

Servant of India

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

VOL. XII, No. 19. }

POONA—THURSDAY, MAY 9, 1929.

{ INDIAN SUBSN. Rs. 6
FOREIGN 15 p.

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	217
ARTICLES :—	
A Move to the Left	219
Maharashtra Provincial Conference	220
Discriminatory Legislation	221
"Disarmament" Again	222
OUR U. P. LETTER	223
REVIEWS :—	
The Indian States. By S. G. V.	223
Indian Finance. By Prof. D. G. Karve, M.A.	225
Far Eastern Relations. By M. V. Subrahmanyam, M.A., L.T.	227
SHORT NOTICES	227
CORRESPONDENCE :—	
Theistic Education for University Students	228
BOOKS RECEIVED	228

TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

THE *Pioneer* has given a summary of what it understands to be the proposals made by the Bihar and Orissa Government to the Simon Commission. The Bihar Government are not only not in favour of an extension of the franchise, but left to themselves would like a reversion to indirect elections. At the same time they know that this is not a matter of practical politics at the present time and therefore recommend the maintenance of the *status quo* in regard to electorates, separate electorates continuing to be a feature of our electoral arrangements as at present. As for the official bloc, while they agree that its presence has the effect of discouraging ministerial responsibility, to sweep it away at one bound is also too much for them. The result is a recommendation, not for its total abolition, but for its reduction, by how much we are not told. The Bihar Government is very illiberal in regard to the transfer of more departments to popular control. Complete provincial autonomy is of course unthinkable so far as they are concerned. Law and order are too sacred to be touched by the profane hands of ministers responsible to the people and must be kept out of their control. According to the Government, these subjects should be in charge of the Governor who should administer them with the help of the Chief Secretary. Joint ministerial responsibility is contemplated; but instead of making the Governor a constitutional one it is proposed to empower him to sus-

pend the orders of the Cabinet or the Ministers "in cases of urgency." In addition, he would have the right to call for any papers he likes and powers to certify expenditure in cases of emergency. While under the new arrangements the legislature can turn out a ministry by a vote of non-confidence, a safeguard against the frivolous and vexatious use of this method is provided by the requirement of a two-thirds majority for the vote to be operative. On the comparatively minor point relating to the recruitment of the services, the Bihar Government is not less unprogressive. They are not yet prepared to give up the recruitment of Europeans for the public service, which they consider essential for a good long time to come. It is of course a mercy that they do not recommend the establishment of a second chamber for the province. We are not told what line the Ministers have taken in regard to these reactionary proposals. We find however that the Education Minister, Sir Syed Fakhruddin, has expressed himself against indirect elections and in favour of the elimination of the entire official bloc from the legislature. His proposals for safeguarding minority interests are virtually a demand for cultural autonomy, though he may not have used that phrase. He wants the rights of minorities to be defined and insists upon due participation by them in grants-in-aid for education, etc. But the one proposal made by him which is open to grave objection is that relating to representation of minorities in the provincial Cabinet. If it is adopted, the way will be clear for Government to select for Cabinet membership, not the best fitted persons nor even those enjoying the confidence of the people as a whole, but persons, not necessarily fitted for the position, but popular with their own communities; i. e. extreme communalists. Is that a way to reduce or to accentuate the divisions in Indian society?

OUR expectation that the points at issue in the mill-strike would be referred to a joint committee has not been realized owing to the obduracy of the leaders of the strike. His Excellency the Governor, the General Member and the Home Member with commendable promptitude hurried to Bombay and had repeated conferences with both the parties; but so far their good offices have failed to achieve any substantial result in the way of reconciliation. The action of the mill-owners in engaging counter-pickets,

although perfectly legal, is viewed by the police with great alarm as the squabbles between opposing pickets are likely to be the beginning of more serious melees. According to the Free Press, the fall in the revenue from income-tax and super-tax from Rs. 2½ crores to Rs. 1½ crore is a certain indication of the depression in the textile industry. In view of this it is worth while for the mill-owners to make certain concessions in order to get over this serious deadlock causing financial losses to themselves as also to the workers. About the great bone of contention, the reinstatement of the 6000 workers in the Wadia group of mills, the mill-owners as a body have already promised to absorb them in the various mills and for the present at least the Girni Kamgar Union ought to give way on this point, since by doing so the dispute would be made to approach very near the point of settlement. In the meantime it is reassuring to note that in response to the request of the Home Member not to excite the millhands on strike by false rumours the Labour leaders have promised to him that they would do their best to see that the strikers conducted themselves peacefully. The Home Member has repudiated the suggestion that the Government were taking sides in the dispute between the mill-owners and the workers.

The fresh outbreak of communal rioting is reminiscent of some of the scenes that occurred in February last. There is the same senseless and irrational attacking of persons, not only men but even women and children. This latter is the most regrettable feature of the recent outbreak and shows the depths to which human nature can reach. The unfortunate part of the thing is that the mill strike affair has got mixed up in many cases with the communal rioting specially on account of the fact that many of the non-strikers are Muslims. Owing to their previous experience however Government have shown remarkable promptitude in the adoption of measures which were found useful during the last riots. There was ceaseless patrolling of the disturbed areas by the military force which has been gradually reinforced and assisted by the armed police from the districts; in addition there has been a rounding up of bad characters. We are sure the citizens' committee appointed to assist in the work of pacification will acquit itself creditably. At the meeting of citizens convened to appoint the citizens' committee Mr. Ginwala made the suggestion that liquor shops should be closed at certain times. His suggestion ought to be acted upon. A suggestion made by some citizens that the headmen in each locality should be made responsible for preserving peace in it appears to us to be absurd as it would be difficult to fix upon any headmen and secondly granting that this could be done it would be wrong to foist such a responsibility on them on the supposition that everybody is amenable to their control. Sir Purshottamdas Thakurdas drew the attention of the meeting to certain inflammatory leaflets against which no action was taken; such a state of things ought to be remedied immediately,

* * *

THE president of the second session, recently held, of the Mysore State Congress, Mr. Venkatakrishtnayya, devoted a considerable space of his inaugural address to the Congress to a discussion of the work-

ing of the Press Regulation in the State. He could speak on that point from personal experience, having himself been a victim to its unsympathetic and harsh working. The regulation, as we showed some time ago by an examination of its provisions, is Draconian in character and was intended for use in much less advanced times; it was made in 1908, apparently as a counterpart of the Indian Press Act. But though the latter has been removed from the statute book, the Mysore regulation still continues in force. Its continuance is all the more objectionable, in view of the fact that it has for long been under promise of repeal. It is true that the communal atmosphere in the State has since changed for the worse and the Mysore Government probably considers the present as an inopportune time for removing from the statute book a measure which they have found very handy in getting rid of inconvenient press organs. If that is the feeling of the Mysore Government they are only subject to a common bureaucratic weakness. But no Government which does not wish to forfeit the confidence of its people, as we hope the Mysore Government does not, ought to lose any time in implementing the promise it solemnly made. Another matter discussed in the presidential address was the need for responsible government. Mysore subjects no doubt enjoy the benefits of an enlightened and benevolent rule; but that is only a poor substitute for self-rule. It is to be hoped that the Congress demand in this respect will not fall on deaf ears; but that early action will be taken on the resolution in question. The Congress also did well in demanding fundamental rights, viz. freedom of speaking, writing and association for Mysore State subjects. In the light of some recent happenings in the State the request for such rights is by no means superfluous. But if those assembled in the Congress suppose that a mere declaration of such rights by the Maharaja was going to protect them from any violation of these rights in the future, they are mistaken. The only way to preserve these rights is by remaining constantly watchful and by exposing every bureaucratic invasion on them.

