

# Servant of India

Editor : S. G. VAZE.—Office : Servants of India Society's Home, Poona 4.

VOL. XII, No. 13. }

POONA—THURSDAY, MARCH 28, 1929.

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

## CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK ...	145
ARTICLES :—	
Fawcett Committee's Report. By R. B. Bakhale	148
A Champion of Indian Princes. By S. G. V.	149
Religious Education for University Students. By Dr. D. D. Karve	150
OUR EUROPEAN LETTER	152
REVIEWS :—	
Money Economy in Human Affairs. By P. B. Junnarkar, M.A.	153
Indian Philosophy. By M. H.	153
Post-War Economics. By V. N. G.	154
The Situation in the Pacific. By S. P. Sarma, B.A.	155
SHORT NOTICE	156
BOOKS RECEIVED	156

## TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

THE rounding-up of Labour leaders, only some of whom, we believe, profess Communist opinions, will have, we are afraid, serious reaction on Indian public opinion in general. In so far as the prosecution takes place under the ordinary law, Government cannot be said to have deviated from the pledge given by them while the Public Safety Bill was before the Assembly that no extraordinary powers would be taken for dealing with Indian Communists till at any rate a trial is given to the new Bill. Nor can we have any serious quarrel with the prosecution if it does not mean penalising Communism as a doctrine. Earl Winterton, in replying to questions in the House of Commons, no doubt denied that the Labour leaders "were arrested because they were Communists but because they were charged with conspiracy to deprive the King of the sovereignty of India." In that case the Viceroy has not taken the wisest course in disallowing the adjournment motion in the Assembly, which was tabled for no other purpose than to find out whether a deeper policy did not lie behind the prosecution. The President and Party leaders in the Assembly could have been trusted to keep out of discussion matters that were *sub-judice* in a court of law. They are all eminent lawyers, and they could certainly have discussed the policy (if any) behind the prosecution as apart from the prosecution itself no less than Mr. Crerar could have replied to their argument without trespassing on the merits of the case. It is very unfortunate that the prosecution should have been started at this juncture without an opportunity being taken to clear the Government of the suspicion that they would make the holding of Communist opinions punishable *per se*.

ALTHOUGH the motion for the rejection of the Finance Bill was rejected by a large majority of the Assembly it was symptomatic of the dissatisfaction felt in it over the failure to make Government respond to the national demand and over the slight control exercised by the Assembly over the national expenditure. The debate over the Finance Bill reveals a condition of exasperation produced by the apathy of Government with regard to the major portion of economic grievances. Mr. Rangaswami Iyengar took objection to the convention making all savings under the Army utilisable for the scheme of mechanisation since it took away from the Assembly the control over expenditure. Even Sir P. Thakurdas who had no penchant for additional constitutional debates and censure motions criticized the military policy of Government and earnestly pleaded for responsible government and the transfer of real power to the people. Mr. Rahimtullah criticized the exchange policy of Government and its attitude towards the mill industry. It is surprising that some of the Muslims went off at a tangent and needlessly emphasized the fact that the Nehru Report was not universally supported. Mr. Neogy remarked that the entire tariff policy of the Government was unscientific and anti-national and criticized their refusal to give effect to the recommendations of the Tariff Board about the textile industry. These are only a few of the long catalogue of grievances ventilated during the debate. Although there are many points raised by the Finance Member which are debatable, his reply to the debate was distinctly conciliatory and evinced a sincere desire to profit by at least the responsible part of the criticism directed against the general administration. While admitting the importance of the question of debt redemption he promised to revise the whole scheme shortly and place it before the Assembly. He recognized the duty of the Government to pursue an Economic Enquiry but pleaded inability to do so on account of the stringency in the financial condition. On the question of the poverty of the people he could not do anything except to repeat the stock assurance that Government were doing everything to raise the standard of living in India which he admitted was very low. He justified the restoration of the grants thrown out by the Assembly as businesslike procedure since it was the business of Government to carry on; this is all very well but the more vital enquiry is about the reasons which prompted the rejection of the grants and its moral effect upon Government. If Government in spite of censures simply carry on administration in the old way then it is time to say that the height of callousness is reached. We are thankful to the Finance Member for once more affirming that there is a genuine determination on the part of the British people to honour the pledge of 1917; but what India wants is not more repetitions of pledges but their fulfilment by some sort of

performance. Sir George Schuster repeated the warning he had given in his Budget speech that any political instability due to the actions of the members would have a prejudicial effect on the credit of India and make it difficult to negotiate financial dealings. This is certainly futile as it is practically asking for a suspension of politics in order to make the path of the financier smooth. Of course there can be no quarrel with the desire of the Finance Member to see that large sums which are invested in foreign countries by Indians are brought back to India by restoring confidence in Indian securities. We would also like to see greater cooperation offered by the members of the Assembly to him at least on the neutral ground of finance; but unfortunately politics is made to intrude in finance by the Government themselves and it is no use complaining that the members of the Assembly cannot dissociate the one from the other. We hope the moral of the debate on this year's Finance Bill will not be lost on Sir G. Schuster.

\* \* \*

IT is unfortunate that the Upper House of the Indian Legislature should have rejected Sir Phiroze Sethna's motion for a comprehensive inquiry into the systems of land revenue prevailing in the different provinces. All the same the Indian ryot has every reason to feel grateful to Sir P. C. Sethna for drawing pointed attention to a matter which so vitally touches him. The principles and practice on the subject vary so much from province to province that an inquiry with a view to their proper systematisation and codification is urgently called for. Indeed when the appointment of the Linlithgow Commission was announced there was general regret that this subject was carefully excluded from its purview. But it was just as well it was so, for it is doubtful if the Commission constituted as it was would have been able to do justice to such a big problem. The Joint Parliamentary Committee recommended legislative form being given to principles of land revenue administration; but the recommendation has for the most part not been acted upon. Meanwhile however fresh land revenue settlements are being carried out in the time-honoured fashion which is, as remarked by Lord Curzon, anything but scientific and which ignores almost at every step the two cardinal principles enunciated by him, viz. moderation in enhancement and sympathy in collection. In the Dominions like Australia and New Zealand the question of the right land policy is being tackled with the earnest attention which its importance merits; but in India there was a tendency not to allow the slightest departure from established practice. This, as is only too apparent, is the subject of much dissatisfaction on the part of the peasantry. The permanent settlement depriving as it does the state of its legitimate share in increased agricultural profits is rightly looked upon by enlightened opinion as being antiquated and unjust. If Sir P. C. Sethna's motion had been carried, that too would have come under review at the hands of experts. But Sir Mahomed Habibullah chose to adopt an attitude which, to say the least, was queer. He asked: can the proposed committee deliver the goods? We wonder which committee or commission has done so. Is the Simon Commission itself going to deliver the goods? All that a committee is expected to do is to collect information and to come to its own conclusions based upon that information. We do not think the Government would have lost anything by undertaking the inquiry Sir Phiroze Setana and his supporters wanted them to undertake. Whether it would have led to uniformity of legislation or not, it would at least have brought

fresh minds to bear upon some of the much disputed questions like e. g. whether the present land revenue demand is fair to the agriculturist or whether it presses upon him with undue harshness. While it is true that settlement officers exercise all possible care in making their proposals, it is equally true that what has the greatest weight with them is not the interests of the agriculturists but those of Government revenue.

