in England.

Sir Charles has had very intimate connection with the industry and has been actively associated with it for a long period of years. He has been variously described as the 'doyen' of the Lancashire Cotton Trade and the Dean of Cotton Philosophers. It is worthwhile to have the views of one who is not a professional politician or a bookish university Professor on questions of business organization and enterprise.

Sir Charles has full faith in the trade union movement and does not flinch from criticising the

Baldwin Government for its Trade Unions Bill recently passed into law. "I can conceive of no business man of experience countenancing it" says Sir Charles. "I see," he adds, "in the clauses of the Trade Unions Bill attempts at restriction that I thought we had done with forever in our trade relations with each other. A general strike ought not to be made the peg on which to hang repressive legislation." (p. 198.) Further, "in my judgment the Trade Unions Bill carries some of the worst features that it is possible to introduce in industrial control."

Sir Charles Macara's views on the Labour question are worth notice. He writes:

"What is keeping trade in its present moribund condition is the lack of *personal incentive*. Raising or lowering hours, altering rates of pay or making the state the employer instead of the individual will, I am convinced, be altogether futile, unless we awaken in the worker an interest other than he has at present. At the moment he is fed with a number of foolish doctrines, one of which is that he alone is by his labour making possible such profits as are made in industry; another, that the best way to serve is to restrict output. This incentive it is the *duty* of the employers to supply. Wages alone cannot accomplish this."

Sir Charles is not only a believer in profit-sharing, but a strong advocate of labour co-partnership. In his view "the labourer must in some measure become a partner and know that in working for his employer, he is working for himself." He criticises strongly the employing class for what he calls their "suicidal individualism" and contends that the working class leaders have "either been too jealous of each other or too afraid of losing their own power and dignity to support a control scheme." He has a firm faith in the partnership idea and explains that "the interest of the workers in the business should be in the form of share capital rather than in cash with no responsibility. There is no doubt that Sir Charles' suggestion is no idle boast but one which he considers to be the only proper position between the scylla of a 'suicidal individualism' and the charybdis of a 'blood-thirsty Bolshevism.' It is as much a warning as it is an advice.

On the question of the cotton industry itself, Sir Charles strongly holds that there is no serious danger and believes that the world market could be made safe for Lancashire provided the producers and the workers agree to what he calls a 'control scheme' which would undertake to adjust supply to demand on a study of carefully prepared statistics.

Sir Charles' views on India's fiscal policy would be of interest to Indian readers. He welcomes the decision of the Government of India in not accepting the recommendations of the Textile Tariff Board. But he adds:

"The capital outlay in the erection and equipment of cotton mills in Far Eastern countries—India, China—is double of what it is in England. Increased interest and depreciation are severe handicaps. Then again although the rate of pay is lower for the operatives than in Lancashire, it has to be remembered that more operatives are required for doing identical work in India."

The stimulus given to the increased erection of mills in India would, in Sir Charles' opinion, benefit the machine-makers of Lancashire. The most interesting admission of Sir Charles is that "there is little or no competition between the goods produced by the Indian mills and those imported from Lancashire." This must make the Government of India think seriously about its tariff policy not only of the past, but also for the future.

Sir Charles has done valuable service in putting together the articles from his pen, for not only are they bound to be of interest to the technical expert

in the production and marketing of cotton, but also because they contain the valuable deductions from the experience of a life devoted to business.

S. V. AYYAR.

FREE TRADE VS. PROTECTION.

SAFEGUARDING AND PROTECTION. By FRANCIS W. HIRST. (Richard Cobden-Sanderson, London.) 1927. 8¾ × 6. pp. 157. 7s. 6d.