* * *

THE commercial needs of Bengal were very forcibly voiced at the annual general meeting of the Bengal National Chamber of Commerce. The President, Raja Rhishikesha Law, deplored the harm done to Indian industry by the income-tax and super-tax and pleaded for their reduction. He expressed a hope that as a result of the Banking Enquiry banking facilities would be extended in the country. In view of the interest of the province in the jute industry he suggested the formation of a Committee to watch over the interests of the trade from the field to the factory, on which all these interests would be represented. A very good review of the trade of Bengal was made by Mr. Nalini Ranjan Sarkar. The year 1928, he said, was one which was engaged in one of the most exasperating tussles between the jute goods exporters and foreign consumers; and in view of the agitation in U. S. for a prohibitive duty on jute he called upon the Chamber to look to the better organization of the cultivation and manufacture of jute. Mr. Sarkar raised a protest against the recent tampering with the money position in India by raising the bank rate to 8 p. c. in the interest of the exchange ratio of 18d., which could not be maintained when London and New York witnessed soaring bank rates. The slump in the Government securities which adversely affected the banks and insurance companies he attributed to the financial policy of Government which he said could not be improved till an

Impartial organization like the Reserve Bank was established. The question before the Banking Enquiry is not in his opinion that of securing more money for the banking circles, but it is one of devising measures to remove the disability which prevents the Indian worker from gaining the best advantage from his work so far as the disability is traceable to the lack of credit facilities. The hundred and odd branches opened by the Imperial Bank in towns are in his view a mere bagatelle; what is wanted in India is thousands of small offices and branches in agricultural areas to convert the primitive system of agriculture into a more scientific one as the broad basis of modern industrialism.

* * *

IN the Bihar and Orissa Government resolution reviewing the reports on the working of municipalities in the province during 1927-8 the nominated official

members of these bodies come in for criticism for failure to attend municipal meetings. Their pleas are inability to influence the voting and the unduly protracted nature of municipal meetings. While we would like to see all municipalities purged of the official element, the Bihar Government appears to be right in insisting that officials, so long as they continue to be members of these bodies, must make it a point to attend their meetings. Then, municipalities do not appear to be particularly anxious to increase their income. This is surprising in view of the none too satisfactory condition of their finances. An instance of their remissness is to be found in their unwillingness to tax private motor cars and to impose registration fee on those plying for hire within their limits. As the resolution points out, this omission costs them an appreciable revenue and is specially blameworthy in view of the fact that the tax is to come mostly from the pockets of rich people. Nor do they appear to be particularly keen upon resorting to revisions of the tax on holdings as a means of augmenting their resources. Thus we find that revisions in some cases resulted not in increase as is generally the case, but in decrease, of income from that source and in a few cases Government had under the special powers vested in them actually to force some municipalities to undertake revision. There also appears to be considerable laxity in the collection of municipal dues with the result that their arrears are steadily growing, these in some cases increasing in a single year by as much as 50 per cent. Since 1921-2 educational expenditure by municipalities has almost doubled in all divisions except in Orissa where far from increasing it has undergone a slight decrease. It is time that the province as a whole and specially that division realised the need of greater outlay on education if they are to keep abreast of the times. Nevertheless municipal expenditure on primary education for the province as a whole has risen from 12.6 to 15.1 of the ordinary municipal income. The resolution comments adversely on the unsatisfactory condition of municipal roads and sanitary arrangements. Want of funds is no doubt largely responsible for this and much improvement in the latter respect can in no case be expected unless a keen sanitary conscience is aroused, which is bound to be a tiresomely slow process. All the same an anxiety to make every rupee go the way it can and strict supervision on municipal services by those in authority are sure to improve matters at least to some extent. There is much scope for this not only in Bihar but all over India.

* * *

A MOVE TO THE LEFT.

THAT the Government's policy of persisting with the Simon inquiry regardless of the feelings of the people is driving even the more moderate elements well-nigh to desperation is evidenced by the recent campaign of Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya in which he recommends measures, some of them calculated to hit Government directly and others to promote solidarity in the country so that the fight with Government may be conducted at less odds. He is now busily engaged in appealing to the country first to inaugurate boycott of foreign cloth and secondly to merge the existing political parties and to fight the ensuing elections on a common nationalist platform. It is quite clear that the boycott of foreign cloth, as envisaged by Pandit Malaviya, is not intended, as in the case of Mahatma Gandhi, merely to further the *khaddar* movement, but is intended to operate mainly as the boycott of British cloth so that it may inflict an injury upon Government and compel it to abandon its present insensibility to public opinion. We do not desire at this moment to discuss either the opportuneness or the efficacy of the employment of this weapon. We are content to note a distinct move to the left on the part of politicians who have done the most in recent years to prevent a deflection of the Congress from its traditional policy. Government can easily do worse than ignore this portent and go on leisurely with its foreign-conducted constitutional inquiries alienating every section of politicians excepting perhaps the reactionary communalists.

The other plank in Pandit Malaviya's platform is no less an indication of his leftward tendencies. There are of course many attempts in the country at present, both in the North and in the South, to ignore the party distinctions for the moment and select the best men of any of the advanced groups as candidates for elections so that the anti-national parties may have as few chances of success as possible. In Madras, e. g., Mr. Yakub Hasan, Dewan Bahadur Masilamani Pillay, Mr. T. R. Venkatarama Sastri, Mr. Arogyaswami Mudaliar, Diwan Bahadur Govindaraghava Aiyar, Mrs. Besant, Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar, and other prominent persons have formed a "Nation First" party, whose main object is to combine all the progressive forces in the Presidency under one banner so that the energies of all may be concentrated on fighting (a) communalism and (b) reactionaryism. Pandit Malaviya too has no doubt a similar object in view, but perhaps because he sees that no *entente cordiale* can take place between the centre party to which he belongs and the Swaraj party which is a long way off to the left, unless his party meets the other half way, he makes it a cardinal principle of the pact which he would bring about that candidates seeking election on behalf of the new party should declare their intention beforehand to decline office under dyarchy. This is indeed a great transformation for Pandit Malaviya. For his familiar rôle till now was to raise in the Congress year after year with

none too conspicuous a success his solitary voice against the Swarajist ban on acceptance of Minister ships. He used to make a bitter complaint against the Liberals, with whom he was in agreement on the futility and the mischievousness of the Swarajist policy, that they had left him to plough a lonely furrow in the Congress, themselves meeting in a different organization. It had become such a permanent fixture in the Congress sessions for Panditji to make an academical protest against the ruling policy and perhaps find himself in the minority of one that the present change of front on his part will come to most observers with a shock of surprise.