\* \* \*

AT the third annual dinner of the Bombay branch of the European Association Sir Frederick Sykes gave expression to certain opinions which require some little scrutiny in the light of current happenings. Sir Frederick Sykes thinks that Europeans in India are certainly not hostile to the claims of Indians for a due share in the government of the country. Probably this may be granted but it is as certainly clear that they favour only a slow progress and are asking for safeguards which are hardly consistent with friendliness to Indians. Sir F. Sykes reverts to that musty old proposition that India is a group of nations; he is very late in the day in speaking about the unifying influences of the English language, the railways and a centralized government. We can easily agree with him when he says that extravagant demands are likely to alienate some of the best friends of India; but the question about what are extravagant demands is sure to be a bar to further agreement. Presumably Sir F. Sykes would regard the demand for Dominion Status as extravagant and very likely also he would regard in the same light the demand for the adoption of the Skeen Report. As for his advice that we should solve existing differences by a policy of toleration and an effort to notice the good points of others rather than the defects, it is certainly welcome and we are certain that members of the various communities will follow it willingly. What we feel however is that it is no use at this time emphasizing the communal differences unless we have a new remedy to offer for doing away with them. Harping on the well-known faults of Indian character and the patent defects of the Indian social system is not now calculated to bring about harmony between the Europeans and Indians. If at all it is likely to create new misunderstandings.

\* \* \*

THE Government of India are apparently determined not to spoil the people of this country by satisfying their curiosity even in matters of comparatively minor importance, such as the purpose or result of the visit of the Director of Labour, Malaya, to Delhi towards the close of last year. In reply to a recent question in the Madras Legislative Council on the point, the local Government pleaded ignorance, emigration being a central subject. But we fail to see why in such matters the Government should wait to be asked for enlightenment. The Malayan authorities are however not so secretive and at a meeting of the Indian Immigration Committee recently held in Kuala Lumpur the Director himself gave out the result of his visit to India. As everybody believed at the time, his visit was with a view to securing a further suspension of the emigration rule prescribing a definite sex-ratio to be maintained amongst emigrants. He told the meeting that exemption from the operation of that rule had been granted up to June 30 next year. Would it not have been better if we had learned about this decision from the Government in this country rather than having to depend for information upon the authorities in Malaya? The condition under which the

exemption has been granted is that the Malayan authorities should see that there was no surplus of Indian labour in the colony. That Malaya last year attracted more labour from this country than was needed for her requirements is evident from the number (13,750) of Indian adults, not all of them decrepits, that were repatriated by the Labour Department in 1928. Labour conditions have since altered and it is said that labour is now less in demand in Malaya than for years past. Steps are being contemplated now with a view to satisfying this condition and we should not be surprised if in the current year Indian emigration to Malaya is strictly restricted. Care is also going to be taken that families rather than single individuals emigrate. It is gratifying to see that Indian labour in the colony whether in the employ of private employers or in that of the Malayan Government or Railways would be paid the standard rates of wages which now obtain in a large part of Malaya.

\* \* \*

**PUBLIC** dissatisfaction at the exclusion of Indians from such appointments as private secretaryships to Governors and Viceroy's and their Aides-de-Camp found vent in the U. P. legislative council in connection with the budget debate. There is of course no legal bar to the appointment of Indians to these posts to which a Governor or a Viceroy as the case may be can appoint anybody he likes. But the convention has all along been not to appoint Indians to them. The only departure that took place was when the late Sir Alexander Muddiman appointed an Indian as his Aide-de-Camp; but in no other province are any Indians reported to be holding these posts. Even Lord Sinha as Governor of Bihar and Orissa had a European as his private secretary. Such is the force of custom and nobody tries to break new ground by making even the slightest departure from the established order of things. While Indianisation has been going on in other departments of public service, these particular appointments are still regarded as a close preserve for Europeans. It is high time this came to a stop. The recent debates on this point in the U. P. Legislative Council serve to show the strong feeling that exists on the subject and it is to be hoped that the next favourable opportunity will be availed of in order to satisfy the Indian feeling in the matter.

\* \* \*

**THE** death of Marshal Foch removes one of the greatest generals of modern times and one of the heroes of the Great War who became closely associated with victory by the fact of being the 'Generalissimo' of the Allied forces in the final phases of the Titanic struggle. His fame as a professor of the Military Science was already made long before the War broke out. His part in the victory of the Marne brought him to the notice of the head-quarters and he was raised to the rank of deputy to the Commander-in-Chief and entrusted with the mission of co-operating with the British and Belgium armies so as to ensure a sort of co-ordination of the total Allied forces. After a few reverses and a temporary obscurity, he was appointed to the Chief Command of the Allied armies fighting in France when such a command became imperative in March 1918 when the Germans launched their great offensive and the Allied armies showed signs of wavering. It is creditable to the British and Belgian armies that they consented to merge their individual claims by accepting a single commander for the Allied forces. From this time the world saw his great genius for organization directed to checking the German offensive and finally launching the great counter-offensive

intended to shatter the exhausted German armies. Even after the Armistice which terminated the War Europe acclaimed him as the saviour of the Allied armies, and showered on him all the honours that she had in her gift. He was made a member of the French Academy and a British Field-Marshal. As President of the Inter-Allied Military Commission he rendered great assistance in the furthering of the plans implementing the Treaty of Versailles, although he has alienated many by his insistent demand for the left bank of the Rhine as a barrier for the safety of France. In the light of recent events it must be said that the idea of Marshal Foch that Germany would keep no pledges has been belied; in the matter of reparation payments and of reduction of the army her conduct so far has been exemplary. It is said that his fault was too intense a patriotism, which prevented him from appreciating the point of view of his opponents in the post-war settlements; but surely it ought to be condoned in the case of one who was professedly a military man and not a statesman or a diplomat. It is worth mentioning at this time that Marshal Foch was a great believer in the entente between the British and French.

\* \* \*

**THE** address delivered by Mr. Sachchidananda Sinha as President of the All-India Kayastha Conference at Delhi is the utterance of an earnest social reformer and an independent thinker of no mean pretensions.

In the history of the Conference which he gave we have to note that in 1912 all the North-India Kayasthas were amalgamated while in 1926 the Conference was joined by the entire community in India by the inclusion of the Marathi-speaking Kayasthas. At the outset Mr. Sinha felt it necessary to justify the existence of a communal organization in view of the opinion that it is likely to retard the growth of an Indian nationality. Mr. Sinha's position is that unless the communities making up the people of this country become self-expressive no true Indian nation is likely to come into existence. He believes that the popular theory that political unity can be brought about by ignoring or suppressing the sociological limitations of the component parts is not warranted either by experience or the teaching of history. What is necessary is that the communalism should not be of such a description as to jeopardise the larger interests of the country. We must admit that there is much to be said in favour of this attitude, provided that the limiting conditions are kept constantly in mind. Mr. Sinha rightly contended that the duty of a President is not to discuss particular problems but to make clear the principles underlying social progress and he referred to the fundamental law of social progress as the continuous adjustment to environment. The reason of our failure is, in his opinion, a natural conflict between our intellect and emotion. Mr. Sinha declared that there is no hard and fast line of demarcation between the social problems affecting a particular community and those affecting the country as a whole and in this connection he quoted from Ranade's address at the Lucknow Social Conference which emphasized the fact that there was in the domain of social reform much common ground between the Hindus and Muslims. In order to impress upon the community the need for real work as opposed to passing a sheaf of resolutions Mr. Sinha pointed out that after eloquent addresses on the evils of the dowry custom, the vast bulk of the community are still persisting in the pernicious practice.

\* \* \*

## FAWCETT COMMITTEE'S REPORT.

THE report of the Bombay Strike Enquiry Committee presided over by the Honourable Sir Charles Fawcett is a document of over 250 closely printed pages and contains decisions on matters some of which are of a highly technical character and others vitally affect the interests of the textile workers of Bombay. It was asked to consider whether (i) the standardisation schemes of wages prepared by the Bombay Millowners' Association and the Joint Strike Committee representing the workers, (ii) the seventeen demands of the latter Committee and (iii) the standing orders for the operatives prepared by the Millowners' Association were fair and reasonable. Looking to the importance and technical nature of the issues involved, one has to admit that the report requires careful study before it can be properly digested and assimilated and before a considered opinion can be expressed on its decisions. There are, however, a few matters in the report on which the industrial peace of Bombay largely depends; and it is proposed to deal with the Committee's decisions on those matters without going into detail.

