

Servant of India

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

VOL. XII, No. 21. }

POONA—THURSDAY, MAY 23, 1929.

{ INDIAN SUBSN. RS. 6
FOREIGN 15 a.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
TOPICS OF THE WEEK ...	241
ARTICLES :—	
Interference in the Butler Report ...	244
C. P. Land Revenue Legislation ...	245
Fiji Indians' Grievances ...	246
United Provinces in 1927-28 ...	246
OUR EUROPEAN LETTER ...	247
OUR EAST AFRICAN LETTER ...	248
REVIEWS :—	
Correct Wages Policy. By Prof. V. N. Godbole, M.A. ...	249
Sir Walter Lawrence's Indian Experiences. By D. V. Ambekar ...	250
Sankara's Philosophy. By D. D. Vadekar, M.A. ...	251
SHORT NOTICES ...	252
BOOKS RECEIVED ...	252

TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

THE present Mayor of Bombay, like his predecessor, has made an appeal to the patriotism of the citizens to assist in averting the danger threatening the premier industry of the city by an amicable settlement. He suggested the appointment of a tribunal of three men chosen from a panel of ten respectable citizens who are not directly connected with the industry. So far his request has met with a poor response and the parties have not shown themselves amenable to his mediation. Although we have not much faith in the applicability of the Trades Disputes Act to the present dispute, His Excellency the Governor ought to be credited with a genuine desire to see the dispute settled when on Saturday last he expressed his willingness to appoint a Court of Inquiry under the Act, if such a move was agreed to by the parties to the dispute. In spite of this we think that the plan suggested by Mr. Nissim might prove to be more effective and expeditious and there should be no hesitation in accepting it at an early date, before the situation develops in the wrong direction. Even now the press reports point out that both parties seem determined to fight to a finish; the mutual recrimination which is at present indulged in is the worst feature of the situation. The Bombay Piecegoods Merchants' Association have given a warning to Labour leaders that if things went on like this it would mean the total ruin of the staple industry in the near

future; but the warning ought in fairness to be addressed equally to the Mill-owners. We should think that obduracy was in evidence on both the sides and what is urgently required at the present moment is the adoption of a conciliatory attitude. Latterly the exhortation to the workers to leave for their homes has created an added complication, since if more than half the workers leave the cessation of the industry during the rainy season is practically certain. The Mill-owners have recently stated that to give way on the point of reinstating the workers in the Wadia group of mills would be tantamount to their waiving the right to manage their mills including that of choosing their employees. But if other issues are settled promptly on this particular point being conceded we should advise the owners to consider seriously the possibility of practising a little self-abnegation in granting this major concession at least for the present. Otherwise it is difficult to see how this vicious circle can be broken. Suggestions have been made for a scheme of social uplift on a large scale; this is certainly the way of tackling the problem of social discontent. But this would be true of the permanent agencies which will produce their effect in the long run. To tide over the present difficulty however, some method of give and take alone is adequate and those who have any influence with either party should lose no time in applying that method.

OF the three parties that are struggling for winning the confidence of voters in Great Britain, the Liberals have only the chance of playing the part of the Irish block, so that, they would be courted by the other two parties when they can secure a majority by their assistance. According to those most informed, the strength of the Liberals in the new Parliament is not likely to exceed seventy or at best eighty; in-coalition therefore will lie their only hope of securing offices. The programme of Mr. Lloyd George is not so despicable as the Tories make it out to be; it is a well-considered programme and is far from being academic. Still it is an expensive programme and is not likely to appeal to the proletariat with as much force as would the Socialist programme of Mr. MacDonald with its taxation of the rich, ample doles and the committees on the iron and steel trade, the textile trade and others. He has besides promised to apply the Socialist ideas in a businesslike way

for the solution of industrial difficulties. In any case the Socialist programme is likely to win not only the ordinary labour vote whose destination is pretty certain but also a part of the Liberal vote. That the women's vote will be predominantly Tory is by no means certain; in fact it was confidently predicted a few months back that it will be predominantly a Labour vote. Probably it would be correct to strike a balance and to credit the Tories with half the votes of the newly enfranchised women leaving the moiety to Labour. The Conservatives are confident of a working majority at least and the calculations made so far by persons in the party credit the party with a majority of hundred votes. The promise of safeguarding industries given so freely by Mr. Baldwin will placate a large portion of the industrialists both owners and workers and the resulting vote will contribute largely to the ultimate success of the Conservatives. Whatever happens however, the agreement to keep India out of the Election programmes and promises, insisted upon by Sir John Simon recently, has been well kept and there is hardly a word about India in the several manifestoes. Recently Mr. J. T. Gwyne has given a forecast of the solution that will be attempted by Mr. Mac Donald; he thinks that the latter will make a solemn pronouncement accepting Dominion Status for India within a reasonably short time as the goal of British policy. This, he says, will be followed by an invitation to Indian political leaders to assemble in London and discuss informally the best means of reaching this goal. Although one cannot be too confident, there is nothing intrinsically improbable in this forecast; such a meeting, if seriously contemplated will, assist Parliament to know the views of Indian leaders first-hand, although it is doubtful if it will succeed in bridging the gulf.

* * *

WE trust recent happenings in Janjira State are being closely watched by the Bombay Government. The State has always been noted for communal harmony; but the communal atmosphere has recently changed for the worse. The trouble, it would appear, began with the Mahomedans closing about four months ago a public thoroughfare which passed through their cemetery and which led to a well that served the locality. It has since transpired that their action was permitted by the Dewan; but belonging as the ground in question did to the municipality, it is doubtful if the Dewan acted within his authority in permitting the Mahomedans to close the thoroughfare. Whatever that be, the action of the Mahomedans was naturally enough resented by the Hindus who after exhausting the usual means of securing redress took the law into their own hands and removed the obstruction. As a retaliatory measure they also decided to have nothing to do with their Mahomedan fellow-subjects. This was followed by wholesale arrests without warrant of Hindus under the orders of the Dewan. It is even said that some Hindus were asked to meet the officials with a view to exploring the possibilities of finding a way out of the

present *impasse* and were then arrested. From all this one thing stands out quite clear. If the public all along enjoyed the right of way through the Mahomedan burial ground, the Muslims were in the wrong in closing the public road and the Dewan in permitting them to do so. It is strange that in stead of assisting the public in the enforcement of what undoubtedly was its right to the use of the particular road the State authorities inaugurated a reign of terror directed against the very persons who had suffered owing to the action of the Mahomedans. And the most regrettable part of the whole affair is that the Janjira subjects have no means within the confines of the State itself of drawing public attention to this injustice, thanks to the very stringent restrictions on the holding of public meetings or the starting of newspapers which have originated with the present Dewan. This the poor subjects can do only in a place like Bombay which is out of Dewan Kapadia's reach. At the meeting recently held in Bombay the whole of the present communal trouble was ventilated and a protest entered against the Dewan's repressive policy. Further, "in the interests of public peace and communal harmony" his recall was demanded. In view of the reaffirmation by the Butler Committee of the right of the Paramount power to interfere in the internal administration of a State should its subjects not be in the enjoyment of the elements of good government, we hope the Bombay Government will lose no time in looking into the present situation in Janjira.

* * *

AT the Annual Dinner of the London Chamber of Commerce, Sir Stephen Dametriadi, proposing the toast of 'His Majesty's Ministers' dwelt on the importance of securing law and order if the trade with India was not to be imperilled. Forthwith he lapsed into the favourite topic of British trusteeship for the majority of Indians who were non-politically minded. They had a right to demand, he said, that the British should not jeopardise the blessings of even-handed justice and freedom from extortion by conceding self-government. It would be "an indelible blot upon the honour of Great Britain" if the British failed to protect the interests of the masses. This argument about the responsible Indian Government being incapable of protecting them has been refuted so many times that we need not waste energy in joining issue with him again; the most curious part of his argument however is the reason he gives for the British trusteeship which is that 236 millions of the total population of India could not read or write—an amazing testimony to the blessings of the trusteeship for the last century and a half!