The reason for this transformation must be, as suggested above, the feeling that without this change there can be no concerted action with the Swarajists. But at the Madras meeting where Pandit Malaviya announced his new policy, he spoke as if the change was dictated by new-found conviction. The reason he gave was that the Ministers called to office had proved such total failures that it would be of greater advantage to the country to show its dissatisfaction with the constitution by refusing to work it: precisely the reason that was being advanced all these years by Gandhian and Swarajist non-cooperators and that was being as strenuously opposed by Pandit Malaviya. Only the former could well divine in advance what the latter has now learnt by actual experience. But must the Ministerships prove failures if good men and true accept them? That few such men can get the necessary support in the Councils is a weakness of our party organization, which it would be wrong wholly to blame on dyarchy. If Ministers are unsuccessful, are the Legislative Councils any better? Barring the C. P. Council, there is not a single provincial Council which has been able to resist the temptation of offering co-operation to the Simon Commission. Every Council has betrayed the country in the hour of crisis. If Pandit Malaviya's reason for boycott of office is valid, he ought in consistency to advocate boycott of Councils as well. But that is apparently not being advocated because it is not required for the desired union with the Swarajists who are themselves bent upon capturing all possible seats in the Legislature even to the exclusion of Nationalists like Pandit Malaviya. If on one more item in the Swarajists' policy agreement is now reached between the centrists and the leftists if one may so term them, what are the remaining points of difference which Pandit Malaviyaji would like the country to ignore while elections are being fought? Only the policy of obstruction, or such of it as still survives. The most recent occasion on which the divergence of policy on this point was thrown into strong relief in the Legislative Assembly was in connexion with the Finance Bill, which the Swarajists threw out *en bloc*, while the Nationalists could not find it in their heart to vote against it. This point was brought up at the public meeting in Madras, and Pandit Malaviya explained it away by saying that he had never voted in favour of the Finance Bill since his

entry into the Assembly. The difference between rejection of the Bill and abstention from voting on it may appear small, but it is at bottom a difference between wholesale obstruction and discriminating opposition. This difference remains, and unless the Swarajists are prepared to wink at it, the chances of common action between the two parties at elections seem remote.

An even more important difference is coming into view. As Mr. Vallabhbhai Patel has suggested, the Congress (which in this respect is identical with the Swarajist party) may insist upon all candidates put forward by it to pledge themselves to carry out the programme of civil disobedience to which the Congress is committed in the not very unlikely event of dominion status not being conferred upon India by the end of the year. What would be Panditji's attitude to the Congress resolution? He expressed a desire in Madras to give a couple of years' grace to the Government, but on the all-important question of civil disobedience he was silent. But we should be very much surprised if Pandit Malaviya could persuade himself to give such a pledge. The least he would insist upon, we think, is freedom to judge of the situation as he may find it at the end either of 1929 or 1931. If the Congress therefore requires all the candidates supported by it to give an undertaking to carry out its programme, it is vain to hope for unity. And who can say that the Congress will not so insist, even though the certain result of it will be the dispersion of nationalist forces?

But for the present we are more concerned with Government. Will it do nothing to check by timely pacificatory action the tendency to move to the left which is so clearly discernible among moderate politicians?

MAHARASHTRA PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE.

THE seventh session of the Maharashtra Provincial Conference, although it has not given us an inspiring programme, has discussed the present political situation as fully as possible. Mr. J. K. Mehta in his welcome address deplored that the Nehru Report was attacked on various sides and that the Congress was stampeded into the adoption of the ideal of independence and the presentation of an ultimatum which in his opinion is premature. He expressed his disapproval of the way in which the Congress was flirting with the left wing of Labour which did not accept the creed of non-violence. As for the boycott of foreign cloth he said it could not be made effective without relying on mill-cloth along with hand-woven cloth. This argument certainly does not require much elaboration; but Mr. Mehta watered down the meaning of boycott so much that to us it appears hardly distinguishable from Swadeshi.

Mr. Vallabhbhai Patel in his presidential address principally dealt with the ensuing elections, the national programme and the land revenue problem with which his name is now inseparably associated. Before dealing with these questions, however, he reaffirmed his faith in non-violent non-cooperation and civil disobedience; we cannot however endorse a fresh inauguration of such a policy as it is certain to lead to disaster through disunion and a lapse from self-control which experience has shown to be the

concomitant of such a policy. Coming to the elections, he proclaimed himself the same incorrigible no-changer that he was in 1922 and he said that the conviction had been growing on him that the Council programme was incompatible with the national programme. Now here again we have to join issue with him since it must be confessed by any impartial observer that in spite of disappointments and failures the Central Legislature and some of the Provincial Councils at least have acquitted themselves well and that without their work, the constitutional struggle for wider powers of government would have been appreciably feebler. But it appears that somehow Mr. Patel bows down to the inevitable and regards the boycott of the Councils as an advice likely to be unpalatable to a large section of Indians. He therefore advised everybody to concentrate on the Nehru Report, hoping of course that before the year was out, the differences of opinion about the Report would be obliterated and an agreement arrived at between all parties and all communities. But Mr. Vallabhbhai Patel not only wants the candidates to pledge themselves to support the Nehru Report but also to carry out a programme of civil disobedience in case this year's Congress should adopt it in December. This last will certainly act as an obstacle to the union of all parties in a common goal which in the very next sentence he describes as a desideratum.

Speaking about *Khadi* as one item of the national programme Mr. Patel agreed with Mr. J. K. Mehta about the necessity of supplementing hand-woven cloth with mill cloth in order to carry out an effective boycott of foreign cloth. He therefore called upon the mill-owners to regard their industry as a national trust and to settle all disputes with labourers by a policy of give and take and consent to the well-meant interference of national leaders for fixing wages as well as the prices of the final commodity. This is certainly sound advice and if it is followed by the mill-owners it ought to go a long way towards solving the dead-locks created by recent strikes.

Referring to communal problems Mr. Patel expressed himself hopeful about the solution of the Brahman-non-Brahman problem in this part of the province. But he veered round from optimism into pessimism when he contemplated the Hindu-Muslim differences; he appealed however to the saner members of both the communities to give up their inactivity and apathy towards the national programme. There is an amount of truth in his assertion that those who have influence with the masses of the two communities do not put a curb on their pen and tongue; certainly a good deal of mischief is due to the senseless speeches and writings of communal fanatics who are never tired of seeing the mote in the eyes of others. It is the duty of leaders of both the communities to use their influence in reforming the vernacular journals indulging in a spate of ill-feeling in season and out of season.

Speaking on the land revenue problem Mr. Patel insisted on the indefeasible right of the peasants to have their say before any settlement is imposed on them. He also criticized the introduction of new settlements in the teeth of the resolutions passed by the Bombay Legislative Council in 1924 and 1927 recommending that the process of revenue assessment be brought under closer regulation by legislative enactment. Referring to the narrow clique of officials whose advice was accepted by the Bombay Government as against the majority of the Land Revenue Assessment Committee he said that the conspiracy of these officials to prevent the representatives of the people from having any voice

in revenue matters has to be fought tooth and nail and he called upon the Conference to give earnest attention to the matter. One piece of advice which he gave to youths was sorely needed and it was that wild talk or wild action was no indication of capacity for sacrifice. "What we want", he said, "is not fitful acts of self-immolation but sustained suffering and sacrifice." We hope our youths would profit by his counsel.

DISCRIMINATORY LEGISLATION.

WHEN the Associated Chambers of Commerce demanded safeguards in the new constitution against discriminatory legislation, Sir John Simon called upon them to draft a clause to be incorporated in the amending Act which would provide the safeguards of the sort they were aiming at. In response to this request the Bombay and Bengal Chambers have forwarded separate drafts of this description to the Statutory Commission. The Bombay draft deprives the Indian Legislature of any power to make laws discriminating against any commercial or agricultural interests established by any person or association—excepting retaliatory legislation against the subjects of a State which has put into effect discriminatory legislation against British Indian subjects; it provides for a decision of such matters only by the High Court of the province, an appeal to lie to the King in Council. The Bengal draft, instead of using the simple phrase 'discriminatory legislation,' expands the meaning by means of a variety of expressions, especially emphasizing the personal liberties, property, contractual rights of British subjects of any race, creed or class. This latter draft is more reasonable as it allows a subsidy to an industry in accordance with existing laws and makes an exception in the case of such protective duties as may be imposed by the Government of India. This fear of discriminatory legislation has been there for a long time since the publication of the Report of the Fiscal Commission which insisted on rupee capital in the case of industries requiring subsidies from the State or asking for a protective duty against foreign imports. But it has become a veritable nightmare since the formal introduction of the Coastal Reservation Bill which proposes to reserve to Indian nationals the sole right of carrying on coastal traffic.