The first impression created on one's mind after a perusal of some of the important chapters in the report is that, while the Committee seemed to have taken considerable pains in understanding the problem before them and in studying the literature bearing on that problem, it suffered from the same difficulty from which any body of men would suffer in dealing with a question of which they have little personal knowledge and which involves economic considerations. The textile industry is a highly technical and competitive industry and bristles with economic problems of a world-wide character. The members of the Committee, not being connected or in touch with the industry and its economics, could not, in spite of their efforts, go deep into the question and their report naturally suffers from a lack of the thorough grasp of the fundamentals underlying it. In fact the Committee seemed to be conscious of this when it said in dealing with the question of effective economies in the mill industry that "it (the question) is not one on which any helpful opinion can be expressed by us." Moreover the Committee seemed to have found it difficult to get over the current ideas on the industrial problems. For example, in dealing with the wage cut, it laid considerable emphasis on the necessity of taking into account the condition of the industry; but it failed to realise that poor wages with low standard of life not only affect the industry in the long run but also the general welfare of the country. It is not therefore surprising if the textile labour in Bombay is dissatisfied with some of the important findings of the Committee. This is inevitable.

The most important point on which the Committee was asked to express an opinion in dealing with the standardization scheme of wages was whether or not there was a justification for a wage cut of  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent.; and it has declared that

there is such a justification, but it has hastened to add that "we think that there is an over-riding consideration against the Millowners' Association pressing the proposal any further." This consideration is that "there is the necessity for the full cooperation of the labour leaders in working the new standardization scheme" and this cooperation will, the Committee thinks, be forthcoming only if the wage cut is not pressed. Thus the Committee has tried to please both the millowners and the Labour leaders by declaring that the wage cut is justifiable but that it should not be enforced; and to that extent it has attempted to secure the establishment of cooperation between the employers and employees. How far this cooperation becomes possible depends largely upon the attitude the millowners take on this recommendation. If they decide not to effect the cut and agree so to adjust the standardization scheme as to secure present average wages for the operatives, there is some hope for giving a fair trial to the scheme. But if, on the other hand, they, in giving effect to the recommendation, make an attempt to *reduce* the wages of the weavers working on drop box looms or weaving fancy cloth, I am afraid the favourable atmosphere required for the success of the new experiment will be missing to a great extent. It is unfortunate that the Committee did not make any suggestions as to the way in which the scheme should be adjusted so as to maintain the present average wage level; and from this point of view, it has left the position between the employers and employees where it was before it began its labours.

While there will be general satisfaction at the recommendation on the wage cut, the textile workers will not be satisfied with the way in which the Committee sought to justify the wage cut. The arguments employed seem to be such as are based upon the ideas prevailing in the minds of people who have been trained to look at this question from a particular point of view. One of the important objections raised by the Joint Strike Committee against a wage cut was that the millowners had not made all possible economies in other directions; and therefore, Labour representatives asked the Committee to make detailed enquiries on this point. But unfortunately the Committee refused to do so on the ground that such an investigation would unjustifiably extend the scope of their enquiry. But in the report it has admitted that "this question of possible economies was relevant to the question of the proposed cut" but stated that it was unable to express any helpful opinion on it. "We also feel," the Committee further said, "that for such an enquiry a committee entirely composed of businessmen would be more suitable than the present one." And yet the Committee stated that "we are of the opinion that there is a legitimate presumption that, speaking generally, a genuine attempt has been made to economise in other directions." One fails to understand how the Committee with the evidence it had

absolutely no proof whatsoever. The Senate of the Bombay University has been persuaded to appoint a committee to consider the advisability of inculcating a theistic attitude in our system of education; and Principal G. N. Gokhale of Karachi has been kind enough to send me a pamphlet written by him on the same subject.

Let us first examine a little in detail the scheme put forward by Mr. Gokhale. He thus defines his attitude:

"The theistic attitude is not a mere code of morals, because it includes a belief in God, as One who enforces the laws of morality; and the belief in God does not mean the God of one religion as opposed to the God of another. Nor is it necessary even, that the God we believe in should have a personal existence. "Theistic attitude," as I understand it, will include an impersonal God, or even a law, so long as that He, She or It is Omnipresent, Omniscient and Omnipotent and governs the whole Universe". (All capitals in the original).

Proceeding further, Mr. Gokhale gives us a G. C. M. of all religions: (a) There exists a Beneficent Cosmic Power, which governs the whole Universe, irrespective of the names under which it is worshipped by people of different religions. (b) All the creation having been derived from that One Cosmic Power, the relationship of the various components is essentially that of Brotherhood, irrespective of differences of colour, caste, creed, sex, name or form. (c) The whole Universe is governed by a law which works with unerring precision, and so every man is himself responsible for all that happens to him, and is the architect of his own destiny.

A greater bundle of inconsistencies and self-contradictions will be difficult to construct. Mr. Gokhale must really choose between having the cake or eating it. Either his god is all-powerful or he is not. If the god is all powerful, he would naturally govern everything in this universe including plague epidemics, wars and famines. It will then be impossible to attribute the responsibility for all that happens to a man to himself. If there is a power which works with unerring precision, I really do not see how in the very next breath a man can be called the architect of his destiny. Moreover, this power is not only omnipotent but it is also beneficent and is the origin of all creation. Now I fail to see the goodness of the power that created cholera germs, idiots, crippled babies and persecuting fanatics. A power, having the capacity to create anything (because it is omnipotent, according to Mr. Gokhale) and at the same time having the desire to do good (because it is beneficent) could not by any stretch of imagination be supposed to be the creator of such hideous monstrosities as earth-quakes, slums, poisonous vermin and the like. A power that creates these things is *either* "beneficent and powerless" or "all-powerful and cruel". If I *want* to do good and have also the *power* to do it, how can I possibly do anybody any harm? I must here point out that Mr. Gokhale, in a private communication to me, admits that he has had no advantage of studying Logic. A scientist should however be expected to know the elements of correct reasoning. The premise is that we are living in a world full of good and bad things; the conclusion will necessarily be that the creator of that world (if there be any), must also be partly good and partly bad.

It should also be borne in mind that no champion of god has as yet succeeded in giving any *proof* of his existence. Sentimental drivel of the kind written by Mr. Gokhale will not help to convince anybody. *Belief* can never be accepted by any reasonable individual as *proof*. If god has got to exist simply for the fact that the Universe cannot be

imagined to have created itself, then god must also possess a creat.r. The law of casuality cannot be made to stop at god. If one has got to stop somewhere, one may as well stop at the earth and not create imaginary individuals.

This much as regards the actual philosophy of life of Mr. Gokhale and his friends. We will now proceed to discuss the details of his scheme, by means of which he expects to inculcate a theistic attitude into the minds of University students.

According to the first proposal, every affiliated college will make arrangements to devote half an hour every day to readings from scriptures of all the religions. Different days will be devoted to readings from different religions. No questions should be asked by the teacher, nor students be allowed to ask any questions in the class (sic). Attendance at these readings should be compulsory to all students and should count towards keeping of the terms prescribed by the University.