MR. HIRST, as the readers of his "Adam Smith" know, is a confirmed free-trader and in this small volume he exposes the fallacies, the "verbal tricks and sleek illusions" of plausible protectionism. As he well points out, the present administration in England has neither political mandate nor moral authority to reverse the policy of free trade. To begin with, he shows how England benefitted immensely after the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846 and the inauguration of the free trade régime. But we are inclined to object to his citation of the United States in the same period as an example of a country suffering from a protectionist tariff; the full effects of the system were to be seen after 1885 by which time the U.S.A. became a serious competitor to England as well as Germany. The history of British public opinion on the free trade issue from 1846 to 1925 given by the author is very fair and unprejudiced, the salient points in the fiscal changes being the breach in the free trade system by the McKenna duties in 1915; the budget of 1924 which swept away these duties and rehabilitated free trade; and the promise of the Conservatives to drop protection when they were again in power at the end of 1924. Although at present the Labour party is in favour of free trade the author doubts whether Socialism is ultimately compatible with free trade. The case is strengthened by Sir Alfred Mond's plea that at the very time when there is a universal movement in the direction of free trade on the Continent, England should not drop free trade. The author then describes the new protection which is disguised as safeguarding but which is really as deleterious in its effect on the consumer without doing the workmen any good. The duties were directed not against the unfair competition of a particular country but against the fair competition of all countries, partly with the object of "doing away at once with the cumbrous and vexatious machinery of certificates of origin." The worst of the safeguarding duties has been, according to the author, that they have almost extinguished the re-export trade in England. The safeguarding committees, we are told, violated most of the rules governing the conditions which must be complied with before granting the request for safeguarding; surely this is bad enough. The report of the Outlery Committee, Mr. Philip Snowden is quoted as saying, contains recommendations every single one of which is a *non-sequitur*. In any case no doubt is left in the mind of the reader after completing his perusal of the safeguarding procedure that the Conservative Premier has violated his election pledges. Next is described the passage from safeguarding to subsidies. In this connection the author first points out that subsidies come out of the public purse and that excessive taxation has diminished the purchasing power of the people and so reduced the home market. Subsidies, in the opinion of Mr. Wheatley, are the logical outcome of Socialism and Mr. Hirst thinks that he was the evil genius of Mr. Baldwin in his policy leading to public bankruptcy. The coal subsidy is regarded as sheer waste of public money being only valuable as a warning to governments in the future; as for the subsidy to the sugar factories the author cannot see the fun of

consumers paying twice as much for home-grown sugar as for sugar imported from abroad. The author does not believe in imperial preference; he rather believes that a free market for Empire produce and a free market for loans in London are far more likely to increase Empire trade than a bargain about a preferential tariff. Occasional trade depression and consequent unemployment cannot prove anything either way with regard to free trade; that is the contention of the author and it is perfectly valid but it is no use denying that increase of exports is a real desideratum.

One chapter is devoted to examining the American Customs Union in U.S. The first thing which the author emphasizes about the country is that its prosperity is partly due to tariffs but partly also to the immense area of free trade which it encloses. As against the advocacy of high tariff by the Republican party the author quotes the Democratic manifesto complaining of the increased cost of living, and the depression of agriculture. According to his reading of the situation, the intelligent section of Republicans are abandoning the crude theory that exports are a blessing and imports a curse. On the whole he thinks that the American tariff instead of being scientific is settled by log-rolling, a conclusion which cannot be denied. Mr. Hirst describes the humorous situation created by U.S. in insisting on the repayment of its debts and yet enacting a high tariff against goods which alone can constitute the means of repayment. He specially deprecates the Baldwin Treaty which he thinks should have at least stipulated that British goods should be admitted free into U.S. or should at least be given a most favoured nation treatment. His remedy then for the ills due to War debts is a general lowering of tariffs. In conclusion, he quotes from the "Bankers' Manifesto" which complains of the blow dealt to international trade by the increased number of tariff barriers due to the birth of new States which treat trading as a form of war and which instead of allaying have intensified racial animosities. In this manifesto the principal bankers of the world arrive at the conclusion that "economic freedom is the best hope of restoring the commerce and credit of the world". The treaty between Latvia and Esthonia which has removed the frontier between the two States is, he says, a good beginning for customs unions. Although we do not agree with the doctrinaire 'free trade' of Mr. Hirst and his denunciation of tariffs as an unalloyed evil there is no gainsaying that he is master of a persuasive eloquence which occasionally displays the highest quality of wit. He is not a mean antagonist and it is difficult to ignore him.

R. G. P.

BRITISH IMPERIALISM IN CHINA.