In spite of the recognition of the justice of coastal reservation by the Mercantile Marine Committee presided over by a European officer, the *furor* caused by the Bill during the last year has been so great that it has estranged the good feeling between the European and Indian commercial communities in India. During the discussion on Mr. Haji's Bill at the East India Association in February last (in connection with Mr. Frank Birdwood's paper), Sir Walter Wilson described the proposed Bill as fantastic and ludicrous. Mr. Birdwood said in his paper that it would be a tyrannical act to enforce reservation without adequate compensation for ships, offices, plant and the staff. Sir Geoffrey Clark said that there was not a single port of any value before the British came to India and that the development of the ports and the seafaring industry were the outcome of British enterprise. All this is true enough, but it just proves the necessity even at this late hour to develop the Indian marine. Of all the speakers—other than Indians—Sir Montagu Webb was the only one who had the fairness to recognize India's right to a national Mercantile Marine and to resort to reservation of coastal shipping. With such sentiments uppermost in their minds it is no wonder that the Chambers of Commerce should ask for a safeguard in the constitution itself for retaining the enjoyment of their vested

rights. That these vested rights would perpetually prevent the development of the Indian marine as well as that of other Indian industries is not recognized as a valid argument by the British commercial interests.

The consequences that would result from the adoption of such safeguards as those contained in the drafts as integral parts of the new constitution would be far-reaching in their effects on the industries of the country. They would besides detract seriously from the complete autonomy of the Indian Legislature in one of its most vital jurisdictions. Sir Atul Chatterji declared in the Assembly a few years ago that the settled policy of the Government of India was that no subsidies are to be given to any concerns unless they have a rupee capital, unless 75 per cent. of the Directors are Indians and unless they allow facilities for the training of Indian apprentices. The continuation of this policy would be made impossible if the demands of the Europeans about discriminatory legislation were granted and their draft clauses find their way to the statute book. Similarly reservation of certain posts for Indians in commercial institutions would be precluded by the new drafts proposed: a case we have in mind is a clause in the Reserve Bank Bill saying for instance that both the deputy governors shall be Indians. A rebate on Indian salt from Sind or elsewhere entering Bengal would again be unthinkable under the operation of these draft clauses; an excise duty on the product of foreign match factories in India demanded by the Indian Chambers of Commerce in 1927 at their Madras meeting would come under the mischief of these clauses. In fact all legislation the object of which is to promote national industries and enterprises by restricting them to nationals would be rendered nugatory under the new constitution, as envisaged by the European Chambers of Commerce. The demand of the Europeans for a fair field and no favour appears on the face of it perfectly reasonable, but as interpreted by them it is in effect a demand for the continuation of the monopolistic advantages which they have succeeded in securing during the last century. Any one who has studied the history of Indian industry for the last century and a half will hardly fail to see that the protest against discriminatory legislation is an interested one, having its roots in the psychology of a profit-grabbing commercialism.

"DISARMAMENT" AGAIN.

(From Our Own Correspondent.)

GENEVA, April 19.

THE papers are once more full of a negative term which it must be confessed has become a little ridiculous. There is talk of disarmament at Geneva yet again. The work of the present meeting of the Preparatory Commission on Disarmament may be expected to produce less results than ever before for obvious reasons. In every vital problem there are certain essentials which are of the nature of a context dominating and determining the given situation, and all impartial observers of the trend of affairs in Europe must be aware that these essentials were never so important as now. From the point of view of limitation of armaments they may be brought under three principal heads.

1. No reduction of national strength in trained men or in weapons is possible in the matter of land armaments so long as the relations between Soviet Russia and the rest of Europe remain what they are. Not only are Western European countries actually afraid of the armed forces of the Government at Moscow, despite all talk of Russia's breakdown, but

the hostility which they sedulously cultivate towards the Soviets is a stupendous factor which vitiates the entire international situation in innumerable ways. And what Soviet Russia is to Western Europe Fascist Italy is to Eastern Europe. War machines of great size and efficiency exist in the Balkans today making that region more explosive than ever. Between these two zones it must be added is a vast area of political unsettlement which stands to the credit of the Versailles Treaty.

2. It is futile to expect that continental Powers possessing large armaments on land will reduce them of their own accord unless obliged to do so by a parallel decrease in armaments on sea. Thus regarded, the naval rivalry between Great Britain and the United States is a factor in the international situation, at least as towering as that of Soviet Russia. Every prospect of these two great naval Powers building against each other means the indefinite postponement of any general scheme of limitation.

3. No initiative looking towards adjustment of the question of limitation of naval armaments need be expected from Great Britain until after the General Election, and for the same reason Washington also will no doubt choose to wait and watch. In any case, considering the way in which such matters have been settled in recent years, before the question is ripe for Geneva the long and difficult proceeding of settling points concerning blockade, search, contraband, destination of cargo, freedom of the seas, etc. will have to be gone through:

Nevertheless, the paradox of the political situation is such that for these very reasons the present Conference must produce some results, however unsubstantial. Soviet Russia's participation in the Conference and the radical thesis consistently put forward by the Soviet delegates, not without a measure of outside support, can no longer be met with ridicule alone. The United States as well as Great Britain is obliged, by the very nature of the impression their rivalry has produced, to make some conciliatory gesture, and finally, in view of the position that the Opposition has taken up, the Baldwin Government would be very foolish indeed not to take advantage of the present occasion to establish a better record at Geneva.

The indications, therefore, are that Mr. Gibson, the United States' representative, will put forward in private to Lord Cushendun the possibility of another Three Power Conference. The Conference in 1927 failed to agree partly because it was assumed that the limitation of cruisers was a naval rather than a political question. In this regard there are signs of change of point of view in Britain as well as in the United States. Secondly, in the case of continuance of disagreement on the rival claims of 1927, Britain insisting on an unlimited supply of cruisers of 6,000 tons, and the United States on 10,000 ton vessels, the thesis might be advanced that it should be commonly avowed that war between the two countries is impossible, and each therefore could build such cruisers as were deemed necessary. This would no doubt be one way of regularising an unsatisfactory situation and an excellent way of giving the appearance of conclusiveness to a discussion where no conclusion has been reached. But even this presupposes a good deal of private conversations, and what is perhaps yet more difficult at Geneva, that every other Power should refrain from introducing a new formula based on armour, age, and speed of cruisers in place of the existing one dealing with global tonnage.

OUR U. P. LETTER.

(From Our Own Correspondent.)

ALLAHABAD, May 4.

ANTI-REVOLUTIONARY CAMPAIGN.

THE Government seems determined to stamp out all traces of revolutionary organizations, if any exist, in this country. Red letters and posters on the one hand and arrests and searches on the other are becoming the order of the day. Nobody, at any rate, was prepared for the searches and arrests of May 2 in this part of the country. So far as Allahabad is concerned, the police seem to have been put on the wrong track in the case of the searches of two out of the three houses, for they found next to nothing, which they would seize. Some police officials got nervous when during the search of a house, the owner in joke said that there was a bomb inside a bundle of jute which they were going to examine. How delicately was the bundle handled and taken to the police station was really amusing. And the Superintendent got himself vaccinated immediately on return home because a bed in a house searched had been, he was told, occupied by a small-pox patient!