Lord Peel responding to the toast drew attention to the prodigious amount of British capital invested in the railways and other trading concerns in India and expressed a hope that the recommendations of the Commission on Agriculture would be utilized for increasing agricultural production in India. But when he refers to exports of manufactured commodities it is not to the Indian exports but to the British exports which he hopes would regain the ground which they had lost in recent years. He deplored that Indian purchases in Great Britain were only 5s. 3d. per head as against £13 5s. represented

by New Zealand and £8-17s. represented by Australia. He further advised the British firms to employ permanent agents in India in order to lay their case before the Tariff Board for demanding protection and for supplying stores in the country itself in view of the new policy of the Stores Department. Lord Peel need hardly be reminded that the new policy is essentially for the purpose of purchasing as much as possible stores made by the assistance of Indian capital and Indian labour predominantly and not stores imported from foreign countries. He rightly said that no section of the British people could do more than the leaders of British commerce to bring about a better understanding with the people of India. India welcomes British traders provided they do not come in the way of her desire to reach the industrial level reached by other progressive countries and behave like equals. We are not however so certain as Lord Peel is that the commercial community of Great Britain would rise to the height of their duty and responsibility, so far as the establishment of better understanding with Indians was concerned. The community must give up thinking about its vested interests and should decide to assist the all-sided economic development of India.

* * *

Indecent Advertisements. The *Pioneer* has recently dwelt on the indecent and improper advertisements that appear in Indian journals and has urged upon the Indian editors the duty of exercising a sort of private censorship over the advertisements that appear in their columns even at the cost of some money. To be frank and fair, one has to admit the truth of the reproach levelled against Indian journals of which a large majority are indifferent to the matter advertised in their columns as long as the law is not violated. Modern newspapers are read by all and sundry including young folk of both sexes and the editors owe it to their readers to see that no matter likely to contravene the recognized canons of decency and propriety finds place in their journals. The journal is right in believing that a few actions in law for the recovery of money by false pretences would be effective in changing the attitude of newspapers which admit advertisements of bogus remedies and old-world nostrums. We do not think however that prosecutions for offending against public morals should be recommended to the powers that be as our contemporary suggests; the remedy would probably be worse than the disease. In the first place it might introduce a sort of censorship which has already acquired an evil odour in England by the recent vagaries of the Home Office and people might easily differ as to what is decent and what is indecent. For example, advertisements about birth-control might easily lead to a sharp controversy as to the meaning of the term 'indecent'; in fact they will be approved by a large section of people who hold that it is the right sort of propaganda. Leaving this contingency aside however one can easily admit that the editors of journals can exercise an amount of supervision in their private capacity and reject advertisements which are decidedly improper by common consensus of civilized opinion. While congratulating the *Pioneer* for having given utterance to this necessary warning we cannot admit its exemption of the English-owned and English-edited journals from the guilt of tolerating indecent and silly advertisements. Without condescending to quote concrete examples, we would simply say that even in these journals there is in evidence a motley crew of advertisers trying to catch the unwary by objectionable appeals to their lower passions and trading on their superstitions by improper appeals couched in objectionable phraseology.

This needless exemption makes the very ably supported indictment, appear to be sectional in the exercise of its function of administering advice and correction. We thoroughly agree with the journal when it says that the subject should be placed prominently on the agenda of future meetings of responsible journalists; it would not do to blink our eyes to the existence of an evil practice which it is the duty of all right-minded citizens to, discountenance by example as well as by precept.

* * *

WE find from the resolution of the Government of District Boards in Bihar and Orissa reviewing the reports on the working of District Boards in that province during

1927-28 that four out of the 19 district boards had nominated officials as chairmen. The boards selected for such illiberal treatment are in the Chota Nagpur division which is perhaps considered too backward for the district boards in it to be allowed to elect their own Chairmen. But even in that division there is at least one board in whose case it is apparently considered safe that it should be allowed to have an elected non-official for that responsible position. The resolution complains about Chairmen of District Boards not touring as much as they should, with the result that there is slackness of supervision. It mentions the case of a district board whose two most responsible officials, viz. the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman, had to be away for long periods in connection with the meetings of the Central Legislature. The complaint appears to be well-grounded. If non-officials owing to various calls on their time find it difficult to give that attention to their duties as Chairmen or Vice-Chairmen of these Boards, the least they can do is to make room for persons who can do so. If we were to scan the statements of income and expenditure of the boards, we find that education still continues to be the second biggest item on the income side. Provincial rates furnish more than half of the income of the Boards, while education nearly one-fourth. On the expenditure side also education is the second biggest item, public works consuming 47.2 per cent. and education nearly 30 per cent. of the total income. That is however not to say that it is getting all that it should. On the contrary education generally in the province is in a very backward condition and female education in particular deplorably so. The number of board schools increased from 18,303 in the previous year to 18,712 in the year under report. There was an increase of about 9,000 in the number of pupils in these schools; but as for compulsory education it is not making much headway. The experiment of making it free was tried by one board with encouraging results. The number of pupils increased by about 6000 in the area served by that board alone, which shows how much can be done for educational expansion even on a voluntary basis. But lack of funds is a formidable difficulty and unless the boards give serious thought to the question of augmenting their resources it is useless to look forward to any considerable educational advance in that province in the near future. The only way out of the difficulty seems to be, as pointed out in the resolution, the imposition of an education cess, whose possibility is being explored. With education so badly off, it needs no saying that provision for medical relief and sanitation in the rural areas of the province is very inadequate. The whole problem is no doubt financial; but in regard to sanitation at any rate something can be done by taking vigorous steps to arouse the sanitary conscience of the people. We hope the importance of sanitary propaganda is not lost upon the district boards in Bihar and Orissa.

INTERFERENCE IN THE BUTLER REPORT.

THE Butler Committee's Report has endorsed to the full the Government of India's claim, in its widest interpretation, to a right of interference in the internal-administration of Indian States. This right is to be deduced not only from the treaties but is asserted to exist independently of them. It may be exercised by the Paramount Power either "in its own interests as responsible for the whole of India, in the interests of the States, and in the interests of the people of the States" (para. 21). The Committee has cited with approval as showing the extent of Government's power in this behalf the three most important pronouncements of the Government of India on the subject, which stretch its power to the farthest limit. The most recent of these pronouncements is contained in Lord Reading's letter to the Nizam of 1926, to which the Princes take vigorous exception. That the Butler Committee on the whole was much less sympathetic to the pretensions of the Princes than popular leaders in British India is proved to the hilt by the unreserved support which the Committee has given to the contentions of Government. For British Indian politicians as a body have not yet supported these contentions, and indeed, in order to clear away the misconceptions which the Princes seemed to be labouring under, the Nehru Committee in its supplementary report has expressly dissociated itself from the position which was taken up by Lord Reading in his letter to the Nizam and which is now fully justified by the Butler Committee. It is small wonder therefore that, as the latter's attitude became discernible towards the close of its labours, the Princes realised their mistake in placing reliance on such a body and in fact in having asked for its appointment, and are now turning their thoughts to the tribunes of the people whom they reviled not long since. This is the true inwardness of the move which is being talked of by the Princes, viz. a conference between themselves and British Indian representatives.