CHINA AND ENGLAND. By W. E. SOOTHILL. (Oxford University Press.) 1928. 9 × 5¾. pp. 228. 7s. 6d.

IT is a pity that Professor Soothill, the great scholar that he is, should have attempted to justify foreign privileges in China in the book before us. He professes sincere affection for China, but we are afraid he loves his mother-country more than he does China. The book, though written in an eminently readable style, suffers from the sin of gross partisanship. When the author declares that England's interest in China is not trade but the welfare of its people, one can easily estimate his work.

The author gives a historical introduction to his subject for he says, that "without a fair knowledge of the past, the present may be viewed entirely out of focus, and the perspective in consequence be

not wholly accurate." In his historical introduction he lays stress on the unwillingness of the Chinese Government to open their country for purposes of trade, and justifies England's determination to force the Chinese to do so. We wish to refer the author to Oppenheim's "Principles of International Law." In this book (Vol. I, p. 199) Oppenheim says:

"The reception of aliens is a matter of discretion, and every state is by reason of its territorial supremacy competent to exclude aliens from the whole or any part of its territory."

We may also draw the attention of the author to the restrictions placed by English kings on aliens trading with England in the Middle Ages. We think that the Manchu Emperors were justified in excluding the foreign merchants from China as they lived very much in what the lawyers called a state of nature, that is, governed by no rule but their own passions or interests. (Davis' "China and Chinese" Vol. 1, p. 100). We are therefore unable to agree with the author that the English were justified in forcing an opening in China.

The author deals next with extra-territoriality. After defining extra-territoriality as "the privilege of remaining under the laws of one's own nation while residing in a foreign land," and after recognising that it is a trespass on China's sovereignty, the author makes the astounding remark that "extra-territoriality, unequal treaties, imperialism and other slogans have nothing to do with China's troubles." We would submit that the only panacea for China's ills is the removal of all those obnoxious privileges which impair her sovereignty and drain the country of its wealth.

The author fails to see how the immediate abolition of extra-territoriality can in any way aid the Chinese in obtaining a settled Government. Our answer is that the abolition of extra-territoriality will make war and political strife much more dangerous for generals and politicians. It will increase the dangers of civil war and so shorten its duration. It will thus enable the Chinese to obtain a settled Government.

The author says that the British treaties are not "unequal treaties," for they obtained for England "not a position of superiority, but one of equality." Students of history are aware of the provisions of the British treaties which gave to England Hong-kong, Concessions, Settlements, Extra-territoriality and the control of maritime customs. These treaties are certainly an infringement of the laws of equality. Yet the author says that the British treaties are not 'unequal'!

The author denies that there was ever hung any notice board in the tiny foreign organised park saying "Chinese and dogs not admitted." The author however admits that in that park Chinese are only admitted when in charge of foreign children, and that dogs are not admitted. He only denies that there was a notice board. But Dr. Ching-Lin-Hsia in his brilliant work—which, by the way, was approved for the Doctorate of Philosophy in the Edinburgh University—says that there was such a board. Now whom are we to believe—Professor Soothill or Dr. Ching-Lin-Hsia?

We are again surprised that so eminent a scholar as Professor Soothill should have ignored the evil consequences of the present tariff-system in China. He cannot put himself in the position of a Chinaman and see the evils of the Tariff System. All those interested in Chinese affairs may be shocked to hear that the lower rate for foreign goods in comparison with the rate for native goods simply means killing all infant industries in China and makes the already economically backward country still poorer.

The low customs rates which deprive China of a considerable revenue force her Government to retain a bad tax like Likin. The present tariff checks too the productive power of China and will tell upon the commerce of the world at no distant date. For these reasons China asks for a revision of her present fiscal system. In fairness to the author it must be said that he wants a revision of the tariff system after the establishment of a strong central government, but he advocates reciprocity instead of protection pure and simple. After suggesting reciprocity as the ultimate solution of the Tariff problem, the author says: "No immediate enrichment would follow its sentiment, indeed it would only be an additional burden on the people." True; but what China wants is not *Plenty* but *Power*.

