

Servant of India

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

VOL. XII, No. 32. }

POONA—THURSDAY, AUGUST 15, 1929.

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

CONTENTS.

	Page.
TOPICS OF THE WEEK ...	373
ARTICLES :—	
Anti-Intimidation Bill ...	376
A Scheme of Self-Government ...	377
Anderson's Fallacies. By Principal D. R. Gadgil ...	378
REVIEWS :—	
War on War. By the Rev. Andrew R. Low ...	380
The New Europe. By Professor S. V. Krishna- swami Iyengar ...	381
The New Way in Education. By K. ...	383
Short Notices ...	384
Books Received ...	384

Topics of the Week.

Anglo-Egyptian Draft Treaty.

THE draft proposals issued by the Foreign Office which after approval by the Egyptian Parliament would be the basis of a treaty with Egypt are decidedly more liberal than those offered hitherto by any British Government. In the former treaty offered to Sarwat Pasha the maintenance of British forces for the purpose of securing "to His Britannic Majesty the protection of the lines of communication of the British Empire" was not limited as to the area in which they would be stationed; in the new draft, the boundary—East of longitude 32 East—is distinctly mentioned and this is a great improvement. It clearly means that the British armed forces will have nothing to do with the needs of the internal Government of Egypt and clause 1 of the draft treaty distinctly says that British military occupation of Egypt shall be terminated. Considering the historical antecedents of the Anglo-Egyptian connection there is nothing offensive, in our opinion, to Egyptian susceptibilities in the stipulation that in the event of war with a third state England and Egypt become allies and Egypt affords Great Britain all facilities including the use of ports and communications. Without this condition any foreign power might take possession of Egyptian territory and use it as a base for endangering communication through the Suez Canal and we think Egypt ought to reconcile itself to this limitation of complete independence. In the present state of British opinion, Mr. Henderson is perfectly right in describing the draft as the extreme limit of concession; in any case no Egyptian politician can gainsay that such terms can hardly be expected from any Tory or Liberal Cabinet in England.

Another commendable feature of the draft treaty is that it concedes what Egypt has asked for so long that the responsibility for the lives

and property of foreigners devolves upon the Egyptian Government; equally acceptable to the Egyptian nationalists ought to be the undertaking to persuade the Powers to agree to a transfer the jurisdiction of the Consular Courts which at present limits Egyptian sovereignty to mixed tribunals. The fact that the draft is to be submitted to a newly elected Egyptian Parliament is very significant since it presupposes the end of the present régime of undiluted autocracy initiated by Mahmud Pasha who had shown himself to be subservient to the dictation of the late High Commissioner. It is true that the restrictions as to the foreign instructors of the Egyptian army being British and the foreign officials in the Civil Service being predominantly British are likely to be viewed by Egyptian nationalists as a serious curtailment of the right of sovereignty; but any violent breach with existing conditions is not expedient. It is doubtful however whether these conditions should be embodied in a regular treaty instead of being left to a mutual understanding. The discussions between Zaghul Pasha and Mr. MacDonald in 1924 came to nought owing to the former insisting on the complete withdrawal of all British forces from Egyptian territory and the abandonment by the British Government of their claim to share in protecting the Suez Canal. As even the Labour Government still regards both these points as vital and essential to the existence of the British Empire, any insistence on them by the new Parliament in Egypt would render the present attempt at settlement nugatory. We hope that the new Parliament would not adopt an attitude of uncompromising opposition to the draft treaty which has so many good points. In any case insistence on complete independence at this stage will prove to be ill-advised owing to complications about the Sudan and the British interests in Egypt.

Ramanand Chatterjee's Conviction.

THE conviction of Babu Ramanand Chatterjee, the famous Editor of the *Modern Review*, of sedition only brings home to us once again the dangerously wide character of our sedition law. The particular book by Mr. Sunderland, "India in Bondage," which is said to contain the incriminating passages, we ourselves have not seen. But no one who is at all acquainted with the profound sense of responsibility with which the *Modern Review* is edited can ever believe that Babu Ramanand Chatterjee would be a party to publishing any matter which in intent or effect is seditious as the word is ordinarily understood. We have besides the testimony of Mahatma Gandhi to whom the book was specially submitted for examination to the effect that the book is entirely unobjectionable. We do not accuse the trying magistrate of any miscarriage of justice, such justice, that is, as he is bound to administer under the existing law. But this conviction should make us put forth our

best endeavour to introduce suitable amendments into the law so as to bring it into consonance with similar provision prevailing in free countries.