To the people of the States the reiteration of the Government of India's right of intervention in the domestic concerns of Indian States cannot but cause a certain amount of gratification. For the possibility of such intervention constitutes the only check to which Princes are now subject, and whether the check functions well or ill, the people cannot afford to be without it. They would fain have this external check, which is applied at present by the Government of India or will in future be applied by the Viceroy, substituted by the internal check of responsible government in the States. But that day is yet distant; nor are the Princes doing anything to hasten it. In the absence, then, of any power vesting in themselves to control the arbitrary rule of the Princes, it is only human for the people to avail themselves of such outside control as may find an opening either in the treaties or in the implications of paramountcy itself. With the working of this control they are supremely dissatisfied. But however keen their dissatisfaction, they cannot in the existing circumstances desire the total elimination of this

control. Their endeavour can only be limited for the present to a regulation of the procedure by which its power of interference is brought into exercise by the Government of India. It is of the first importance that interference, when it takes place, should not be arbitrary but should follow a settled course. This can be ensured only by the Government of India indicating, as clearly as possible, a minimum standard of good government, a falling off from which would give it a ground for interference. It is of course obvious that in such matters precision is impossible; but between the total absence of any criteria of "gross misrule" and a precise definition of the elements of good government which the Paramount Power shall insist upon in every case the Government of India can take a middle ground and at any rate indicate matters which will require careful watching on its part. The Mandates Commission of the League of Nations has done it in the case of mandated countries, and its example is commended to the Government of India in the memorandum of the States' People's Conference submitted to the Butler Committee. Further it should be provided that no interference will in fact follow till the Princes concerned are convicted of misrule by an independent tribunal from which all persons belonging to the Princely class have to be rigorously excluded. It follows of course that the evidence on which the proposed action is based must be made available to the Princes for rebuttal and must be equally accessible to the people who, as a party in whose interests the interference is supposed to take place, should be given an opportunity of tendering any further evidence. We have on several occasions before elaborated these ideas, and they have won acceptance of the people's organization. We need not therefore dwell on them any longer except to emphasize that the people of the States have no alternative in the situation confronting them but to avail themselves of the exercise of such outside control as is now possible, although the exercise may be fitful, arbitrary and even interested. It remains for the Princes, if they desire removal of these obvious and grave defects, to unite their voice with the people's in pressing on the Government the adoption of a reasonable scheme for regulating the processes of intervention.

The Butler Committee, while reaffirming the Government of India's position in the matter of interference, has indeed gone farther. Till now the ground for interference in any State was the prevalence of gross misrule therein. The British Government held that the guarantee it had given to the Princes for protection from internal insurrection as well as external invasion carried with it a guarantee to the people of the States for protection from oppression and misgovernment. This duty to the people, which follows as an immediate consequence of its duty to the Princes, implies a positive obligation on its part to secure for the people a certain measure of good government. The obligation has of course been variously interpreted at various times by various Viceroys; but, whether the interpre-

tation was in any particular case narrow or wide, the scope of the obligation itself was limited to prevention of misgovernment and securing of good government. It did not extend beyond good government to self-government. No Viceroy regarded it as a duty incumbent on him to recommend to the Princes the substitution of democratic for autocratic government. But there is in the Butler Committee's Report a recognition, however faint, of the Government's duty to recommend popular government to the Princes in certain circumstances. As envisaged by the Committee, the duty becomes liable to be discharged only when the Princes' position becomes insecure, requiring the Paramount Power's aid, owing to popular agitation for the introduction of democratic government. In normal times, so long as the Princes can hold their own against the people, the Government of India is apparently to sit still, being estopped from recommending a change in the form of government. But as soon as its intervention is invoked by the Princes, its position becomes altered. The intervention, when it does take place, must be in favour of the Princes and against the people when popular unrest is caused not by prevailing misrule but passion for self-government. The intervention can only take this course while the unrest lasts, for the Paramount Power has undertaken to secure the Princes in their existing privileges, rights and dignities, and therefore, although the Government's sympathies may in reality be on the side of the people, the weight of its intervention must be thrown in the scale against them. In other words, Government is bound under treaty to quell armed uprisings and suppress peaceful agitations when they come to a head without discrimination, but after the agitation for the replacement of an old-world by a modern type of government is once put down, then Government becomes free, and indeed obligated (to use an Americanism) to suggest measures to the Princes for the satisfaction of the people's demand for a change of form of government (provided that the change is for something other than a republic in which the Prince can have no place). We have quoted in an earlier number of the SERVANT OF INDIA the text of the relevant passage in paragraph 50 of the Butler Committee's Report where this doctrine is set forth, and we are therefore content on this occasion to give our own interpretation of it. The people of the States would of course have liked a more full-blooded and less halting pronouncement on the subject; but they will surely welcome this recognition, for the first time, of the Government's obligation in the interest of self-government as well as good government. The declaration, though of small account in itself, is capable of yielding valuable results, and as such the people in Indian States will acclaim it as an important landmark in the history of the Paramount Power's relations with the States.

C. P. LAND REVENUE LEGISLATION.

In this article we propose to examine the principal features of the C. P. Settlement Act which has been placed on the statute-book at the beginning of this year. To begin with it is to be noted that the Revenue Member gave an assurance on behalf of Government that the provisions of the Act would be made applicable to those parts where the settlement operations had not been completed so that they would get the benefit of the new policy. The term of settlement of any local area has been fixed at thirty years exception being made in the case of areas where there is ample scope for agricultural development or where the existing pitch of assessment is unduly low or where there has been rapid development owing to the construction of roads, railways or canals since the last settlement. In the latter case the Local Government is allowed discretion to fix a shorter period, provided that in no case it shall be less than twenty-years. This limitation is certainly reasonable if the Local Government acts with a due sense of responsibility. It was suggested during the debate that this power to shorten the normal period of assessment should be exercised with the consent of the Legislature and this point will be fully debated when an amendment of the Land Revenue Act of 1917 will be proposed by the Government in the form of a regular Bill in due course. In view of the discussion in the Punjab Council over the details of the item of cost of cultivation, it is gratifying to note that depreciation of stock, interest on the cost of buildings and on the expenditure for seed, manure and on other costs of agricultural operations and the money equivalent of the cultivator's labour have all been included in the body of the Act as factors which must be taken into account in estimating the profits of agriculture. A good concession is thus made to the demands made by non-official members of legislatures all over India and the Government of C. P. would be well-advised in continuing this policy of taking the Legislature into their confidence. For purposes of future settlements the Local Government has promised to maintain a detailed inquiry into the profits of agriculture and into the value of the land used for agricultural purposes. A valuable amendment stands to the credit of Rao Bahadur N.K. Kelkar which adds to the money equivalent of the cultivators' labour the item of the equivalent of the labour of his family; although this is a small item it is quite reasonable that it should not be left out in arriving at the total cost of cultivation. As in the case of the Punjab Council a suggestion was made in the C. P. Council that uneconomic holdings should be exempted altogether from assessment. One obvious objection to such a course would be that such a procedure would make a large gap in the total land-revenue which would be difficult to fill up except by taxing the economic holdings at such a high rate as to raise serious issues with respect to the general policy of assessment. The tendency however to demand that small holdings shall be exempted from assessment has been observable in various provinces and the question is one for impartial consideration in the immediate future.

The increase of assessment allowed at the time of revision is fixed by the Act at the maximum of 75 per cent. on an individual holding and 33 per cent. on the total rent of a group of mahals. The first maximum is definitely objectionable and although the Government has given an assurance that it is only a limit and that in practice the increase would be much below the maximum allowed, some lower figure should have been insisted on by the Council, making exception in the case of low-rented areas by specifically mentioning that lands assessed at less than say one rupee per acre might show an increase of three-fourths of the previous assessment.