Mr. Gokhale expects to teach religious tolerance to the students by this compulsory attendance and respectful silence. Rather an ingenious idea of compulsory tolerance! Not even a conscience clause is to be accepted as entitling a student for absence. If Mr. Gokhale wants really to teach tolerance, he should at least have been consistent in his reasoning and have proposed to devote one day to readings from atheistic books and taught a little bit of tolerance to the theists for once in a while. But no. The theists, according to Mr. Gokhale, cannot be tolerant towards the atheists; only the latter must be taught compulsory tolerance. Only non-believers must learn to maintain "respectful silence". The theists need not do that. In exactly the same way, the Europeans in South and East Africa are teaching tolerance to the Negroes and Indians. They are demanding respectful silence from the latter for all their laws and customs and ambitions. Why denounce them?

The second proposal of Mr. Gokhale is directed towards what may be called common prayer or worship. At the commencement of any meeting or gathering, 15 or 20 minutes are to be devoted to common worship. Here also, the different religions are treated with perfect impartiality. Turn by turn, each religion will get the first place and a common prayer from it will be read out by a believer. The only man who does not get justice at the hands of Mr. Gokhale is the non-believer. *He* is not allowed even to absent himself. He may not join in the prayers, but he must maintain a "respectful silence". In the first place, I do not see the necessity of praying to the power which works with unerring precision and which is, on the evidence of Mr. Gokhale, already so friendly towards us. If at all there is the necessity of praying to somebody, it should be to an individual or power that is not good to us.

Let us now take a larger view of the whole scheme and see how reactionary the suggestion is. The gentlemen who want to prohibit the teaching of evolution in schools, the tyrant who wants to make practice and propaganda of birth-control illegal, the legislatures which want to protect the so-called sacred books and individuals from attack by means of blasphemy-laws and Mr. Gokhale who wants to compel students to hear theistic lectures—all these types belong to one and the same class, viz. those that are afraid of freedom of thought. I, who am an atheist, do not, for example, say that the students should be compelled to attend atheistic lectures. That would in fact be as bad as Mr. Gokhale's proposals. The only thing a reasonable man can



demand, is to let the students alone and let them form their own views. If at all they are to be taught anything, they should be taught *all sides* of the question. Arrange for theistic and atheistic lectures and then I have nothing to say. But that is exactly the thing that Mr. Gokhale is afraid of. He wants to teach the atheists to be tolerant towards the theists but not the theists towards the atheists.

University education, in this country, has always been free from religious influences. To start now to compel students to attend lectures on the goodness of god, when they actually see the misery of his creation around them, is a mockery of their ability to think. All believers in freedom of thought must do their utmost to defeat this retrograde proposal. Even the theists should oppose it; they will do more harm to the theistic cause by making it compulsory.

D. D. KARVE.

## OUR EUROPEAN LETTER.

(From Our Own Correspondent.)

GENEVA, March 7.

### THE COUNCIL SESSION.

THE 54th session of the Council of the League of Nations has assembled here, and this session, like the others, has had sensational preludes. There was first the incident of the Lugano session when the German Foreign Minister, after protesting against the Polish representative's statements by loudly striking the table with his fist, dramatically proceeded to demand the discussion of the problem of minorities in the agenda of this meeting. Since then the arrest of a German leader by the Polish authorities and the various repercussions arising from the publication of the alleged military alliance between Belgium, France, and Great Britain (now admittedly false), have served to increase the tension. Herr Stresemann's long awaited speech was, however, obviously couched in conciliatory diplomatic language. Yet it did not lack in fighting quality. "This century has not established an eternal state of affairs: the Covenant itself recognises the fact" said the German Foreign Minister touching the problem of minorities arising from the post-War dispersion of the German population. This metaphysical generalisation is highly provocative at a place and under auspices teeming with political and historical forces. Scores of journals all over Europe would no doubt take note of this remark unravelling a variety of implications. Meanwhile it is enough that Monsieur Briand as well as Sir Austen Chamberlain have not referred to this observation on the part of their colleague in the League Council in approving terms. Trained observers of the political situation in Europe are feeling that the problem of minorities has attained first-rate importance, that it is a vital part of the whole problem of peace, and in facing it the League of Nations will have as great a task as it can and has need to face.

The burden of Herr Stresemann's argument was that on occasions the League had strayed away from the purposes of its inception. In practice it wished to absolve itself of its protective functions and yielded its ground too often to powerful interested parties. His main recommendations consisted of an exhaustive study of improving the present procedure; the participation of certain countries hitherto excluded; a definition of the duties of the guarantor of the League exclusive of petitions; and a definite validation of the principle of the guarantee of the of minorities assumed by the League. The

German Foreign Minister declared that the League should set before itself the ideal of eternal peace by which he obviously meant that its machinery should be elastic enough to accommodate itself to political developments and that it should anticipate the causes of war and provide itself with the power to ease the situation.

Sir Austen Chamberlain's reply was that the League's method of dealing with the problem of minorities might leave much to be desired, but it was a dangerous business to indulge in any talk of the revision of existing treaties or anticipation of radical alterations in the present arrangements. At a time when the charge is made in England that the British Foreign Secretary has capitulated to France Sir Austen's attitude at Geneva in this matter would only strengthen the hands of his opponents. Monsieur Briand, the French Foreign Minister, also drew attention to the inviolability of the sovereignty of states and stated his conviction that any approach to this problem which did not take account of this factor would be useless.

Taking a general view of the whole discussion it is abundantly clear that in raising this issue Herr Stresemann has tumbled into what Signor Mussolini once called the interminable corridors of European politics and against which he warned Geneva. Despite all juridical niceties about the conception of sovereignty, if the League were to fulfil its functions, it should find a way of dealing with Europe as Versailles left it. It would be useless to attribute a mystic fundamental significance to that settlement. It is, thanks to the Versailles Treaty, that to-day the rights of minorities have crystallised into a novel political doctrine possessed of moral virtues like all novelties. The League has been burdened with the work of rendering this doctrine practicable and the League is the only means for Europe to settle this or any other difficulties.

The truth of this idea has been once more brought home to Europe by President Hoover's inaugural declaration. In political affairs like in everything else there is a static and a dynamic centre. There is a formal and actual reality. We do well in looking to Geneva for understanding European problems but it has now become necessary to be no less watchful of the trend of events in Washington to understand them in all their bearings. It may seem an exaggeration and yet it is only the truth to say that President Hoover's inaugural declaration was received here with much the same kind of anxiety as President Wilson's decisions about a decade ago. There may have been nothing surprising in Mr. Hoover's statement that "the United States will not consider adherence to the League or to any other agreement which may commit us in advance as a nation to become involved in the settlement of controversies between other countries. Our people adheres to the belief that the independence of America from such obligations increases her ability and availability for service in other fields," but it makes Europe's problems at once more circumscribed, more urgent, and more real. It is true that Mr. Hoover said:—"In the creation and use of the instrumentalities for pacific settlement of controversies between nations we should support every sound method of conciliation, arbitration, and juridical settlement," but to Europeans it has meant the snapping of old ties. It sounds like "fairness but no friendship." It strikes them cold. They feel that they have to set their house in order even as we have felt before a power with whose attitude of self-righteousness we are quite familiar.

before it could presume to speak in the way it has done. The oral evidence did not, so far as one could see, bring out the exact extent of the economies effected by the millowners. The Joint Strike Committee complained that owing to the defective and imperfect system of presenting accounts obtaining in the mill industry, one could not say whether necessary economies had been made or not; but it is surprising to see the Committee refusing to consider this point. It laid considerable emphasis on the present state of the industry and opined that the cut was justifiable. This is indeed a superficial view and cannot be accepted by the workers. The Committee has, however, suggested a financial reorganisation of the whole industry by a combination of mills if the industry is to hold its own in future.