* * *

Mr. Shanmukham Chetty's warning.

IN a press interview given on his return from England Mr. Shanmukham Chetty referred to the activities of the die-hard element in that country which has been making an attempt to compel Parliament to legislate along lines suited to them. It is a pity that no Indian representation is there to counteract the activities of this well-known element. Mr. Chetty thinks that Mr. Baldwin's speech in the debate on the address to the King contained a clear threat to the Labour Government to be cautious in dealing with the Indian problem; but he emphasizes the significance of the first official recognition of the real feeling in India towards the Commission in Mr. MacDonald's reply to the speech which clearly stated that the mass opinion in India had been against the Commission. The impression that Mr. Chetty gathered from his conversations with the two heads of the India Office was that the Labour Government is anxious to conciliate Indian opinion. This is some consolation to those who hope to find in the new Government, a better appreciation of the real situation in India and consequently greater willingness to have an opportunity to discuss all outstanding questions. He anticipates that some steps will be taken to bring about a Round Table Conference. Most important in the present condition of Indian feeling, however, is his warning that indiscriminate attacks on the present Government in England will serve no useful purpose. We hope this warning will be heeded by publicists in India and an open mind kept about the Labour Ministry till they have declared their final proposals. Since the Liberal Party holds the key to the political situation in England Mr. Chetty thinks that it is worth our while to tackle the party. Although nothing will be lost by any endeavour in this direction we hardly think that this will be a right quest in view of the utterances of Liberal politicians all these few years. He deprecates the raising of the issue of council entry again, since in his opinion there is a certainty that it will be made the major issue in the coming Congress to the detriment of other issues.

* * *

Joint Action by all Parties.

IN reply to a leading article in the Allahabad *Leader* commenting on the inexpediency of council boycott and holding out the great possibilities of joint action by all parties, Pandit Motilal Nehru has addressed a letter to the journal. In this letter, while agreeing with the journal about the value of compromise with a view to joint action he asks the other parties i. e. the non-Congress parties to indicate a plan of a joint action that will be effective. He himself seems to believe that direct action is called for and that the days of mere platform agitation have gone by; the only thing he promises is that the Congress will not hamper the other parties in carrying on agitation on their own lines. This is of course poor consolation based as it is on something merely negative; as for the lines of joint action they can be settled at any time by a meeting of a select number of representatives of the principal parties. Pandit Motilal regards the organization of hostile demonstrations to have been the more effective way of carrying out the boycott of the Commission and is inclined to blame the non-Congress parties for their passive attitude; but apart from any possible consequences of such demonstrations the real essence of the boycott did not lie in them but in the exercise of

will-power in abstaining from assisting the activities of the Commission and being ready to suffer all the consequences of such a course. In any case the differences of opinion about the moral evaluation of the boycott demonstrations which Pandit Motilal accentuates in his letter need not make us pessimistic about joint action, provided that the main purpose and lines of such action are substantially agreed upon by the principal parties. We can assure him that the so-called dry as dust politician is as much needed in national emergencies as another type who will sacrifice good deal for the sake of sentiment. We agree with him that in case the national demand is not conceded all Nationalist should fight the next general election on the constitutional issue as one organization, in order to agitate for Dominion Status. But whether the Simon scheme should be worked or whether all parties should make it impossible to work the scheme at all will depend upon the circumstances of the time and we think it would be difficult for any party to give a pledge from now as to its future course of action. We suppose that what is meant by joint action is that all parties should act together irrespective of minor differences, in any common programmes that may be agreed upon as being vitally necessary for realizing the end of freedom. Excepting the launching of a non-co-operation movement again, in regard to which there may be keen differences of opinion, any suggestion for a joint programme for all parties will receive a favourable reception at the hands of all non-Congress Nationalist parties.

* * *

Principles of Land Revenue.