FIJI INDIANS' GRIEVANCES.

AMONG the many disabilities from which our countrymen in Fiji suffer is the virtual denial to them even of the municipal franchise. It would appear that until 1915 they were entitled to vote at municipal elections on an equal footing with other communities; but in that year the right was restricted only to those who could "read, write and speak the English language." The result was the disfranchisement of an overwhelmingly large number of Indians who had so long enjoyed the franchise—a fact which was greatly resented by the Indian community generally. By way of protest even the eligible ones among them refused to get themselves admitted to the voters' register and according to the Town Clerk who gave evidence before the Royal Commission appointed to go into this and similar other grievances of the Indian community, not a single application for registration as a voter was received from an Indian during the eight years he was connected with the municipality. Indeed the few Indian names,—22 out of 143 Indian 'rate payers,—that were on the municipal register were put there by the municipal officials on the strength of their own knowledge and without consulting the persons concerned. Normally-minded people would interpret this as a gesture of protest on the part of Indians; but the authorities with a characteristic lack of imagination attributed the unwillingness of Indians to get themselves registered as electors to their indifference. When in 1920 the Colonies Committee drew attention to this inequity, the Fiji Government promised "to extend to Indians the same rights as to other British subjects," so that when in 1927 the appointment of the Royal Commission already referred to was announced, it was generally believed by the Indians in Fiji that it would be asked to suggest means of implementing the understanding reached on this point between the Colonial Office and the Government of India as to the manner in which the Fiji Government's promise could be given effect to. But the only point referred for consideration to the Commission was "whether amendment (of the Ordinance) was needed, and if so, on what lines." The Commission submitted two reports—a majority report and a minority one, only the latter having so far been published. The reason for this is not far to seek. The Majority of the Commission is reported to have vetoed the idea of implementing the Fiji Government's promise and the Fiji is perhaps afraid that its publication would be followed by unprecedented indignation on the part of Indians resident in Fiji. There were however some statements in the minority report which apparently lent support to the complaints of Indians,—statements which the Fiji Government could not allow to go unchallenged and a further Royal Commission composed only of the Chief Justice was appointed to

find out if the statements were justified. The statements in question related to the denial of the municipal franchise to Indians, the unsatisfactory condition of roads, and lighting arrangements in Indian areas, racial discrimination against Indians in the matter of public baths and the library, etc. The Chief Justice's report which was published recently is in the nature of a white-washing document. It considers most of these statements exaggerated, though it makes no attempt to question the accuracy of the above facts. E. g. it admits the exclusion of a large number of Indians from the franchise owing to the imposition of the language test, but adds that there is nothing in the way of those who wish to qualify for the vote from doing so. Similarly, the fact of the unsatisfactory condition of roads and lighting arrangements in the localities inhabited by Indians is not denied; but objection is taken to the use of the phrase "Indian areas" in that no areas have been set apart for the exclusive occupation of Indians. With regard to the alleged discrimination to the disadvantage of "Indians in the matter of public baths and the library, the Chief Justice finds the statements to be well grounded. It remains to be seen what action is taken to set right these injustices. Meanwhile it is to be hoped the Government of India will procure and make available for the Indian public the full text of a document which so vitally affects Indian interests in Fiji.

UNITED PROVINCES IN 1927-28.

THE Chapter dealing with political conditions in the U. P. administration report for 1927-28 is a study in the art of *suppressio veri* and *suggestio falsi*. In an attempt to belittle the volume of public support behind the Nehru report important facts are kept from the public. Thus, e. g., we find that while the protest of the Muslim members of the U. P. Legislative Council against their supposed exclusion from the All-Parties Conference held at Lucknow in August last is duly recorded, there is not a whisper about the explanation subsequently furnished of this incident by Mr. Rafi Ahmed Kidwai, the Secretary to the Conference, or even a hint that such an explanation was forthcoming. The writer's objective is merely to make out that the Nehru report had not found much favour with Indians and in the attainment of that objective not much regard for truth is shown. The muslim opposition to the Report is magnified beyond measure and the impression sought to be created is that the whole of the Mahomedan community is up in arms against it. Now, we would be the last to deny that a large part of that community is opposed to the report; but to say that the whole of it was hostilely disposed to it, as is made to appear in the report under notice, is to distort facts. The writer of the report should have known that at least the Maharajasahab of Mahmudabad, an ex-member of the U. P. Government itself and a much respected muslim, not to mention others, had all along cast his influence on the side of the report. But where the endeavour is to represent the report as a Hindu affair pure and simple, not much surprise will be felt that such important facts are not given their due weight.

Writing about the Simon boycott, the walk-out of the Nationalist and Swaraj parties from the Legislative Council in September last when the motion for the appointment of a committee to co-operate with the Simon Commission was made, is represented as having been designed with a view to avoiding facing their sure defeat. Here too the writer of

the report is guilty of suppression of relevant facts. Even he cannot be unaware of the fact that, if the official bloc had refrained from voting on the motion the result would have been different. In this connection too the attempt is noticeable to split up Indian society into two hostile camps by representing the Hindus as the opponents of the Commission and the Mahomedans as its supporters.

With regard to education, we are glad to find that the problem of the removal of rural illiteracy is receiving attention. During the year, the report tells us, the schemes of nineteen district boards for compulsory primary education in selected areas were sanctioned by Government and the schemes of fourteen other boards by the department. The principal difficulty in the enforcement of these schemes is of course the paucity of funds which greatly hampers the work of the nation-building departments. As in other provinces, the local Government contributes the lion's share of the educational expenditure of these boards, its contribution being as high as 90 per cent in U. P., while there is hardly any scope for the expansion of the boards' revenue. But some means of getting over the difficulty ought to be found if the spread of literacy which is at the root of Indian progress is not to wait indefinitely. It is a matter for satisfaction that in 36 municipalities compulsory primary education is in force, the schemes framed by six of them having received sanction during the year. The number of schools managed by district boards increased from 15,222 to 15,846, while there was a rise from 4,382 to 4,679 in the number of aided schools. The number of scholars also increased from 1,046,890 to 1,120,019 attending both district board and aided schools. The number of pupils belonging to depressed classes is also rising; but what is even of greater importance is that the public prejudice against them is slowly disappearing.

To judge from the fall in the revenue from country liquor, its consumption appears to have gone down considerably which is as it should be. The revenue from that source was Rs. 106 lakhs in 1920-21, while it was only about Rs. 55½ lakhs in the year under report. As compared to the preceding year however its consumption showed an increase of nearly 7 per cent, which must be a source of disquiet to all temperance workers, seeing that since 1920-21 this is the first time that an increase has occurred. At the same time country liquor seems to be gradually making room for cheap foreign spirits which are becoming more popular every day. Licensing boards and advisory committees appear to be doing good work and we are assured that the majority of the latter's recommendations found favour with the Government. An appeal is made in the report to all citizens in making the Government's temperance policy a success—which we heartily support. We ought really to be ashamed that in a province with a population of nearly 5 crores, only 21 temperance societies should be at work. These are asked not merely to press for steps for reducing licit consumption but to extend their co-operation in the unearthing of excise crime. While temperance bodies may, if they can, give valuable help in these matters, they for their part would be justified in asking for the co-operation of Government in exposing the numerous irregularities and breaches of excise rules which are daily perpetrated in all liquor shops. It is to be hoped Government will not be short-sighted as to withhold their help to temperance workers in this matter.

OUR EUROPEAN LETTER.

(From Our Own Correspondent.)