In dealing with the efficiency or rationalisation system, the Committee has admitted the importance of the problem of unemployment and pointed out to the millowners that "the mere fact that Government have not yet taken up the question of unemployment and provided measures of alleviation... affords no sufficient ground for millowners to wash their hands of the whole business. On the contrary we consider that it is in their own interest to take some steps to mitigate hardships entailed in the introduction of the scheme which is in some respects a form of Rationalisation and thus lessen the opposition to it or at any rate any reasonable cause for bitterness." It is refreshing to find that the Committee has taken such a broad view on this question and has itself suggested a scheme in their report for meeting the distress of the unemployed. They suggest the establishment of an "Out-of-Door Donation Fund" on a voluntary basis to be financed by the millowners by contributing one anna per month per operative and by the operatives by a similar contribution. The Fund is to be administered in consultation with Labour. This is a new idea which deserves careful consideration.

R. R. BAKHALE.

#### A CHAMPION OF INDIAN PRINCES.

WITH the growth of nationalistic aspirations in British India there is an increasing tendency among English statesmen to concede the claim of the Indian Princes that the treaties entered into with them forbid the Imperial Government to allow the rights of paramountcy vesting in it to be exercised by a Ministry responsible to the British Indian Legislature. This claim would imply a perpetual veto on the grant of responsible government to British India, for if even one of the six hundred and odd Princes refused to waive this power of veto His Majesty's Government would be unable, on this interpretation of the treaty rights, ever to confer self-government on India. The demand for Swaraj on the part of British Indian politicians must be felt irresistible on other grounds by prominent English statesmen if in order to reject it they have to accept such a serious detraction from the Crown's undeniable rights. To the ranks of these statesmen who would rather place a

disability on the British Government than leave it to meet the Indian agitation fairly and squarely must now be added Sir Sidney Low who has contributed a pamphlet to Benn's Sixpenny Library on "The Indian States and Ruling Princes."<sup>\*</sup> There is hardly any new matter in this little booklet, which it need hardly be said is written with considerable literary ability, but the endorsement it contains of the constitutional position claimed for themselves by the Princes will exert wide influence on British public opinion, and as such the contentions put forward in it must receive their refutation in these columns though the refutation too must follow familiar lines.

We will first let our author put forth his arguments in his own words. Placing the Indian Princes alongside of the depressed classes as a minority to be defended against ill-treatment, Sir Sidney Low says that the Princes claim that "no changes should be made in the Indian constitutional system which would place them in a worse position than they are in at present. Here is a trust which the Crown has accepted by treaty, grant and convention, and it cannot abandon or delegate it against the wishes and interests of those concerned." The safeguarding of Princes "is a solemn obligation binding upon the Imperial Crown, by which is meant, of course, the King-in-Council, the sovereign of Great Britain, acting by the advice of Ministers responsible to the British Parliament. Nor can that same authority abandon the supreme control of the Indian executive without a grave breach of trust." Surely, there is a very solemn obligation resting upon the Imperial Government to protect the Princes from external aggression, and internal rebellion, but, as surely, there is no obligation as to the choice of agency to carry out this task. The Crown must be presumed, unless the treaties contain any provisions in a contrary sense, to select either a bureaucratic or parliamentary executive in India to implement this undertaking. If the treaties provide that only a non-parliamentary executive can be entrusted with the discharge of this trust, it is surprising that the Princes, who do not allow departure by a hair's breadth from express treaty provisions, have not yet referred to them. If they succeed in unearthing some clauses in the treaties, engagements, etc., which require the Crown to employ an official machinery free from popular control in the performance of duties undertaken by it towards themselves, the British Indian public will have to consider whether they can admit the validity of these treaties which keep them permanently out of their indefeasible and inalienable rights. Till, however, such clauses are produced they need not contemplate a contingency which has not yet arisen. But one would like to inquire how, say, in South Africa the grant of self-government was not held to have been estopped by treaties with native chiefs. Or, how even at the present day, the Imperial Government considers itself free to change the constitution of Kenya Colony and Kenya Protectorate, and of East Africa in general, though by treaties similar to those entered into with Indian Princes it has guaranteed

<sup>\*</sup> Pub. Ernest Benn Ltd., 1929. pp. 80. 6d.

internal and external security to the Sultan of Zanzibar and other chiefs. First, the status of a part of Kenya was raised from that of a Protectorate to a Colony; then the system of administration was changed from a pure Crown Colony form of government to government with the help of Legislative and Executive Councils composed partly of popular representatives; now the official majority in the Legislative Council is being abandoned in favour of a non-official majority; and eventually full responsible government is to be established. Whether this consummation comes early or late, it is at any rate not barred by the treaties with the Sultan. Why are treaties to be interpreted in India alone in such a way as to deprive His Majesty's Government of the power (if it had the will) of endowing India with a Dominion form of government except with the consent of, not one but some seven hundred Princes and Princelets?

The question here, it should be noted, is not whether the Parliament of British India should decide by its own vote questions of common concern to both British and Indian India, for which no responsible Indian politician has set up a claim, but whether the Crown of Great Britain can or cannot turn over the exercise of rights which it enjoys and the discharge of obligations which it has undertaken to, as our author says, "a native government, depending upon the majority vote of the British Indian constituencies." Has the British Crown no legal right to replace the present bureaucratic by a popular executive in India both for enforcing its power of intervention and redeeming its pledges of protection in strict conformity with agreements between itself and Indian States? To this question Sir Sidney Low returns a blank negative, but his answer is not supported by any arguments or authorities. Now, what could be the possible objection of Indian Princes if the rights and obligations of the British Crown, exercised and performed at present by an irresponsible executive, are taken over by a responsible one? If Sir Sidney Low is to be believed, their objection is mainly a racial one. Being Indians, they have no respect for and confidence in their fellow-countrymen such as they have for and in foreigners.

"The heads of the Foreign and Political Departments, the Viceroys and Lieutenant-Governors and Chief Commissioners, and the Residents and Agents, were Englishmen with English traditions. They might sometimes have been ill-informed, officious or arrogant; but, on the whole, they were fairminded and honest, and they had no temptation to be anything else. The local rulers could trust, if they did not always love, these functionaries. They felt that the Government was in the hands of men who were generally capable and upright, and who acted in the interests of all Indians, as they understood them, not in those of a section, class, or community. In these officials, the servants of the British Crown, to which they were bound by treaty, the state rulers felt a confidence which they would not extend to any collection of Indian politicians?"

We are curious to know whether the Princes subscribe to the opinions here expressed by their

champion on their behalf. We know of course that they have a predilection for Britishers over Indians. They opposed the appointment of an Indian to the post of Political Secretary; they opposed the selection of an Indian as leader of the League delegation; they oppose the substitution of the Indian for the British Parliament as the final authority in Indian administration. But we did not know by what precisely this—to us unaccountable—preference was inspired. If the Princes feel that Indian politicians are as a rule dishonest, incapable, corrupt, parochial, we can well understand their preference, though we do not know that even then they acquire the right to dictate to the British Crown whom it shall appoint as its instruments for carrying its undertakings into effect. But we can well account for the existence in India of what must be regarded as the counterpart of Indian Princes, a section of politicians who will not be content with anything less than the entire blotting out of all the states from the map of India. For our part we have always looked upon the policy of this section as extremely foolish and suicidal, but, with the knowledge of the feelings running in the minds of the Princes, we shall have no difficulty hereafter in finding enough reason, if not justification, for the policy. The Princes must realise, however, that whatever their repugnance may be to their compatriots, they must learn to conquer it. They will soon have to deal with an Indian Foreign Secretary; they will this year not only be associated with but serve under an Indian politician at the meetings of the League Assembly; they will also have to treat, much sooner than they expect, with a popular Ministry installed in the place of the present bureaucratic Government at Delhi. These things, after all, happen irrespective of their wishes; and in objecting to them albeit through publicists like Sir Sidney Low, they only make it difficult for people like us to plead for charity and indulgence in dealing with them.