The author subjects the "Three Principles of the People" of Dr. Sun-Yat-Sen to a very critical test and finds inconsistencies and historical inaccuracies here and there. The author forgets that Dr. Sun-Yat-Sen was fighting against Imperialism and feudalism and had to issue his manifesto in such a way that the masses of China would be roused against the forces of reaction and privilege. Far be it from us to support the political pamphlet of Dr. Sun-Yat-Sen in toto, but we would only say that the circumstances of the time and the condition of his country warranted the production of such a document. And if at all Dr. Sun-Yat-Sen has erred he erred in good company. Did not the Conservative party use the Zinovieff letter to malign the Labour party? Do not parties suppress truths and suggest falsehoods? All is fair in politics.

We have thus indicated the prejudiced attitude of the author. He seems to have spent many years in China, but we are afraid he has what Arthur Ransome calls the 'Shanghai mind.' The author wields a powerful pen; but he has wielded it for the sake of Imperialism instead of for humanity.

M. V. SUBRAHMANYAM.

HINDU PHILOSOPHY.

INTRODUCTION TO VEDANTA PHILOSOPHY. By PRAMATHANATH MUKHOPADHYAYA. (The Book Co. Ltd., Calcutta.) 1928. 9¾ × 6¾. pp. 258. Rs. 7-8.

THESE represent the Sreegopal Basu Mallik Fellowship Lectures on Vedanta delivered in the Calcutta University in 1927. One of the conditions of the Endowment requires the Lecturer to indicate in particular the place to which Vedanta is entitled in modern thought. This in all probability accounts for the peculiar method followed in the work. The lectures are almost entirely couched in modern Western scientific terminology which makes it difficult to get at the Vedantic thought that is in them or to follow the precise bearing of the discussions on it. The titles of the Chapters except in one or two cases give no clue to it and the exposition often runs to several pages together without the least allusion to anything that is directly connected with Vedanta. Thus in a Chapter styled "Matter and Form" the reference to Vedanta does not occur till the last page and there the transition appears sudden and startling. It seems to us premature to express Vedantic ideas in terms of recent Science, even granting the necessity for or the propriety of doing so, for its concepts are not as yet well understood beyond the circle of a few experts. One also fears that in this kind of exposition there is the risk of pouring new wine into old bottles. In spite of the novelty of its method, it has to be added, that the book in several places is highly suggestive owing to the bold comparisons it institutes between two types of

thought so widely different in their historical antecedents. As regards Vedanta itself, the author does not view it as anything peculiarly Indian but as the necessary implication of all human thought wherever developed—realistic or idealistic, monistic or dualistic (p. 154). His point is that the teaching of the Vedanta as found in the Upanishads foreshadows in a remarkable manner the truth towards which all science and philosophy have been moving. "Many of the deeper currents in the realms of science and philosophy are now seeming to converge to a position that is essentially similar to the position of *Brahma-vada* in the Upanishads". He does not approve of the now generally current estimate that the Upanishads contain only guesses at truth which are neither certain nor consistent, but he makes little effort to establish his view or to refute the opposite one. The author does not concede the same position of finality to any of the schools of later Vedanta. Each of them, he thinks, over-emphasises some aspect of Upanishadic teaching and none therefore represents it faithfully. There is much to be said in support of the latter view, but it is difficult to believe that the Upanishads contain quite a definite doctrine.

M. HIRIANNIA.

SHORT NOTICE.

THE SHADOW OF ABDUL. BY H. K. GORDON
(Edward Arnold & Co., London.) 1928. 7½ × 5
pp. 315. 7s. 6d.

THIS sloppy novel is the product of an imagination which runs in lewd channels and feeds abnormally fat on Indo-phobia. Poor as his literary resources are, Mr. Gordon, its author, is consumed by one unholy purpose; that is to make social contact between Europeans and Indians impossible. He gives his flimsy story such a transparently unfair setting that the unfortunate Indian always emerges from it with highly discreditable black spots and the European uniformly figures as a flawless angel. In spite of the fact that Mr. Gordon in his prefatory note says that "the characters in the book are all fictitious and no reference is made to any living person," he takes every ill-contrived opportunity to slander the impersonal Indian to the top of his bent. In the opening chapter, the insipid heroine, an English girl of twelve, is introduced to us with the revolting encomiums of her Indian nurse.