GENEVA, May 2.

ASKING FOR TROUBLE.

THE *Observer* of 21st April had the following from a "special correspondent" on the "Home-Coming of the Simon Commission":

"The members of the Statutory Commission on Indian Reforms will arrive at Victoria Station, on completion of their second and final tour in India, on Friday afternoon. They are assured of a hearty reception from fellow-countrymen, who recognise that the discharge of their important task has meant much personal sacrifice, and that most unjustifiably they have been exposed to hostile demonstrations as well as constant vituperation in the advanced Nationalist Press. Happily, the effort to bring about a boycott has failed and many important elements in Indian life have given all possible assistance to the Commissioners in their task. An echo of this response will be heard at Victoria, when the students composing the Chief Punjab Association of London, attired in their national costumes, will present an address of welcome and garland the Commissioners. They propose to carry out a complimentary ceremonial on the platform according to Hindu rites."

And the *Journal de Genève* of 26th April had a dispatch from London:

"The Simon Commission arrived in London on Friday afternoon. It was received at the station by Mr. Baldwin. Noticeable precautions were taken by the police in view of anticipated manifestations. Before the arrival of the train, a number of demonstrators, of whom some were Indians with black flags bearing the inscription "Down with Simon! Freedom for India" had gathered. The police prevented the demonstrators from distributing their tracts, seized their flags, and dispersed the crowd. On the arrival of the Commission at the Victoria Station the police arrested four Indian students who had taken part in the demonstrations on the platform."

The style of the *Observer* correspondent whom I have quoted was typical of many similar attempts to prepare London for the Commission's arrival. The Indian student abroad, specially in London, like all foreign students, is very sensitive about nationalism and those who had manoeuvred the complimentary Indian reception by exploiting the students should have known that they were asking for trouble. It is to be hoped that they would realise that their only achievement has been to give the Commission to the end the same sort of publicity in the world's press as it had from the beginning. There are times when it is more politic for autoocracy to be barefaced than to put on the plumes of benevolence.

DISARMAMENT.

After a whole week of the most depressing discussion in which the preparatory Disarmament Commission was fighting the Soviet propositions in a manner which added nothing to the credit of the League or to the distinguished diplomatists now gathered at Geneva, the air was cleared by a speech from Mr. Gibson, the United States representative. Mr. Gibson is a familiar figure at Geneva, and it is no reflection on his credit to say that his declaration assumes a special importance in view of President Hoover's succession to the White House. Europe has been anxiously waiting to ascertain whether isolation or cooperation is going to be the policy of the new President, and in so far as Mr. Gibson indicated that the United States would whole-heartedly participate in the League's efforts at disarmament without insisting on having an independent conference, the American attitude has been favourable.

Such an attitude gives grounds for hopes about disarmament for the first time in seven years.

But the diplomatists have frequently resorted to exaggerated promise at Geneva so as to make up for lack of performance. None of the three main points of Mr. Gibson's statements, it should be noted, are really new. The United States representative said that Great Britain and U. S. A. should approach the problem of naval disarmament as friends and not as potential belligerents and yet the cult of the common heritage of the English-speaking peoples is a long-standing one. As to the Kellogg Pact opening the way for disarmament, while this is true for a new American initiative, those who believe that the Pact might serve for the first of the three famous links of the disarmament chain, security—arbitration—disarmament—must be very naive indeed. Such a belief would amount to a faith, and a blind faith inasmuch as it would necessitate a complete lack of memory of all the long drawn-out fights about security. Finally, the American Government still desires serious reduction, not limitation or stabilisation and Mr. Gibson's suggestion that naval forces should not be estimated by displacement tonnage alone was already put forward on a previous occasion by the French representative. Not only has there been no indication of a change in the British thesis on the absolute naval needs of Great Britain as to cruisers below 10,000 tons, but Lord Cushendun has so far said virtually nothing to Mr. Gibson's offer to submit immediately fresh proposals on naval disarmament to the Commission and to his pointed references as to the inadvisability of confining the present discussions to land and air armaments as Lord Cushendun would like to. In this connection the Italian response is also noteworthy :

" Mr. Gibson does not see," says the *Giornale d'Italia*, "the special needs of countries in the Mediterranean basin, and considers small countries inoffensive, a point of view which demands our special attention . . . Italy will reduce to any point provided no Continental Power should exceed her, and limitation should be general and not by category."

The course of disarmament, like that of much of European politics, now depends on two main factors, the conclusion of the meeting of the committee of experts for reparation payments in Paris and the British elections. The first of these, none can claim, gives hopes of developments encouraging America to take more active part in the affairs of Europe or of consolidating "security" as between Germany and France. We have had a foretaste of the implications of the second in the repercussions to Mr. Snowden's references to the Balfour Note in the House of Commons. Even if a change of British Government favours naval disarmament—a hypothesis which takes too much for granted because the British policy in this regard is determined not by changing Ministers but by the permanent departments—whether Locarno would survive the change has become a grave doubt. And Locarno is the British substitute for the Protocol with the disappearance of which disarmament discussions reached a deadlock.

OUR EAST AFRICAN LETTER.

(From Our Own Correspondent.)

MOMBASA, May 9.

MR. SASTRI.

THE RT. HON. V. S. SRINIVASA SASTRI, P. O., is expected to arrive here tomorrow morning from India by S. S. Ellora. Indian representatives from Zanzibar have already arrived in Mombasa to meet him on arrival and acquaint him with their viewpoint on

the Closer Union Report. Mr. A. M. Jeevanjee, the Grand Old Man of Kenya, will entertain Mr. Sastri to lunch at his ancient and historic villa. To the lunch are invited leading Indians and Europeans. Mr. Sastri will leave Mombasa the same afternoon for Entebbe in Uganda, via Nairobi and Kisumu. The Government of Kenya have arranged for a special coach to convey Mr. Sastri from Mombasa to Kisumu. During his halt for two hours in Nairobi, the capital of Kenya, Mr. Sastri will confer with the Acting Governor and the Indian leaders. He is expected to arrive in Entebbe on the 13th inst. and will there meet Sir Samuel Wilson on the eve of his departure for Tanganyika. It is expected that Mr. Sastri will decide, in consultation with Sir Samuel, whether to accompany the latter to Tanganyika or return to Nairobi.

Disappointment is universal at the lack of co-ordination between the programmes of Sir Samuel and Mr. Sastri. According to Mr. Amery's statement in Parliament, Mr. Sastri was to accompany Sir Samuel right through his journey and assist the Indians in all the East African territories to present their cases to Sir Samuel. Assisted by Mr. Hirday Nath Kunzru, the Kenya Indians have already presented their Memorandum to Sir Samuel. It was arranged that the Indian deputation should interview Sir Samuel at Nairobi on the 6th inst. when, according to the earlier expectations, Mr. Sastri was to be present. But since Mr. Sastri did not arrive in Kenya by that date, the Kenya Indians have desired that their interview should be postponed till it was convenient for Mr. Sastri to be present at it. Sir Samuel left Nairobi for Uganda on the 6th and will leave Uganda on the 13th for Tanganyika. Since Mr. Sastri will not be able to meet him till that date, he cannot be of assistance to the Uganda Indians in presenting their case to Sir Samuel. The Uganda Indians have requested Mr. Kunzru to assist them in the matter, and Mr. Kunzru has left for Uganda. The Tanganyika Indians have already drafted their memorandum. If Mr. Sastri accompanies Sir Samuel, he may still be of use to them in presenting their case. But that would leave Mr. Sastri very little time in Kenya, where the problem needs his services most.