A NATIONALIST MUSLIM.

But while these arrests, searches and red letters have provided temporary sensation, an event of greater significance was the address of Mr. T. A. K. Sherwani, M.L.A., at the Benares Conference and deserves mention. Mr. Sherwani is one of those nationalist Muslims whose politics do not change to suit the occasion. He is a quiet man who does not force himself on the public eye. Mr. Sherwani himself told us in his address how the Benares Congress of 1905 made him a nationalist. He joined the non-cooperation movement and though he has now resumed practice in the High Court, he has not forgotten that Indians' freedom has got to be won. I have never missed, Mr. Sherwani said, any nationalist gathering which I have had the opportunity of attending. Recently during a tour in U. P. to popularize the Nehru Report, Mr. Sherwani invited Dr. Shafaat Ahmad Khan many a time to come and address a public meeting on the Nehru Report and take votes on that issue, but the doctor every time managed to excuse himself. It is needless to add that at the Benares Conference Mr. Sherwani gave much wholesome advice to his co-religionists on the questions of joint electorates and safeguards for minorities.

THE NATIONALIST PARTY.

The U. P. Council, it is believed, will be dissolved at due time and preparations for fighting the elections have not yet commenced. But the Nationalist Party, as usual, has not slackened its efforts in giving a fight to the Government in every bye-election. News comes from Gorakhpur that Mr. Madhusudan Das has been returned unopposed because he has joined the Nationalist party. The career of the Nationalist party in the U. P. Council, it may be noted in passing, possesses great constitutional importance. It is a truism that the two-party system is the *sine qua non* of parliamentary responsible government. The Nationalist party in the U. P. Council comprises the Liberals, the Swarajists and some Zamindars and presents, for all practical purposes, a united opposition to the Government. The rest of the Council consists of some groups but is practically a following of the Government and the Ministers. On all important matters, and even in the day-to-day working, the Council is in essence divided into two camps and the system works as well as a real two-party system. If full responsible government

had been conferred on the provinces, there is no doubt it would have been successfully worked, for the chance of coming to power and shouldering responsibility exerts a wholesome influence on the party.

REVIEWS.

THE INDIAN STATES.

THE BRITISH CROWN AND THE INDIAN STATES. By the DIRECTORATE OF THE CHAMBER OF PRINCES' SPECIAL ORGANISATION. (King.) 1929. 22cm. 244 p. 10s. 6d.

THE Butler Committee does not seem to have been too favourably impressed by the case put before it by the Chamber of Princes, but the latter certainly spared no pains in preparing their case and popularising it. *The British Crown and the Indian States*, which has just been published, is so brightly written and is so forcible and yet persuasive in its arguments that it cannot but produce a strong prepossession in favour of the Durbars in the mind of the reader. The apparent restraint and anxiety to avoid dogmatic assertion shown by the authors, who are masters of the art of writing, make it very difficult for the average man to detect the weaknesses in the Princes' case as presented here; nevertheless the weaknesses are many and serious, as indeed is obvious from the Butler Committee's conclusions.

The first part of the book gives an historical sketch of the changes through which the theory of political relationship between the Crown and the States has passed. This theory has often varied; emphasis is sometimes laid upon the internal sovereignty of States and at other times on the right and indeed the duty of the Suzerain Power to interfere with their affairs with a view to preventing misgovernment and securing good government. But whatever the variation may be, past history as outlined in these pages lends no support to the legal opinion, on which the Princes' claims as regards their political status are based, to the effect that the rights of the Paramount Power over the States proceed only from one source, viz. the States' contract with the Crown. By the Paramountcy Agreement, which is common to all the States, the latter have surrendered control over their external relations; but in their internal relations they retain their full sovereignty except in so far as any particular State may by definite agreement have renounced it for some reason or other. It is therefore treaties and engagements which alone determine the degree of subordination each State is under to the Paramount Power; apart from these treaties and engagements the Paramount Power has no rights over the States; and the Government of India cannot "claim any general Paramountcy over Indian States investing it with the right to order the rulers to conform to the wishes of the Government (apart from external relations) or to intervene in any matters outside the express provisions of the treaty" (p. 103). This claim is obviously untenable in the light of history (in spite of the stress sometimes laid upon non-intervention, which indeed was always understood as subject to

this general power) and has been emphatically rejected by the Butler Committee. The Supreme Government has power of intervention, independently of and beyond the terms of the treaties, in virtue of its very supremacy, and this power can be exercised in the interest of the country as a whole, and more particularly in the interest of the welfare of the people in the States. It is unnecessary to elaborate this position at greater length.

The second part sets forth what the Princes regard as injustice which they suffer from in their economic and financial relations with British India. In this part the treaties of the States, by which so much store was set in the earlier part, fade into the background, and if mention is made of them at all it is only to show how unjust the treaties of themselves are and by what unfair pressure consent to them on the part of the Princes was obtained at their inception. In the matter of salt monopoly, opium, currency, &c., the States have entered into agreements with British India, and there can be no question of injustice in regard to these so long as the agreements are adhered to by the Government of India. It is not contended that the agreements are being departed from, and the injustice complained of therefore is in fact a plea for a revision of the treaties in favour of the States. This fact, however, is carefully concealed from the reader, who is led to believe that the States suffer an injury unwarranted by the existing terms of the agreements. An estimate is made in each case of the monies that pass from the States to the Government of India, and they are represented as unjust exactions from the former, which must be stopped at once. Under Currency and Mints, *e. g.*, the States are shown as being laid under contribution to the tune of Rs. 86 lakhs and under salt to the tune of Rs. 93 lakhs. Assuming that these figures are correct, they give no ground for complaint unless it can be shown that any infringement of the rights which still vest in the Princes takes place. This has not been shown, and it is small wonder therefore that the Butler Committee has summarily disposed of them. Speaking of salt, for instance, the Committee says, very shortly, "Treaties and engagements have been made, and there is no more reason why these treaties and engagements should be revised than the political treaties and engagements of more than a century ago." But to the Princes political treaties are sacrosanct (in their own interpretation of them) and economic and fiscal treaties of no binding force.

The most important claim of the States is in respect of a share in the proceeds of sea customs and tariffs. This claim has been thoroughly examined and shown to be groundless by Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer, who says that the principle governing this matter is that "every State is entitled in the exercise of its sovereignty to levy customs duties on goods entering, crossing, or leaving the State." This principle is however denied in the *British Crown and the Indian States*, which refers to the practice of foreign countries or British Colonies as set forth by Professor H. Stanley Jevons in a paper read by him before the

fourth Conference of the Indian Economic Association in 1920. But Professor Jevons refers there to cases covered by mutual agreements between countries which have therefore no application to the question we are considering. It is of course open to the Durbars to open negotiations with British India and arrive at an agreement either to exempt goods consumed in the States from the levy of customs duties or to admit the States to a specific share of the customs revenue based on the proportion of population or some other criterion. But, in the absence of such an agreement, the States surely have no reason to complain. The Butler Committee says as much: "On principle then we hold that British India is fully entitled to impose maritime customs for the purposes of India as a whole." The Committee is prepared to give "some relief", but it is only by way of concession, and for this concession no justification is advanced. The *British Crown and the Indian States* says further that "it might be urged that these duties are in effect transit duties," as indeed is held by Professors Jevons and Shah, but Sir Leslie Scott, the Princes' counsel, having expressed the contrary view, the authors of the book evidently felt embarrassed in pressing that claim. The upshot of the whole thing is that if customs duties are the means of transferring Rs. 7,06 lakhs from the States to the British Indian Exchequer, as is estimated in the book before us, it entails no injustice upon the States. Any other Power in the position of British India would have derived the same advantage, conformably to the provisions of international law.