Sir Sidney Low thinks that "the obvious destiny of India is Federalism in some form." He has not of course elaborated any scheme of Federation. The only suggestion he throws out is that "the machinery of consultation between Ministers representing the various Executive Governments, with the decisions embodied in consequential legislation in the individual states" which is now in operation in intra-imperial affairs should be instituted as between British and Indian India. Given good-will, such a system can be devised, but in the Princes' present mood and temper, if the extract given above reflects these, the prospect of such an amicable adjustment is not very cheerful.

S. G. V.

#### RELIGIOUS EDUCATION FOR UNIVERSITY STUDENTS.

A VERY harmful and dangerous movement has been started by some champions of god in this Presidency for the undermining of the freedom of thought of the students of the Bombay University by *compulsorily* teaching them certain things for which there is



## REVIEWS.

## MONEY ECONOMY IN HUMAN AFFAIRS.

**MONEY.** By WILLIAM TRUFANT FOSTER AND WADDILL CATCHINGS. (The Pollak Foundation for Economic Research, Newton, Mass. 1927. 8¼ × 5½. pp. 409. \$2.00.)

THIS is the second publication in the Pollak Foundation Series for Economic Research, the first being the well-known "Making of Index Numbers" by Professor Fisher, and fully sustains the standard set by the first of the Series.

Books on the subject have been numerous in the past and ingenious theories have been advanced on the part which money economy plays or ought to play in human affairs. In dealing with 'money,' almost everybody who has thought over the subject considers himself an expert, everyone else to him being 'a man in the street.' Every 'expert' has some favourite nostrum to offer, the adoption of which would effect, in his opinion, an instantaneous cure of all economic ills. To the 'man in the street,' the whole situation is bewildering, and the authors, with singular freshness, remind that every one in our day is a 'man in the street' as far as economics is concerned. The most competent of our professional economists can offer only partial and tentative analyses of the recurrent periods of depression and consequent suffering. None of the explanations are entirely convincing and the best of them are unsatisfactory even to these authors.

The United States of America would appear to be the most fertile field for theories and experiments in currency and banking. Probably this is why it has succeeded in evolving the most original monetary and banking system in the world. It has not been content to accept the secondhand lessons of the old world. With considerable freshness and enthusiasm, theories are evolved putting a new garb on the old. Nor is Professor Fisher with his compensating dollar the only one in the field. Mr. Henry Ford is not content to be merely a manufacturer nor Mr. Edison to be an inventor. They put forward a Commodity Money Plan, issuing mortgage certificates and equity certificates for certain basic commodities to be stored in concrete warehouses in charge of Federal Officers, these certificates being the basis for the issue of notes. Even the versatile Charlie Chaplin has a scheme for eliminating the gold standard, the Government issuing currency based on production. In spite of the lessons of history, a senator can be found in America to sponsor a bill authorising unlimited issues of paper money based on land, with the futile proviso rendering any discrimination in favour of gold a criminal offence. The labor-hour, as a unit of exchange and a substitute for gold, proposed many times in the past is now enthusiastically advocated by the 'Equitist' Society.

"Certain as it is that money is not a standard merely because it is based on the fiat of the Government, it is equally certain that money is not a standard merely because it is based on land, or on stores of wheat, or any other farm product... Equally futile is the attempt to stabilize the purchasing power of monetary units by

having them "represent" energy units or labor-hours, or productive capacity, or merely anticipated output of wheat or fertilizers. It would be as effective to have money "represent" the sands of the sea."

The authors examine the different proposals critically. The 'examination' is marked by a strong commonsense which enables them to reach conclusions with which it is impossible to disagree.

The authors have expressed a surprise at the reception accorded to their book, which has been adopted as a text-book in American Universities. It would be surprising if it had been otherwise. The subject of money is generally considered very abstruse; those, who have dealt with the subject in the past, appear to carry an uneasy load of learning too great for their shoulders. The authors combine remarkable erudition with a great fund of commonsense and treat the subject in a style full of vivacity. Indian Universities will be well advised to adopt this as a text-book, a change which will be appreciated very much by the students.

P. B. JUNNARKAR.

## INDIAN PHILOSOPHY.

## THE VEDANTA AND MODERN THOUGHT.

By W. S. URQUHART. (Oxford University Press, Bombay.) 1928. 8½ × 5½. pp. 256. 12s. 6d.

THE term 'Vedanta' was originally applied to the Upanishads but has in course of time come to signify their teaching as systematised by Badarayana or by one or other of the numerous commentators on his *Sutras*. After referring to this change of connotation, the author tells us that he will, for the purposes of this book, take the term as standing for the doctrine as taught by Sankara. The restriction of meaning is in accord with common usage and is justified not only by the large number of adherents which the doctrine claims but also by its intrinsic merits. 'Sankara has been taken as the typical philosopher of the school, for reasons which appear to me to be satisfactory; and the general trend of opinion amongst Indian writers and thinkers themselves would appear to justify this concentration.' Of the other versions of the Vedanta, the Visishtadvaita of Ramanuja is referred to now and again by way of contrast, and these references often serve to indicate to the reader in what direction the author's own preferences lie. The book seems to be based mainly, if not entirely, on translations and modern expositions of the subject. The consequent lack of touch with the original sources probably accounts for a few misapprehensions that are repeatedly found in it. Thus the terms 'subject' and 'object' are often contrasted with each other in discussing the metaphysics of Advaita (e.g., pp. 106, 215) while the opposition between them is only psychological. According to Sankara, the subject is a complex of the self (*sakshin*) and the not-self (*antahkarana*). It thus contains within itself a non-spiritual or objective element and cannot therefore be made to stand over against the object. Equally inaccurate is it to describe Maya as both *sat* and *asat* (e.g. pp. 57 and 144). The true position is that it is neither the one nor the other (*sadasadvilakshana*) and the view that is represented here as Advaitic is explicitly ruled out as self-discrepant. A thing cannot both be and not be. Though a few misconceptions of this kind are met with, the account of the doctrine as a whole, it must be stated, is remarkably faithful. Great care is shown in the statement of the facts of Advaita; there is also a solicitous desire to be quite

fair in interpreting its various tenets. Thus in explaining the creation of the world, the Advaitin may appear to be reasoning in a circle. He justifies God's action by referring to *karma* and seems to assume *karma* for doing so. Our author says in respect of it: "But it is not wise to bring a charge of fallacious reasoning against a philosopher of Sankara's quality and we have the feeling that there is more in his argument than appears on the surface" (p. 167). The same spirit of fairness is evident in the author's discussion of the relation between Buddhism and Advaita. These doctrines seem to be essentially the same; but, at the same time, there is the fact that Sankara is not less vehement than any in denouncing Buddhism in all its forms known to him. Here is a problem which requires careful consideration and it will not do to dismiss it, as it is sometimes done, as simply an inconsistency. Our author entirely disapproves of such a course and, after an able analysis of the two views which brings to light the real difference that underlies their superficial resemblance, comes to the conclusion that to identify them is to confound the illusory with the phenomenal (p. 99). There is certainly an element of negation in the Advaita as in Buddhism but what is negated is not the world but only its ultimacy.