Mr. Sastri is not popular with a section of the Indian community in Kenya. The columns of the *East African Standard* everyday contain letters about him, either critical or suspicious or hostile. The gravamen of the charge against Mr. Sastri is his "irresistible moderation". Reuter cabled an interview given on the eve of his departure from Bombay in which Mr. Sastri denied having said the disparaging remarks that the Bombay correspondent of the *East African Standard* attributed to him. But his Indian critics in Kenya are not disposed to credit him. Mr. A. M. Jeevanjee has joined issue with these critics and defended Mr. Sastri against these attacks and put in a plea for a clam atmosphere.

THE KENYA SETTLERS AND SIR SAMUEL WILSON.

A deputation of the Kenya Elected (European) Members of the Legislative Council and representatives of the Convention of Associations waited on Sir Samuel Wilson on the 2nd inst. and has since issued a statement in the press. The Deputation denied that the settlers ever initiated the proposal of federation and affirmed that they considered it only when invited to do so on Imperial grounds. They refused to contemplate it until they had a guarantee that there shall be no interference with the present policies which Kenya was following ; and that could only be secured by conceding self-government to Kenya. The settlers repudiated the contention of the Closer Union Commission that an unrestricted increase

of White colonisation would jeopardise the economic future of the natives. The Commission's proposals regarding the place of the natives in politics would create a native political problem, which they greatly deprecated. They had no fresh proposals to put forward before Sir Samuel Wilson, but promised to give sympathetic consideration to any proposals that Sir Samuel might put forward. Sir Samuel replied that he had not yet formulated any proposals; that he would not be able to do so until he had visited Uganda and Tanganyika, and that he would convey the views of the settlers to the Home Government.

OPINION IN UGANDA.

Extracts from the joint memorandum of the Uganda Chamber of Commerce and Agriculture, the Uganda Planters' Association and the Uganda Cotton Association including Europeans and Indians have been published. The memorandum regretfully observes that the meagre notice given to Uganda in the Closer Union Report was due to the fact that the main object of the Hilton-Young Commission was to deal with the demand for self-government by certain Europeans of Kenya. The Uganda people welcome the appointment of the High Commissioner with executive power, provided non-officials are given facilities to influence the decisions of the High Commissioner. They do not, however, propose a federal council, but are content with Advisory Councils, on which each territory joining the closer union should be equally represented. They attach great importance to this demand for equal representation. With regard to the Legislative Council, the authors of the memorandum express dissatisfaction with the present system of nominating the members thereof, and desire them to be elected. As regards the franchise, they note that the Commission disapproved the adult franchise in Kenya and recommended a civilisation franchise. They desire that whatever test is ultimately applied to Kenya may be applied to Uganda also. They condemn very strongly the recommendation of the Commission for the creation of homogeneous Black and White areas. Such segregation will be bitterly resented not only by the natives but also by the non-natives. They recommended that the headquarters of the High Commissioner or Governor-General should not be in any of the existing capitals, but in the island of Mombasa. They suggest the inclusion in Uganda of the province of Bukoba from Tanganyika and the Kavirando from Kenya. The former, they allege, was neglected by the Tanganyika Government on account of its remoteness from Dar-es-Salaam. As for the latter, they believe the transfer to Uganda will result in the increase of native production and wealth to such an extent that the Kavirandos will not be obliged to leave their homes to work elsewhere for the money wherewith to pay their poll tax.

REVIEWS.

A CORRECT WAGES POLICY.

THE CONTROL OF WAGES. By WALTON HAMILTON and STACY MAY. (Macmillan, London.) 1928. 19 cm. pp. 185. 6s.

THE book is concerned mainly with the question whether it is possible to make wages adequate for maintaining the culture of a community at a high level and in solving this question it tries to solve a subsidiary one whether the worker can bring wages under his control; and the authors tackle both these questions very successfully. At the outset they brush aside all theories which by explaining wages as the

result of natural law make out the impossibility of controlling wages. The possibility of raising wages by trenching upon profits or salaries and other incomes allied to wages is declared to be impracticable if it is applied to all the industries. The more promising source in their opinion is the increased efficiency of the organization including efficiency of management and the improvement of the technique of industry. In this connection it is significant that the authors bewail the existence of an establishment with an incompetent management which survives in the most basic industries of the United States. The examination of the institutions which go to make up the economic order to find out new sources for higher wages made in the book is very stimulating and well worth the attention of social reformers. The authors have emphasized that prices as a factor of the rate of wages are equally amenable to man's control instead of being regulated by a natural law. One agency of reducing prices is the judicious use of luxury taxes and graduated income tax for reducing the demand for luxuries and making of necessities on a larger scale; the other is the extension of the services given to him gratis by the community. In giving their theory of wages the authors admit the tendency towards uniformity throughout industry but object to the notion of labour as a fund of homogeneous units. In their opinion the labourers are unlike each other in capacity, experience and personality. They also discard the theory that the various rates of wages are expressions of differences in the economic worth of labourers and regard them as dependent upon power and strength of organization of the workers.

For formulating a correct wages policy there is need for intelligence and vigilance on the part of workers; for this reason the authors recommend that organized labour should study the sources from which the increment is likely to come. If the increment is at the expense of other groups in the community it would receive an early check; the proper course then is to increase the wealth out of which all income is paid, similarly the policy ought to take account of the problems connected with the development of economic organization including the problem of the stability of the money unit and the problem of 'business cycles' with their tides and ebbs of prosperity. Instead of agitation the authors suggest a reform by changing the agencies and methods of the institutions which make up the economic order. This is very sound advice. In asking for a larger division of the net product of the industry for labour the authors recommend the collection of reliable statistics and proving the justice of diverting to wages a share of that which is claimed by other groups. In any case the authors insist upon a minimum standard of living as indicated by real wages, over a series of years. The next claim of the wage-earner should be for increased efficiency and increased output and here the authors point out that the workers should not be afraid to assume the aggressive because the famous Committee on Waste in Industry in 1921 charged 75 per cent. of the responsibility for removing waste to the ownership and management group and only 25 per cent. to labour. If labour succeeds in eliminating specific waste by its own economic pressure it is likely to receive a fair share of increased return in the form of higher wages. This programme, say the authors, will enable organized labour to develop an intensive knowledge of the technical processes of industry and will be a great asset in their demand for a share in industrial management in future. As for the remote aspects of the control of wages, that is, long-time policies, the problems presented are described as intricate and the

authors suggest that organized labour should take the lead in demanding that such problems should be worked out intelligently, and providing for the publication of data which will throw light on such problems. In the concluding chapter the authors emphasize the intimate connection of adequate wages and welfare; and although through bad choice even good wages might be made to contribute to ill-being it cannot be denied that a higher wage is a larger measure of social welfare. The book gives sound advice about raising wages by a slow process of adjustment and is free from the aggressiveness characterizing the socialist literature.

V. N. GODBOLE.

SIR WALTER LAWRENCE'S INDIAN EXPERIENCES.

THE INDIA WE SERVED. By WALTER R. LAWRENCE. (Cassell.) 1928. 9¼ × 6½. pp. 317. 25s.

THE book abounds in fine descriptions of the places where the author served and some State Durbars he attended; there are also penetrating pen pictures of people he came in contact with in the course of his varied official career in India. But we can only pick out here from his reminiscences a few points of wider public interest.

The theory of direct relations with the Crown which has recently been formally put forward by the Indian princes is apparently no new thing. Though the public of British India has been somewhat taken aback by it, the Princes appear to have always preferred to deal with the Viceroy as distinguished from the Governor-General. Sir Walter tells us:—

"The ruling chiefs and their ministers always distinguished between Viceroy and Governor-General in Council. They looked to the Viceroy and regarded the Governor-General and his Council as an institution for British India. In my time no member of the Governor-General's Council, not even the Commander-in-Chief, could visit an Indian State without permission of the Viceroy." (p. 55.)