THE Bombay Land League seems to be doing its work in right earnest. A sub-committee has considered the principles of land revenue and submitted its report to the Executive Committee of the League. On the basis of its general principles have been adopted by the Executive Committee and published for general information. The first principle is the proprietorship of the landholder; the second is that the land revenue is a tax and not rent, the consequence being that the State is entitled only to a certain percentage of the profits. Another principle embodies the usual definition of net profits as the gross income minus all the expenses; the expenses are made to include the cost of the labour of the cultivator and his family which are liable to be neglected. It may be noted that on this point there was animated discussion in the Punjab Council and finally this item was enumerated specifically in the final Act. It is laid down that rentals do not constitute the proper basis for assessment since they do not in every case represent net income or net profits. Another principle stipulates for the control of all settlements by the Legislature. It is further laid down that representatives of the people should be associated in the collection of facts pertaining to the assessment of land revenue. Lastly it is formulated that income from subsidiary occupations should not be taken into account in calculating the net profits of cultivation. In view of the suggestion made by an official during the recent discussion on Mr. Pataskar's Resolution that the revenue could be easily paid by the people of Ratnagiri on account of the additional income they made in Bombay, the importance of the last principle can easily be realized. The sub-committee is going to consider the question of the percentage of the net profits which the State should appropriate and the question of the duration of assessment. In the meantime it is resolved to undertake propaganda work to acquaint the cultivators with the principles formulated so far.

* * *

The Madras Simon Committee.

THE report of the Committee appointed to collaborate with the Simon Commission in Madras begins by showing that the causes which in 1918 necessitated large political changes have now become intensified in strength. The report states that the claim for Dominion Status for India is based on justice and has already been conceded in the Declaration of August 1917. In the opinion of the Committee responsibility in the provinces and irresponsibility in the Central Government would be incompatible with the aim of abolishing diarchy. It therefore recommends responsibility in all Civil departments of the Government of India. The Committee does not make a bid for immediate Dominion Status but asks for a declaration that full Dominion Status is accepted as the goal and that the automatic achievement of such a status will be brought about by Indianisation of the Army and other forces. The necessity of bringing into operation military training in all provinces is insisted upon. The Committee has made a recommendation that several Indian Sandhursts should be opened for the training of the officers for the Army and that the recruitment should be open to all classes and all provinces. The Committee points out the practical difficulties in dealing with a large electorate resulting from universal suffrage and therefore declares against it; the future extension of the franchise should in its opinion be left to provincial legislatures. On the question of communal electorates the Committee admits them simply because the feeling in favour of their retention is practically unanimous among Muslims. For the depressed classes panels of representatives elected by recognized associations are suggested, from which the Governor is to nominate the requisite number of members of council; the number of seats should be in proportion to the population of the depressed classes, in the opinion of Mr. Shrivraaj who represents them on the Committee. The majority recommend the continuance of the special representation of commercial interests and landholders. Although the Governor's power relating to certification of demands is to be abolished he is to have certain emergency powers for the maintenance of peace and in regard to legislation and finance. After a review of the various considerations the Committee have declared in favour of a second chamber. The majority of the Committee recommend that all the services should be provincialized; Sir A. P. Patro however, dissenting, makes an exception in the case of the I.C.S. and the Police. In introducing responsibility in the Central Government, the Committee warns against a repetition of the old system of diarchy in the provinces. The Governor-General's powers of veto with regard to legislation and of issuing ordinances for the maintenance of peace are necessary in their opinion during the transition stage before complete responsibility is established. Although the Committee has shown itself to be weak-kneed with regard to communal electorates and the emergency powers of the Governor it is gratifying to see that it has asked for full provincial autonomy without any reservation.

The Economic position of India.

IN his address to the East India Association Mr. Kikabhai Premchand has given a review of the present economic position; and although we do not see eye to eye with him on many points the address is certainly very suggestive. Referring to the mill industry he expressed the hope that the Labour Commission will make recommendations which will assist in pacifying the labour unrest; as for the for-

ign competition he rightly attributed it to India's loyalty to the Washington Labour Convention which made her prohibit the employment of women and children at night while one of her competitors, Japan, did not observe the Convention. His remedy is a tariff against foreign products, meaning by 'foreign' those made by countries outside the Empire so that British goods might not be brought under it. The pertinent question in this case is how in such a case the competition from Great Britain is to be guarded against. But his thesis is that economically the interests of Britain and India are identical and for this reason he is decidedly in favour of a preference given to the countries within the Empire. Mr. Kikabhai Premchand is enamoured of the dictum recently laid down by Mr. Snowden that the raising of the purchasing power of Indians would benefit British trade. But as the increased trade is likely to be diverted to foreign countries he emphasizes the conception of the Empire as an economic unit and by another route comes round again to the need for Imperial Preference. He regrets the miscarriage of the Reserve Bank project and hopes that the new Banking Enquiry will lead to the foundation of a Central Bank independent of political influence and control. The amazing growth of the amount of Indian capital available for investment during the last thirty years to which he referred is certainly a reality. But when, following Sir Basil Blackett, he predicts that India will not only supply her own capital for industrial enterprises but will be a considerable investor in overseas concerns we feel that we are not able to share his facile optimism. The economic tendencies in India point to a sustained progress in his opinion provided that all our capital resources are brought into productive use.