The purpose of the work however is not merely to give an account of the Advaita. It endeavours to find out to what extent the doctrine can satisfy the religious needs of man; and the conclusion reached, to put it briefly, is that Sankara's attitude towards ordinary experience is too negative and abstract. It puts a man out of touch with the universe in which he lives and therefore requires to be supplemented by a positive teaching like that of Christ, if it is to be completely satisfying. The author realises the need for the negative element in all such teaching but he is of opinion that it should not end in negation as the Advaita does. It is on account of the presence in it of this necessary element that he considers the Vedanta as a definite preparation for Christianity. It points forward to, he says, and welcomes the teaching of Christ—not however in its conventional but in its essential form. There may be many amongst the readers of the book who do not see eye to eye with the author here, and it is not possible in a review like this to discuss the reasons for such disagreement. But we may ask one question. Even supposing that the Vedanta as taught by Sankara is too negative, is not the doctrine found with the necessary correction applied to it in the Visishtadvaita of Ramanuja with which the author is so familiar? This aspect of the matter is not considered in the book, doubtless as the result of the general aim of the series to which it belongs. This aim, as stated in the Editorial Preface, is 'to set each form of Indian religion by the side of Christianity in such a way that the relationship may stand out clear.' The writers of this series of volumes believe that the age-long quest of India for religious truth will find its goal in Christianity. Whether the belief will come true or not, the idea behind it, viz., that the fulness of truth can be reached only through co-operation between the East and the West and that each has a most important contribution to make to the other, deserves warm commendation.

M. H.

#### POST-WAR ECONOMICS.

**THE DAWES PLAN AND THE NEW ECONOMICS.** By GEORGE P. AULD. (George Allen & Unwin, London.) 1928. 8¼ × 5½. pp. 317. 10s. 6p.

In view of the renewed agitation over reparations on the ground that the transfer of these payments into

foreign currencies is mechanically impossible, Mr. Auld has written this volume to prove the possibility of this transfer and the intrinsic justice of the reparation payments. Although addressed primarily to Americans, the book will, we are sure, prove interesting to those amongst people of other countries who are working for international concord. We believe that the author is certain to convince the reader that the cancellation of the reparations is prejudicial to such a concord and is unquestionably unjust to the Allies.

The author believes that Europe has entered a period of prolonged eclipse, and that the road to economic recovery will be a long and difficult one; and he attributes this principally to the condition of serious depletion of the capital necessary for renewed production, including under capital man power. The basis of the reparation claim is that France since the War has to bear the heaviest burden of taxation of all the European belligerents and the motives which actuated her in insisting on compensation were purely economic. Mr. Auld does not support the reproach on the ground of moral turpitude brought by half the world against France for its firm attitude regarding reparations nor does he think that the policy of inflation followed by French Ministers was a sign of their fiscal ineptitude. He repudiates Lord Curzon's description of the Reparations Commission as an instrument of French policy and says that the false note struck by Lord Curzon marked the turning point in reparation controversy. The chapter on "The Anglo-French Dispute" makes delightful reading; in this the author makes short work of the case for the scrapping of the Treaty and the reparation debt, based on the maxims propounded by Prof. J. M. Keynes which declared that an internal debt was not a real economic burden and that large international debts could not be paid. With regard to stabilisation of the mark the author praises the wisdom of leaving the administration of the new Bank to the Germans while vesting powers of inspection and veto in foreigners appointed by the Allies, thus making the control as inoffensive as possible. As for the dictum of the impossibility of the transfer of the reparations owing to the shortage of foreign exchange offerings Mr. Auld pronounces it to be an economic fad of what he calls the economist school of thought; he proves by reference to actual facts that the system works not by fits and starts but continuously day by day by the exchange of marks for dollars or other foreign currencies and he does not think that the prophecies of an exchange crisis have any objective foundation at all. As for the dumping menace created by the German export surplus equivalent to the annual reparation payment the author says pertinently that this surplus might easily flow out to debtor countries other than the creditors of Germany and thus create foreign exchanges of various kinds and amounts. The most important argument against the pessimists is that to-day the reparation debt is transferred against dollar and other loans to Germany in cash to a large extent and this will continue as long as Germany needs foreign capital.

Mr. Auld thinks that nowhere was the statesmanship of the Dawes Committee more impressively displayed than in the handling of the difficult subject of settling the intended duration of the annuities so that people might form proper opinions as to the real measure of the burden on Germany. Mr. Auld construes the Dawes plan as a guarantee that there shall be no serious dispute regarding reparation for the next twenty-five years and he computes the capital amount of the settlement as equivalent to 8000 million dollars. In discussing the question whether the burden is fair, Mr. Auld strongly repu-

diates the contention that the burden of an internal debt is lighter than that of an external debt owing to the fact that the latter involves a drain on the general economic strength of a country. The Committee ultimately proceeded on the principle that a tax is a tax, whatever its destination. Taking therefore the debts at the original figures, since the effects of inflation were incalculable he regards the settlement as a result of sound business judgement and eminently fair. The praises showered on the plan by the author are certainly well-deserved; it was truly "a shining example of the capacity of the human intellect and conscience to construct and not to destroy." The Dawes Committee, as he says, gave a great impetus to the growth of an understanding among Germans that reparations are an equitable contribution to the reconstruction of Europe; and the credit for this is due to the able minds and devoted spirits which contributed to its making. As for the agitation for the premature reconsideration of the problem he warns the Germans of the horrors from which the Dawes plan rescued them and asks them to appreciate the continuing benefits of peace which it confers. On the other side he advises the Allies to put aside for ever the argument based upon the war-guilt of the whole German nation.

The author is naturally puzzled why British economists are describing American loans as circular flow of mere paper while the European investors were flooding the whole world with three times as much capital, just before the War and this capital was as much paper as the American loan is to-day. The explanation is again the belief in the theory that war debts cannot be transferred much longer. Another motive of such theories is, according to him, the belief of these economists that Europe is recovered and does not stand in need of any further loans; which belief he proves to be a great delusion. He believes in the industrial eclipse of Europe at least temporarily, and he thinks that the bankers and merchants ought to be better equipped to deal with world affairs with a vigorous and informed interest and with a clear consciousness of the obligations of world-citizenship. The book is in places aggressively American no doubt; but it serves as a necessary antidote against the policy of running down the United States with regard to its post-War activities, which some European economists have been following since the inception of the Dawes Scheme. The reputation for independent thought and clearness of expression gained by the author to which Mr. Rufus Dawes refers in his foreword to this volume is well-deserved. He has made out a powerful case for the sustaining of the Dawes plan as the best presage of a reconstructed Europe.

V. N. G.

### THE SITUATION IN THE PACIFIC.

**THE MASTERY OF THE PACIFIC.** By FRANK FOX. (The Bodley Head.) 1928. 7½ x 5. pp. 256. 8s. 6d.

THIS book, written by a recognised authority on the subject, aims at telling the true situation in the Pacific today, without bias or sentiment. The general position of the author may be shortly stated thus. Only three Powers may be seriously considered to have any interest in the Pacific at present, Britain, the U. S. A. and Japan. No other power in Europe is strong enough to threaten the position of any of these three countries. France, Germany and Italy are all too weak on the sea, and have not fully recovered from the effects of the war. Russia, in the author's words, is the one great casualty of the war. Her Revolution was caused by a few anarchists with

the help of German organisation, German arms and German money. And the Bolsheviki "seized the power of the Czars and substituted for a kindly, inefficient, corrupt despotism, the most unscrupulous machine of national destruction that humanity has ever known." This estimate of Russia—which very evidently has to be taken with a grain of salt—makes the author predict that that country may safely be left out of account for half a century more so far as any fear of her becoming a source of danger in the Pacific is concerned. Britain then is the only European nation capable of any independent action in that quarter. Her policy towards other European nations has always been affected by her interests outside Europe and in that sense she has always been a "bad European". Leaving India out of account, there are three British self-governing dominions in the Pacific, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. Much of the intellectual and economic life of Canada is influenced by the U. S. A.; and her fear of danger from any European quarter is considerably lessened by the existence of the Monroe Doctrine which forbids the acquisition of any fresh European interests on the American continent, on pain of incurring the displeasure of the U. S. A. But her attachment to the Empire is no less on that account than the attachment of any other dominion. Australia and New Zealand, both of them largely British in character, are also firmly bound to the Empire. It may therefore be safely predicted that the whole of the British Empire will act as one unit if any contingency arises in the Pacific.