The Butler Committee says further that "if the States are admitted to a share of the customs revenue of British India, British India may legitimately claim that the States should bear their full share of Imperial burdens, on the well established principle that those who share receipts should also share expenditure." But in regard to defence, *e. g.*, the authors of the book we are reviewing hold fast by the terms of the treaties under which it is claimed that no obligation attaches to the Princes to contribute to its cost. The Paramount Power has undertaken, in return for the surrender by the States of their external relations, to defend the States against both external and internal dangers, and whether it be a good or bad bargain, the Paramount Power must carry out its terms; and there is no ground in law or constitution which would justify a demand on its part for a share in the cost of defence. Suddenly the treaties again assume tremendous importance. "They stand as the bulwark of the States' freedom, and the Government of India, as the agent of the Crown, are necessarily bound by them." If, in disregard of the treaties, the States were charged with a proportionate share of the cost of defence, it is calculated in this book that the States would be liable, in addition to what they are required to pay under particular contracts at present, to a burden of Rs. 4 crores a year. The States now contribute to the Central Government (thus runs the estimate) altogether Rs. 10 crores and even if they were made to contribute their portion of the cost of defence, the Central Government must

make over to the States, it is argued, Rs. 6 crores in order to get even.

This is a rough calculation which the Durbars are prepared to submit to an expert committee. But above all they wish to see instituted a sort of federalised executive composed of the representatives of Indian States and British India to take decisions on questions of common concern. But here is seen the cloven foot of the suggestion. If the States, although independent political communities governed by treaty relations, are in despite of the treaty position to be treated as constituent elements of a federal government, and are to be admitted to a voice in the shaping of British Indian policy, they cannot in consistency claim a share in the receipts of any of the taxes in which they are now claiming a share. As observed by Sir Sivaswamy Ayier, "in almost all federal governments the revenue derived from customs has usually been allocated to the central government." In India the provinces have no share in the customs receipts, and so the States on that footing can have none. Thus the largest item, Rs. 7,06 lakhs goes. "The regulation of coinage and currency is one of the matters which would be reserved to a central government in any federal union." Railways, posts and telegraphs, salt are all central sources of revenue, in which the provinces have no share. If the States then contribute Rs. 10 crores to the central Government, that is what they would in any case contribute under a federal government. The States, however, want to share in the advantages of federation without shouldering its burdens. This attitude must be strenuously resisted. The Butler Committee has recommended the appointment of an expert committee to enquire into certain claims of the States, but it is to be hoped that the committee will not be allowed to depart by a hair's-breadth from the provisions of the agreements already made. If these agreements are to be reviewed in the light of modern conditions and a new federal machinery for the adjustment of political and fiscal relations is to be devised, it cannot be done by this expert committee nor by Parliament nor by the British Government. This can only be done by agreement between the States (in which the people will play an important part), British India and the Crown. To such an honest federation British India will oppose no obstacle; but the sort of federation proposed in which the benefits are on one side and the burdens on the other can never be acceptable to it.

S. G. V.

INDIAN FINANCE.

FEDERAL FINANCE IN INDIA. By K. T. SHAH. (D. B. Taraporewala, Bombay.) 1929. 8 $\frac{3}{4}$ x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$. pp. 332. Rs. 6.

In the list of economists in India the name of Prof. K. T. Shah stands very high and his latest book on Federal Finance in India serves only to enhance an established reputation. In that book, which is a reprint of the Benauli Readership lectures delivered in the Patna University by the author during the year 1928-29, an attempt has been made to survey

the field of Indian Finance with a view to trace the emergence of the principle of federation and to suggest remedies for the better and speedier realisation of the same principle in future. The lectures are six in number. In the first an analysis of the financial systems of the chief federations of the world is made to yield certain characteristic features of federal finance. Lecture second is mainly taken up with a historical treatment of Indian financial organisation down practically to the present day. Lectures third and fourth contain a review respectively of the public revenues and expenditure in British India. Chapter fifth, perhaps the most important in the book, constitutes an exhaustive and able survey of the general economic and financial relations between the Indian states and British India, which is calculated to aid immensely in the task of bringing about that mutual adjustment without which all schemes of development in India are bound to be incomplete. The sixth and the last lecture, besides throwing out a few further suggestions regarding financial organisation, national development and audit, contains the author's recommendations about reconstruction. The book covers over 325 pages and contains a number of very valuable tables and charts. The treatment accorded to the position of Indian states *vis-a-vis* the financial development of India is very full and satisfactory. About 100 pages are devoted to this part of the subject and they will be read with great advantage not only by professed students of the subject but also by our all too ill-informed public men and journalists. The historical and analytical part of the book is also of a very high order. One cannot but feel that, had the author been able to persuade himself to economise a little on other parts with a view to elaborate in greater detail his proposals for actual and immediate reconstruction, the usefulness of the book would have materially increased. A high order of scholarship and a becoming restraint characterise the book throughout. One finds so much in Prof. Shah's treatment of the subject that is acceptable and praiseworthy that it is with the greatest reluctance that criticisms can be offered. All the same there are certain important aspects of the subject of federal finance in India on which more has got to be said than can be read in Prof. Shah's work.

First and foremost the question, what is the principle of federal finance, has got to be satisfactorily answered before the proper viewpoint, either for a historical survey or a present analysis, can be obtained. Those who will closely follow the pages of Prof. Shah's book will of course learn that federal finance is not merely a matter for ready and rough division of functions and revenues, but that it seeks to establish the principle on which this division should be based. Whether all will agree with Prof. Shah in his statement of that principle is more than one can say. Prof. Shah's version of the guiding principle of federal finance can only be gleaned from a number of references in the book, but it is nowhere more clearly stated than in the following remark on page 332: "The life of the Federal State must be considered to be one, and the several units making up that State must be regarded as the different facts of a common vital principle inspiring the entire body politic." It is as well to ask in this connection two very vital questions. What in a federation is to be considered the unit of collective development, the federal state or its component parts? What part of the composite organisation is to be considered as existing for specific duties connected with the nation's life in general and to what is to be entrusted the main task of collective progress for which the state ultimately exists? This is a question unaffected by any particular scheme of division of functions and

revenues, as it may well happen that in some cases practical allocations based on both the possible answers to the question may substantially be the same. It is also agreed that so far as the most obvious manifestations of sovereignty are concerned, the federation is more truly their custodian than the component states. But historically and analytically the function of the federal government is only to secure those conditions which, it is agreed, are essential for the safety and general progress of the nation. It may well be, as is observed by Prof. Shah himself, that the nation in its federal aspect may decide upon an irreducible minimum of civilised administration and it may further be arranged that this minimum may for convenience and economy of administration be divided between the federal and the state organisations. In such a case it follows that resources will have to be found for individual states irrespective of their own economic position. What Prof. Shah calls the 'irreducible minimum of civilised administration' would in that case be essentially federal functions, which are administered in practice by both the federal and the state organisations, but are still predominantly under the control of the first. For these federal functions adequate resources will have to be found and their burden will have to be distributed over the provinces as nearly as possible in proportion to their taxable capacity. But the other activities of the state which are governed mainly by the resources, responsibility and general will of the citizens of the province will have to be left to themselves. The federation is a political and financial unit only in respect of those functions that have been definitely marked out as the field of its action. The component states continue to be self-conscious and self-dependent units for other than specifically federal functions.