How far have we travelled away from those times!

During Sir Walter's time there were British Civilians serving in the judicial line who saved themselves a good deal of work by asking litigants to settle their disputes without the formality of a judicial trial and even coerced them into doing so. Sir Walter gives an interesting account of one such.

"According to my clerk, my predecessor would appear in Court at about 8 a. m., lightly dressed in pyjamas, bow to the suitors, and ask them to stand in groups, plaintiff facing defendant. He would then express his hope that when he had had his bath he would find that their disputes had been amicably settled. He would bow and retire. In about an hour he would return dressed, would bow, and ask how business was proceeding. Perhaps half of the cases would have been settled. He would again bow courteously, and say how much he wished that all would be settled when he returned from breakfast. When he next appeared the sun would be well up. More would have settled their disputes, but there was usually an obstinate remnant. To these he would say: "You cannot do justice to yourselves in this murky court; go into the fresh air and sit on the roof," and he would add in a sharp voice: "No water must be carried on to the roof." "In an hour he would usually come back to find all disputes composed, and would congratulate them on their wise decision, for, as he always said, the suitors know more of the real facts of the case than he could ever know." (p. 39.)

This is on a par with the judgments, briefest in the

history of judicial trials, of a well known Indian who acted as judge of a small cause court. They used to be, it is reported, something like this:—

"Case called. P(laintiff) by P(leader)
D(efendant) by P(leader)
D(ecree) for P(laintiff)."

When Indian politicians describe the system of Indian administration as wooden and soulless, they are perhaps unaware of the full extent of the conscious and persistent effort on the part of the higher authorities to eliminate the personal factor as much as possible. It is not as if anybody, as soon as he joins the Indian Civil Service, automatically learns to act impersonally. At any rate it was not so in the case of the subject of this autobiography. The incident he describes however shows how every possible occasion is seized to din this advice into the ears of the newcomer; and if anybody still finds it impossible to disregard the personal factor, it is never due to any want of exhortation on the point from those higher in authority over him. Sir Walter Lawrence met one evening, quite casually it would appear, the Chief Secretary of the Punjab, who incidentally told him that

"the great secret of administration was to ignore the personal factor: that in making appointments to Districts, it did not matter whether Jones or Brown or Robinson was appointed to a certain District. They were parts of a machine, and if they were not exactly alike, they must be regarded as alike and taught to consider themselves as alike. I ventured at this midnight hour to say that I had always imagined that the personal factor was of the first importance in India. Whereon he said that I should never succeed in the Secretariat. In this he was right, but in his views on the question of the personal factor he was wrong." (p. 82.)

Though Indians have been told *ad nauseam* that all offices in the gift of the Government are open to all irrespective of race, colour or creed, the promise has remained merely on paper and what Gokhale called "the dwarfing of the race" is still going on merrily in practice. Even at this day there are offices reserved for people belonging to the ruling race from which Indians are virtually shut out. The case is however different with the British members of the services and no Indian will be surprised to learn from Sir Walter Lawrence that "the youngest Civilian knew that he might one day become a Lieutenant-Governor, or a Member of Council, and our charming and courteous seniors always treated us as though they recognised this possibility. It was the same in the Army." (p. 80) Can an Indian even yet aspire to be a Governor or to command a British regiment? We are afraid, not for a good long time to come. Similarly, the remark, "If they (Indians) understood the rudiments of combination, you and I would not be here tonight", made by J. L. Kipling, father of the famous Rudyard Kipling, and quoted on p. 83 brings home to us what indeed we have known all along—that our differences are the strength of the rulers. But we doubt if the same remark cannot be repeated with equal truth even today. Contemporary history shows plainly enough that we are still very far from mastering these rudiments.

Sir Walter Lawrence's experience with Indian States and their rulers must indeed have been unique. Else it is difficult to account for his overflowing admiration for their system of administration, so much so as to imagine that it was better suited to conditions in British India. On p. 183 he says:

"I regard the average Indian State as better suited to the happiness and temperament of the Indian than the huge unwieldy administrations which are responsible for the vast provinces of the Indian Continent. And I be-

lieve that the average State ruled by Rajas of the standard which I have known, is better calculated to bring content and opportunities to the people than is the present system of British India, a bureaucracy of British mark largely administered by Indians."

Again:—

"But if the two systems must clash I should prefer to see the system of British India reverting to the type of the Indian State rather than to see the last of real India submerged in the dead and levelling waters of democracy." (p. 190.)

Further the following is typical of a retired Anglo-Indian official:—

"We are told that the system of British India is out of favour, and that the people of three-fourths of India which we have painted red on the map require some form of government more congenial and more national. I believe that the British system as it existed up to the end of last century was benevolent and in a material sense a monument of just, progressive and prosperous government. It was perhaps too rigid and somewhat uneventful, but it was successful while it was controlled by the English. But it is an impossible system when the Indians themselves take control, for they cannot work a bureaucracy of the European model. If they are to succeed they must get back to some system of their own." (p. 191.)

So, according to Sir Walter Lawrence, the salvation of India lies not in going ahead with democracy, but a system of autocracy, benevolent or otherwise! It is true Sir Walter is not alone in holding and expressing these antiquated opinions. That however does not alter the fact that those who give expression to these views are hopelessly out of touch with present-day Indian aspirations and conditions.

But it is more as private secretary to Lord Curzon that Sir Walter is known to and remembered by the present generation of Indians and any appraisal by him of his chief's character has particular interest for them. This, as we see from the book under notice, does not differ very much from that formed by Indians in general. They have ungrudgingly admitted that it would be difficult to find "such power of work, such diligence and such accuracy" as characterized the late Lord Curzon. They also look upon his sense of duty as of the most exemplary kind. But it is equally undeniable that he would have made a more glorious name for himself in the history of this country if, to borrow Gokhale's expressive words, the gift of "sympathetic imagination" had not been withheld from him by the "jealous" gods—a sentiment which we find paraphrased as follows on p. 224: "If he could have been a little more patient, a little more understanding, he would have been a very perfect Viceroy."

An obituary notice published in England soon after Curzon's death said that he always conducted himself as if he was standing in front of a camera every moment of his life. This trait of his character did not fail to force itself on Lawrence's attention and he tells us on p. 223 that Lord Curzon's guests "never saw George Nathaniel Curzon, but always saw the Viceroy."

There are many other points and incidents in the book like, e. g. the author's discerning comparison of the characters of Curzon and Kitchener, to which we should have very much liked to draw the reader's attention. But this is impossible owing to the limits of space.

D. V. AMBEKAR.

SANKARA'S PHILOSOPHY.

MAN AND HIS BECOMING ACCORDING TO VEDANTA. By M. RENE GUENON. Translated from the original French by C. J. WHITBY. (Rider & Co., London.) 8½ x 5½. pp. 227. 10s. 6d.

THIS book is a study of the fundamental Vedantic (Sankarite) concepts in regard to the making and destiny of man. Viewed as such, it is an accurate and concise presentation of the subject. The author expounds it with a lucidity born of a thorough grasp and conviction. He begins right up from the pure Brahmaic Essence or *Purusha* and traces all its further "evolutional" ramifications through the mazes and workings of the *Prakriti* culminating in the individual and also the backward "involutional" process returning to the starting point. It is a sort of Platonic-Hegelian journey from the Idea to the other and from the other back to the Idea. It is an adventurous journey; but the reader feels sure that he is in the hand of a skilful and reliable guide.