In Asia Japan is the only power that can threaten British interests. America rudely knocked at her doors in 1853 and soon found she had raised up a mighty power. Japan defeated China in 1895 and exacted a large indemnity. In 1902 an alliance with England left her free in the Far East and in 1905 followed her brilliant victory over Russia at Mukden. During the War she made her twenty-one demands on China, while the rest of the world was engaged in a death-struggle, and acquired Kia-Chow and a 99 years' lease of Port Arthur. These demands came up before the Washington Conference in 1921-22 and Japan agreed that she would not play a lone hand on the Asiatic mainland in the Far East. In the words of the author, it was clear to the world then "that in Pacific questions, the British Empire had resumed full liberty to follow a line of policy independent of that of Japan."

On the American continent, only the U. S. A. is strong enough to interfere in the Pacific. Latin America occupied by a weak hybrid race of people, torn with dissensions and financially in the grip of the U. S. A., is not capable of any independent action. The notion that the U. S. A. is peculiarly disinterested in her foreign policy is wrong. She has always been imperialistic. In fact she will prove to be the great imperialist of the 20th century even as Britain was of the 19th. When she was young and wanted freedom for development the Monroe Doctrine meant that she would not interfere with other people's affairs. And when she had developed some strength, the doctrine was invested with the meaning that the European Powers should not interfere with the affairs of America and that the U. S. A. would not interfere with those of Europe. Now however it has come to mean that while in America the U. S. A. had undoubtedly a paramount interest, she has an equal voice with the other Powers as regards the rest of the world. From the outset the history of the U. S. A. has been one of steady territorial expansion. She first spread over the mainland and then acquired Honduras, Cuba and the Philippines. Her interest in the Panama Canal then led her to

claim some influence over territories adjoining the Canal. Though during the war she played the game at the end of it she bungled in her conduct. Her attitude at the Versailles Conference was too idealistic. In regard to finance particularly, her rejection of the British proposal to cancel all debts among the Allies was a mistake. She favoured the policy of each country paying up according to capacity, though she knew that all the countries were tired, war-weary and unable to pay for a long time. The situation today is this. Germany has wiped off her internal debt by currency inflation and is paying up according to the Dawes plan only by fresh borrowing. France is devoting four-fifths of her Budget to liquidate her internal debt and is scarcely thinking of her external debt. Only Britain is meeting her obligation. The U. S. A. raised her tariff walls and prevented her debtors from paying in kind. This poured gold into her for a time and now she is buying up stocks in the world. A big financial crash is impending.

In the Pacific then there is cause for conflict between the three great naval Powers today. In particular dangerous possibilities hover round China. After her defeat by tiny Japan, she realised her weakness, and decided to gain lost ground. She sent her students abroad for study and fired by new ideas and new enthusiasm, these effected a revolution in 1911. But to overthrow a ruling dynasty proved easier than to establish a settled government. Ever since the country is suffering from a plethora of warlords, each aiming at his own end. According to the author, she is the heart of the problem, the bone of contention, in the Pacific. Japan aims at political and industrial domination of the country so that she might have the opportunity "not merely of ruling China but all Asia and then of dictating to the rest of the world." Britain desires "to safeguard China against foreign domination; to protect any party in China which wishes to restore order; and to provide equal opportunity for all foreign traders in the country." The British author of the book under review has no doubt that this is the only correct attitude. America however has her own solution. "The independence of China is to be safeguarded; in the development of the resources of the country the Chinese should be first considered and after them all the world should have an equal opportunity." This attitude, it is admitted by the author, is correct theoretically. But he goes on to say, what it is really difficult to understand, that it is the attitude "of the one just man in the world who cannot soil his soul by association with his neighbours; and who is also a selfish man and does not care who is miserable so long as he is prosperous."

The book is throughout interesting, written in a racy gripping style which does not allow the interest to flag. But it is not a study "without bias or sentiment." The book is clearly intended to be a special pleading in favour of an Anglo-American Entente. Whatever else it may be, impartial it decidedly is not.

S. P. SARMA.

#### SHORT NOTICE.

**SENSE IN SEX AND OTHER STORIES OF INDIAN WOMEN.** By A. S. PANCHAPAKESA AYYAR. (D. B. Taraporevala, Bombay.) 1929. 7½ × 5. pp. 288. Rs. 4.

MR. A. S. P. IYER first thrust upon the book world his two pompous volumes of "After-Dinner Stories"

and having thereby overcome "author nervousness" has presented it with this new book. Persistent practice has in this instance borne comparatively better fruit. There is a certain lack of dramatic efficiency and language-effect even about these stories and the pictures of Indian sex life which they purport to portray assume a foreign character with their abundance of "dearests" and "kisses". In the opening story, we make the acquaintance of a queer person called Sadashiv, whose cool moral head is unsettled by reading some sex pamphlets. As a result he unconsciously tumbles into the arms of a prostitute. By a "respectable" effort, he regains his "good character" and the love of his blameless wife. The weak point in this story consists in the way Mr. Iyer as if by pressing a button drops a prostitute from the sky, no sooner Sadashiv vaguely feels a craving for venereal romance and makes her behave in a manner too disreputable even for a prostitute. Ordinarily "the sense in sex" in India does not follow this course. By reason of the highly "moral" social life that the Indian youngster leads, he stealthily accumulates undesirable information about the tabooed mysteries of life instead of asking his mother the plain question "How was I born, mummy"?

The other scenes from Indian life revealed by Mr. Iyer are somewhat better stage-managed. Here and there the otherwise flat narrative and conversation are broken by passionate declamations against the social prison regulations, uttered by Indian wives who are really too meek and servile to give expression to them.

P. M. K.

#### BOOKS RECEIVED.

- THE OPEN CONSPIRACY: BLUE PRINTS FOR A WORLD REVOLUTION. By H. G. WELLS. (Victor Gollancz.) 1928. 7½ × 5. pp. 156.
- JAPAN AND THE UNITED STATES, 1853-1921. (Revised and Continued to 1928.) By PAYSON J. TREAT. (Stanford University Press, California.) 1928. 7½ × 5½. pp. 307. \$3.50.
- THE JOYS OF FORGETTING. By ODELL SHEPARD. (Allen & Unwin.) 1928. 8 × 5½. pp. 278. 7s. 6d.
- THE CHRISTIAN MISSION IN RELATION TO RURAL PROBLEMS. Vol. 6. (Oxford University Press.) 1928. 8 × 5½. pp. 304. 4s. 6d.
- A HISTORY OF SOUTH AFRICA. By ERIE A. WALKER. (Longmans.) 1928. 8½ × 5½. pp. 623.
- THE LAWS OF SOUTH AFRICA AFFECTING WOMEN AND CHILDREN. By IRENE A. GEFFEN. (R. L. Esson & Co., Johannesburg.) 1928. 8½ × 5½. pp. 420.
- CHRISTIANITY AND THE GROWTH OF INDUSTRIALISM IN ASIA, AFRICA AND SOUTH AMERICA. (Oxford University Press.) 1928. 8 × 5½. pp. 199. 3s. 6d.

### INDIAN ECONOMICS

(In Two Volumes)

By Prof. G. B. Jathar, M. A., I. E. S.

AND

Prof. S. G. Beri, M. A.

Vol. I Demy 8vo. pp. 497. Rs. 4-8.

Vol. II Demy 8vo. pp. 623. Rs. 5-4.

By far the best book obtainable on the subject. Indispensable to economics students and most valuable to publicists, politicians and general readers.

D. B. Taraporevala Sons & Co.

190, Hornby Road, Bombay, 1.