This distinction between a policy of looking upon the central government as the unit of administration as a whole and that of assigning to it only a specific field is not merely of an academic importance. In the distribution of the functions and burdens of administration it is likely to make considerable difference in practice. In particular it is calculated to be of use in solving the question as to whether the progressive and prosperous provinces are to be indefinitely mulcted so that others may be allowed the advantages and facilities which they can neither afford nor appreciate. The conception of the theory of federal finance presented in the book requires completion on its organic, political and historical side. If in a federation it is implied that all the parts of the state must march in a line in all respects that matter then the federation will be organically a unitary and only mechanically a federal state. Politically also, as responsibility in administration develops in the provinces they would be justified in claiming for their own use all their resources, except such as are necessary to meet their proportional contribution towards financing the federal expenditure. In no country, least of all in a big continent like India, will the demands of provincial self-government be satisfied without drawing a definite line, wide as it may be, round the functions of the central government. Viewing the progress of the Indian constitution in a historical spirit, it will be observed that, at this juncture in the nation's history, the cause of the central government needs no special emphasis. Its supremacy and stability are accomplished facts of history. Evolution is to be directed in India towards widening the limits of provincial autonomy simultaneously with the establishment of popular control in provincial governments. Prof. Shah is himself a federalist and we need have no doubt that he agrees in substance

with the practical conclusions indicated by this line of reasoning. Certain passages in the book suggest, however, that the author is concerned unduly more on account of national uniformity and unduly less on that of provincial autonomy and progress. Had it not been for this he would not have failed to recognise in para 201 (and 207) of the Montford report a delineation of the correct principle of federal finance.

The case for the Indian States has been very ably handled by Prof. Shah. As he so well observes, the problem of the relations between the states and 'British' India is to be considered as affecting the relations between the two peoples, as distinguished from those between their present autocratic administrations. Moreover, the claims of the States have been presented with so much moderation that very little can be said in opposition to them on theoretical and technical grounds. Unfortunately, however, it so happens that neither in the political nor in the financial sphere is the problem of the Indian States likely to be solved at present by reference to theoretical rights of the princes on the one hand and the bureaucratic Government of India on the other. When the peoples of the states, represented by elected or hereditary leaders, agree to be members of a common Indian federation, then alone will all their just claims be capable of final satisfaction. So long as the princes seek to stand forth as sovereigns of their territory and people, and actively agitate for permanently breaking away from their kith and kin in British India, it is not possible that facts of the administration will be substantially affected by an appeal to charters or theories. The end is certain that in the future the states will findings their place in an Indian federation; but so long as they have not done so there is no possibility of their major demands for a readjustment being granted. In the meanwhile, however, the people of British India cannot afford to wait till the day of the realisation of a common responsible form of Government. Financial reform must be brought about in British India *now* as circumstances permit along lines of federation, the ideal of which has only a guiding, not a dictatorial, value. It is in this respect that one misses the realistic touch in the last chapter of the book. Hardly 17 pages out of 332 are utilised for offering a solution to the problem at present facing the advocates of Federal Finance in this country. The author himself knows this, better perhaps than anybody else. But suggestions which are based upon the realisation of economies to the tune of Rs. 20 crores in the budget of the Government of India can have little immediate value. We shall not be surprised if Prof. Shah adds in the near future another book to his valuable authorship, bearing on the immediate problems before the country. The Simon Commission and the Butler Committee have felt it necessary to supplement their findings by appeals to specialists' recommendations on the financial aspects of their respective inquiries. The purpose of educating interested public opinion on the subject will be better served by a book from Prof. Shah dealing with the practical problems of the day, as distinguished from a very desirable, yet improbable, general scheme of political and financial reorganisation. 1

It is hardly necessary to repeat that the book is a very instructive and useful production and should be read by all students, public men and journalists.

D. G. KARVE.

FAR EASTERN RELATIONS.

FAR EASTERN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS. By H. B. MORSE and H. F. MACNAIR. (Commercial Press, Shanghai.) 1928. 9×6¼. pp. 1128. \$10.

It is a matter of common knowledge that there exists in the West colossal ignorance about Far Eastern problems. This is partly due to the fact that Europe is pre-occupied with her own problems and partly to the feeling—a feeling which is shared even by America—that Europe is the earth's centre of thought and power, and that one need not concern oneself with developments in the Far East. But it is not often realised by Americans and Europeans that "the Pacific is their front door toward the world", and that only a sound knowledge of the complexities and conflicting policies of the Far Eastern countries will enable the West to have peaceful and prosperous diplomatic, missionary, and commercial relations with the Far East of to-day.

The book under review represents a piece of good earnest work. It gives a brilliant and an exhaustive historical survey of Far Eastern affairs necessary for promoting happy relations between the West and the Far East. Dr. MacNair has condensed in the book under review Dr. Morse's three volume work "The International Relations of the Chinese Empire", has revised it, has brought it up to date and what is more important, has broadened the scope of the original, which dealt with China alone. The main facts in the history of the international relations of China, Japan, Korea, Siam, Indo-China and the Philippine Islands are narrated in unbroken sequence, each in its proper perspective and in due proportion. We are constrained to remark, however, that Dr. MacNair has devoted too much attention to the Anglo-Chinese War of 1840. We do not know why the learned author thought it fit to devote as many as 80 pages to it. Nor do we agree with the author when he says at p. 150 that "to the Chinese, opium was the one reason for the war." An impartial study of the literature bearing on the subject makes us believe that the official attempt on the part of the British Government to set up machinery to exercise jurisdiction over their subjects in China and the resistance of Chinese officials to this questionable procedure contributed largely to the origin of the so-called "Opium War".

The book is based on the numerous publications which have appeared from time to time. Of the publications utilised by the author, some idea may be formed when we state that the list of books, given at the end of this work covers 25 pages of closely printed matter. No work lately published seems to have escaped him. To enable the college student and the general reader to follow the Far Eastern "puzzle", the author has introduced a number of very useful maps in the book.

We have great pleasure in saying that the book under review is a monumental work, and all students will thank Dr. MacNair for thus rendering accessible in compact form the history of Far Eastern Relations. The book is excellently got up and has a useful index.

M. V. SUBRAHMANYAM.

SHORT NOTICES.

THE LIFE AND LETTERS OF WALTER DRUM. By JOSEPH GORAYEB. (The America Press, New York.) 1928. 9½×6¼. pp. 313.

EVERY inch a soldier of Christ: such is the impression the *Life and Letters of Fr. Drum* leaves on the

reader. He was the son of a soldier who had died gloriously on the battlefield, and he brought to the Society of Jesus, which he joined when barely eighteen, the spirit of his father. In the Society that spirit became Ignatian: a passionate love for Christ and a burning desire to spend himself entirely for the souls redeemed by Him. And he did spend himself entirely every minute of his life. Loyalty was his peculiar note: loyalty to Christ, to Christ's Church, to His Society, and loyalty to his friends. "He was the most loyal Jesuit I ever came across", wrote one of them.