But here and there, one comes across certain *obiter dicta* of the author, which, though they do not detract from the real value of the work, yet betray a certain unfortunate and almost a mediævalist prejudice hardly intelligible in these days when comparisons and interpretations constitute the core of our philosophical studies. I refer to the author's side remarks at various points throughout the volume deprecating attempts at the interpretation of Indian thought in terms of Occidental Philosophy. Indeed he opens up his work with a characteristic outburst in which he avers that the Vedanta "is neither a philosophy, nor a religion nor anything which partakes more or less of the one and of the other." And the reason for all this, according to our author, is that these terms, philosophy and religion, are "wholly" or even "exclusively" Occidental ones, and as such cannot indicate "the true nature of Oriental thought." But our author is not satisfied merely with this bifurcation of the Oriental and the Occidental philosophies; he goes further and condemns philosophy itself: "When we consider what philosophy is in modern times, we cannot help thinking that its absence from a civilization is nothing especially regrettable." Nor is this all. He also thinks that philosophical learning far from being "a preparation, even a remote one, for the attainment of the 'sacred science', . . . sometimes, . . . is an obstacle thereto." This tendency to separatism and obscurantism in matters of the spirit is far from beneficial in the ultimate human interests of a world-civilization. Fortunately we need not join issues in this connection with the author, as the strange and ironical working of Nemesis has rendered it unnecessary. Our author himself, in his copious footnotes and sometimes even in the text, has freely drawn upon non-Indian—including the Occidental—sources of religious and philosophic thought for purposes of exposition and comparison, which forms one of the least negligible features of the book! This shows that he does as a matter of fact realise the essential unity, commensurability and value of all philosophy, though he does not seem to be cognisant of it himself.

We recommend this book very heartily to those who want within the limits of a single handy volume the most representative and correct summary of Sankara's philosophy in its especial relation to the life of an individual.

D. D. VADEKAR.

SHORT NOTICES.

IMMIGRATION RESTRICTION. By ROY L. GARIS. (The Macmillan Co., New York.) 1928. 9×5¾. pp. 376 \$4'00.

THIS book is a study of the opposition to and regulation of immigration into the United States of America. The author has attempted to trace the development of opposition to immigration from the earliest Colonial days to the present time. The author who believes in the necessity of immigration restriction avers that "the legislation of today is not a thing of the moment but the product of almost two hundred years of study and thought by the American people."

The Quota Act of 1924 which restricts the immigration of aliens—white aliens—into the United States provides "that the number of any nationality shall be 2% of the number of foreign born individuals of such nationality resident in the Continental United States as determined by the U. S. A. Census of 1890...." The Quota Law does not apply to the natives of Canada, Newfoundland, Mexico, Central America, and South America. The 'so-called' "latitude and longitude" clause has closed the door virtually against all Asiatics. On the whole it is an instructive study of the history of American Immigration Laws.

In connection with the American Immigration Laws, it will interest students of the problem that attempts are being made to revise the Immigration Laws in a way to get the three Asiatic countries viz, Japan, China, and India, to avail themselves of the quota basis. It would only involve 150 Japanese 150 Chinese and 100 Indians being admitted each year, in accordance with the quota. The prospects are not very reassuring, but if that could be attained it will save the three great Asiatic races from the humiliation of being treated as racially inferior. Some American friends of India are bringing forward a private Bill known as the Copeland Bill in the United States Legislature, whose aim is to include Indians among the white races of the world. In the first place the Bill has not the ghost of a chance of being passed, and even if it became law, it would not be in the best interest of this country, for it will imply that India has recognised the principle of Colour Bar and will moreover alienate the sympathies of China and Japan.

S. A. WAIZ.

WARREN HASTINGS. A PLAY IN FOUR ACTS.
By HOWARD PEACEY. (The Cayme Press, London.) 1928. 7½×5. pp. 131. 3s. 6d.

THE value of dramatisation in the teaching of history can hardly be overestimated. Howard Peacy has laid the educational world under a deep debt of gratitude by dramatising the chief events in the proconsulship of Warren Hastings. The play is divided into four acts, of which the first three acts take place in Calcutta and the last in London. The author must be congratulated on his brilliant achievement. The play is very good, judged by the canons of dramatic and historical criticism. It fully brings out the character of Hastings, Francis, Marian, Pitt, Dundas and the Impeys. That Hastings was an unscrupulous proconsul with whom necessity knew no law, that Francis was a mischief-maker and gave a lot of trouble to Hastings on account of his failure "in another quarter," that

Pitt the younger was influenced by Dundas in Indian affairs, and that Sir E. Impey committed a judicial murder—these are the principal ideas which we gain by a perusal of the work. We have no hesitation in saying that it is a book which no student of British Indian history should be without.

M. V. SUBRAHMANYAM.

LITHUANIA, 1928. Comp. by E. J. HARRISON. (Hazell, Watson and Viney, Ltd., London.) 1928. 7¾×5¼. pp. 383.

LITHUANIA was constituted an independent republic on February 16, 1918 when the people of that country declared their independence. The present publication is the result of a desire felt by Lithuanians to make themselves and their country better known; and it admirably fulfils that desire.

The constitution of Lithuania, which is reproduced in this book, was adopted on August 1, 1922 and amended on May 15, 1928. In view of the strenuous attempts that are being made by some communities in India to secure privileged treatment for themselves in the future, the following clause from the Lithuanian Declaration of Rights is worthy of note:—

"Special privileges may not be accorded a citizen nor his rights restricted on account of his origin, religion or nationality."

Besides giving the historical and geographical information usually met with in such books, the present publication gives the Lithuanian who's who, a chronological table of most important events of the first decade of Lithuanian independence and a list of cabinets and parties. This is decidedly a very useful reference book.

G. B. P.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- EMPIRE AND COMMONWEALTH. By CHESTER MARTIN. (Oxford University Press.) 1929. 23cm. pp. 385p.
- THE ORDEAL OF THIS GENERATION. By GILBERT MURRAY. (Allen & Unwin.) 1929. 20cm. pp. 236. 4s. 6d.
- POPULAR GOVERNMENT. By ARNOLD BENNETT HALL. (Macmillan, London.) 22cm. pp. 296. 2s. 6d.
- THE LETTERS OF THE TSAR TO THE TSARITSA, 1914-1917. Translated by A. L. HYNES. (John Lane, London.) 1929. 23cm. pp. 324. 15s.
- THE DECLINE OF THE WEST. Vol. II. By OSWALD SPENGLER. Translated by FRANCIS ATKINSON. (Allen & Unwin.) 1928. 25cm. pp. 507. 11s. 6d.
- THE LIVING CONSTITUTION. By HOWARD LEE MCBAIN. (Macmillan, New York.) 1928. 20cm. pp. 284. 6s.
- ST. AUGUSTINE. By ELEANOR MCDUGALL. (Christian Literature Society for India, Madras.) 1928. pp. 114. As. 8.
- HINDU CUSTOMS IN BENGAL. By BASANT COOMAR BOSE. (The Book Co., Calcutta.) 1929. 19.5cm. pp. 125.
- THE PALLAVAS OF KANCHI. By R. GOPALAN. (University of Madras.) 1928. 22cm. pp. 245. Rs. 5.
- ENGLAND'S HOLY WAR. By IRENE COOPER WILLIS. (Knopf, London.) 1928. 21. 5cm. pp. 398.

WANTED—Candidates for Telegraph and Station Master's Classes. Full particulars and Railway Fare Certificate on 2 annas stamp. Apply to:—
Imperial Telegraph College, Nai Sarak, Delhi.