"Aye, big enough, tall as I am and so strong and straight. But a child still—you ripen slowly, you, daughters of the sahibs. When I was twelve years old my hips were wide, my breasts were swelling. A thirteen I was husband ripe."

Immediately after "life's mysteries, which few children live in India until the age of twelve and do not learn," are painfully opened to her and we find her under circumstances which for flagrant obscenity of description, has nothing to compare in English literature. A dissolute wretch of an Indian,—for of such is the whole nation composed, according to the unsound conception of the average European and our author in particular—takes her unawares. And "she bit his finger and he struck her. She fought him pantingly, but how could child of twelve withstand the maddened beast of twenty? Her struggles weakened; she grew sick and dizzy. The end was certain." Haunted by thoughts of moral pollution, this neurotic girl finds herself in England and is even there pursued by a harmless Indian boy, in whose sportive pranks she reads a deep

sexual meaning. "Suddenly it was gone no longer, for Sylvia unable to dislodge the grip of those brown fingers burst into panic-stricken screaming." Time passed and the scene shifts to India again. Here hideous clouds gather over her life; an innocent politician that he is, Joshi is made to play the ignoble part of an unscrupulous robber for the sake of the country; he misfires at Frampton, his Oxford help-mate; Frampton in hospital in a shell-shocked frame of mind; Sylvia abducted by the Raja of Dharmcot, the monstrous accomplice of Joshi; Frampton's mock heroic confession; Joshi caught and vengefully sentenced to death; Sylvia released from Dharmcot's palace of treachery to his abject discomfiture; in the process the faithful nurse sacrificed with cool non-chalance; at last to satisfy the racial craving of the author for the pound of flesh of the Indian, Joshi's lofty neck undeservedly tied to the fatal rope.

Thus the book gives us an altogether unjust portraiture of England and India. In the interests of Indo-Anglian friendship, it must be totally eschewed. Fortunately the links that bind England and India are made of such sterner stuff that the soap bubbles blown by trivially constituted writers like Miss Mayo who, by the way, is mentioned once in this novel, and Gordon, do no injury to them.

K. VENUGOPAL RAO.

ADVICE TO A YOUNG REVIEWER. By EDWARD COPLESTON.

THE rôle of a reviewer carries with it unlimited powers of life and death over the kingdom of letters. It only becomes him who possesses a lofty sense of "justice and candour" prompted by extreme delicacy. In the absence of this much voluntary restraint, what is pre-eminently an art will degenerate into mockery and vulgarity. The Shakespeare Head Press, concerned as it is with none but the fixed stars of the literary firmament, has worthily dredged out of obscurity a literary recluse of the early nineteenth century—Edward Copleston—whom no less a person than Cardinal Newman gave credit for "scholarlike taste and purity of style"—in order that his "advice to a young reviewer" may serve as a guide to intending critics. Sufficient unto their purpose, therefore, is the classic advice and the illustrative parody.

K. V. RAO.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- CHINA AND WORLD PEACE.** By MINGCHIEN JOSHUA BAU.
(Fleming H. Revell Co., New York.) 1928. 8½ × 5½. pp. 194.
\$2.00.
- BUDDHISM AND FAITH.** By MASATOSHI GENESSEN MORE
(The Herald-Sha, Tokyo.) 1928. 7½ × 5. pp. 148.
- PRE-EXISTENCE AND RE-INCARNATION.** By WINCENTY LUTOSLAWSKI. (Allen & Unwin.) 1928. 7½ × 5½. pp. 157. 6s.
- TOWARDS SWARAJ, BEING THE EXPOSITION OF A SCHEME OF RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT.** By S. K. SARMA. (M. K. Srinivasa Iyengar, Madras.) 1928. 7½ × 5. pp. 428. Rs. 5.

WANTED—Candidates for training Telegraph Signallers. Station Masters. Railway Commercial Courses, Motor Driving, Motor Mechanics, Electrical Engineering taught. Lodging, Furniture free. Railway fare paid. Agra healthier than Delhi. Cheaper living. Apply for prospectus with two-anna postage stamps to the Imperial Telegraph Institution and Electric and Motor Engineering College, Agra.