Jesuits are often credited with little family affection. Surely Fr. Drum was a true Jesuit. His whole life was an uninterrupted attempt at realizing in himself the spirit of the Society, and yet if there is one thing more than another for which he will be rewarded in Heaven, says one, it will be for his obedience to the Fourth Commandment. His love for his mother was so tender; it was as if she were the very core of his heart. As to his father, he almost worshipped him. His whole countenance would light up as he recalled one or another incident of his father's life. And as he loved his father and mother, so also did he love his sister and brothers. In a particular way, he always seemed to look up to his elder brother, showing an unflinching respect for his seniority.

Fr. Drum was a first-rate linguist: he knew twenty-seven languages. God alone knows the labour the learning of those languages had implied. The father had no faith in modern inductive methods. "The old way of conning paradigms and learning the essentials of grammar by rote is the only safe way", he often said. Moreover, he had keen appreciation of beauty, literary as well as artistic and natural. It is with the greatest pleasure that we read the notes he took on his many journeys in Europe and on the Holy Land.

One is only sorry that the author of this book died before he had seen his work in print. Many quotations he would have surely omitted, others he would have embodied in the text.

A. AMBRUZZI.

TALES AND SONGS FROM AN ASSAM TEA GARDEN. By MAURICE P. HANLEY.

(Thacker, Spink.) 1928. 22cm. pp. 100. Rs. 2-8. THE labourer on a tea plantation is not without his own peculiar and primitive thrills and pleasures of life. The Saheb monopolises all his higher vision, sometimes assuming greater proportions than all the fearful ghosts of his religion. His destiny is to slave through life and humiliate himself to the dust in order to propitiate his white-skinned God. He is the very soul of loyalty to his master and he runs all manner of fatal risks out of sheer devotion to him. "Truly these Saheb-logs are great folk, for they seem to have dominion even over the Gods" is the labourer's honest estimate of the planter. If there is anything, he stands in mortal fear of, it is the ghost. He will not have a bamboo shoot disturbed from its place or sow tea plants on a forbidden piece of land, lest the ghost inhabiting them should bring disaster on the saheb. When out hunting he is in his own element, and many a labourer who has some valorous shikars to his credit is a petty hero to his rustic valet.

The planter on his side is a veritable father of the labouring population, sometimes a monstrous one at that if he is composed of stern fibre. At any rate he is not a saint, nor does he ever pretend to be. The life in outlandish regions has a deteriorating effect on him and

"As rough as the country we are in
And the good God above will bear witness
How hard it is to keep from sin".

Far from civilisation, the goldbearing plants and their faithful caretaker with his ghost stories, make him cling to his hapless life. Not a day passes for him without the wild excitement of a hunt which perchance is the saving of many valuable lives.

Material enough for a literary spinner like Mr. Hanley and so we have his extremely delightful and realistic "Tales from an Assam Tea Garden." But when it comes to versification, his modest prosaic genius produces some flat and stiff rhymes.

K. VENUGOPAL RAO.

CORRESPONDENCE

THEISTIC EDUCATION FOR UNIVERSITY STUDENTS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SERVANT OF INDIA.

SIR,—May I request you kindly to make room for the following reply to Mr. D. D. Karve's communication on the above subject in your issue of 28th March? Prof. Karve had written to me a private letter explaining his views on the subject, and I had already replied to him. Evidently he thought that the movement was so 'harmful and dangerous' that he wrote to you about it. That is quite proper, but I had thought it was the accepted etiquette amongst gentlemen not to refer in the press to private letters. This rule Prof. Karve does not seem to respect. Now that the public have been informed of my admission that I have learnt no logic I might be permitted to confess further that I have learnt no moral philosophy either. I am only a licensed engineer; but I submit that it is all beside the point when the public are asked to judge of my proposals, and not of me.

Whatever I have learnt or not learnt, in studying science I remember to have read somewhere that a man of science does not pass hasty judgments. To him all explanations are in the nature of a hypothesis, and even if one solitary fact cannot be reconciled with it, he scraps not the fact but the hypothesis, however cherished it may be. I was taught that that was the scientific attitude and all I am proposing is to get our young men to maintain that attitude in looking at religion itself; because to me religion includes all known and unknown sciences.

I will give an example. Dr. Barnardo, the great social worker of England who is running homes for thousands of orphans, mentions that whenever he feels himself in a tight corner, even in point of money, he settles down to pray. Time after time he has found that an earnest appeal to God has brought him the solution, and large sums of money that he so badly needed have poured in just in the nick of time. Many other people like Tennyson have had similar experiences in life, and a man of science, a seeker after truth, has got to explain the fact. It is all a "coincidence", say some; it is the prayer which has produced the result, say others. They suggest that whenever a man thinks, he like a wireless transmitter sends out waves from his brain which propagate in all directions or in a particular direction with more or less ease, depending upon the nature of the thought. These waves can be and are

picked up at the other end under certain conditions by other persons or intelligences who act as receivers, in whose brain they produce sympathetic vibrations. Let us suppose that Dr. Barnardo is praying in his room in London. A charitably inclined person is thinking in another place as to what he should do with his next cheque, and like a tuned oscillator, it suddenly 'strikes' him that Dr. Barnardo's homes need it most. He therefore sends his cheque that way. Dr. Karve who has studied 'science' in Germany—the home of sciences—may call this 'sentimental drivel,' but it all appears to me a far more reasonable explanation, especially when it opens out before me a great vista of knowledge as to the laws which govern the propagation of thought waves. I do not for a moment want the younger generation to 'believe' my hypothesis, but I want them to be told about it. Is it a 'dangerous proposal'?

The fact is that we have at present in India amongst our 'educated' men a number of half-baked scientists, to whom anything 'which smells of God' acts as a red rag. Dr. Karve has disguised this fairly well in the letter published in your columns; but in another letter in Marathi published in the *Dnyan Prakash*, he suggests that we should have public meetings for abusing God. It is this spirit of 'abusing,' whether in the domain of politics or religion, that is corrupting our social life, and I feel that until we get rid of it, there is no hope of success for our country. I therefore put 'tolerance' as the first virtue to be cultivated by learning to look at Truth or God, as I call it, from every possible point of view. If Dr. Karve will take the trouble to read carefully my little pamphlet he will see on page 34 that the materialistic view of the struggle of existence has not been omitted by me. As the conduct of a very large number of men in this world is based on that view—whether they openly admit it or not—it would be foolish to shut our eyes to its existence. Dr. Karve complains that my proposals undermine the freedom of thought because I do not propose to set apart a day for 'abusing' God, or reading an atheistical penny pamphlet of which we had a sample in another letter published in the *Indian National Herald* under the signature of Dr. Karve's brother. Is the complaint justified? I am content to leave it to your readers to judge for themselves; but before they do so, I am sure it is not too much to request them to read my little pamphlet on the subject. I shall be glad to send a copy free to those who ask for it.

Yours, etc.

G. N. GOKHALE.

Karachi, May 1.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- THE NATIONALIST CRUSADE IN SYRIA. By ELIZABETH P. MACCALLUM. (Foreign Policy Association, New York.) 1928. 18·5cm. pp. 299.
- THE ECONOMIC MORALITY AND THE ETHIC OF JESUS. By HARRY F. WARD. (Macmillan.) 1929. 21. 5cm. pp. 329. 10s. 6d.
- THE WORLD'S RELIGIONS AGAINST WAR. (Church Peace Union, London.) 1928. 21cm. pp. 163. About 2s.
- FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY. By CHARLES C. PETERS. (Macmillan, London.) 1927. 20·5cm. pp. 447. 10s. 6d.
- THE ECONOMICS OF WELFARE. (3rd Edition.) By A. C. FIGOU. (Macmillan, London.) 1929. 22·3cm. pp. 835. 30s.