* * *

League and the States.

ANOMALOUS as is the position of British India in respect of the League of Nations, vastly more anomalous is that of the Indian States. Their right to representation at Assembly meetings is recognised by the practice, which has not yet been sanctioned by any statutory authority, of appointing some Prince or other. This Prince, however, does not represent all the States in the aggregate or even his own single State, but is supposed to represent both British and Indian States, the same as the other two representatives appointed by Government. In theory therefore the Prince represents in part British India as well as Indian States. This fact is construed by some of the Princes as conferring much dignity and power on themselves, but if they will reflect further on the subject they will discover that their position cannot be a source of any comfort to them since they receive their mandate, which they have to obey even in the smallest particulars, from a Government at whose authority they want to jib. They owe their seats in the Assembly Hall to the British Government and they take their orders for their conduct in the Hall from the British Government. Need the Princes plume themselves upon this sort of international status? The League in discharge of its deliberative functions consults with the Government of British India, say on the Egyptian Treaty, but ignores the Indian States administrations altogether. These have no voice and can have no voice so long as they have no corporate existence. The Princes' Chamber, constituted as it is, can never attain that position. It has no power, e. g., of ratifying and then enforcing any of the Conventions which the Maharaja of Bikaner or Alwar may have helped the League to formulate. The Princes are therefore condemned by their loose organization to only a formal and utterly unsubstantial share in the League's activities.

Articles.

ANTI-INTIMIDATION BILL.

BY declining to promulgate an Ordinance conferring special powers on the police to deal with intimidation, the Labour Government had given the plainest possible indication of their own views on the subject. But the Bombay Legislative Council, composed as it is at present, would not profit by any such hints. The non-Brahmans of the Presidency and Mussulmans of Sind form any day a big enough *bloc* to carry any reactionary policy or any repressive measure. To this Adullamite cave was now added the strong commercial interest of Bombay and other centres. When these three elements are united no opposition can succeed, however infamous be the cause to which opposition is offered and however respectable the persons who offer it. Among the latter were not only men like Mr. Nariman, who are apt to be ignored as irresponsible firebrands, but such staid and sober members as Rao Bahadur Kale, Mr. Bhojising Pahlajani, Mr. R. G. Pradhan and Mr. Chikodi. No persons could be more hostile to a campaign of intimidation and more severe to those who practise intimidation than these. But they felt it their duty to oppose the Bill from the first reading onwards. They have no manner of sympathy with communism or wanton strikes inflicting great hardship of every kind on the community. They are prepared to give every assistance they can to Government in fighting communists and others who recklessly disrupt the peace of the industrial centres, but they are convinced that such extraordinary measures as the Government are bent upon passing will afford no relief and will on the contrary impose unnecessary and burdensome restrictions upon those who are engaged in carrying on legitimate trade union activities.

The Home Member, Mr. Hotson, had really very little to say in justification of the Bill making intimidation a cognisable offence. He related the difficulties now encountered by the police and described how the man in the street would more readily go to the police to make a complaint than to the magistrate. All this is true. But if Mr. Hotson's arguments have any validity, they prove far more than he sought to prove by their use. They show that the criminal law not only in this country but in the whole civilized world is fashioned on wrong principles and that it requires a radical revision. That the common man is averse to going to the magistrate for laying a complaint before him was, we daresay, well known to those who framed the law, and yet they imposed on the police a disability which they thought would on the whole work to the good of the community. They evidently feared that if powers of arresting persons without warrant were conferred on the police the latter would be an engine of oppression to peace-loving and law-abiding persons. Nothing has happened to show that the Bombay police

should be freed from the restrictions which it is generally agreed must be laid on them in the general interest. Will the act be of any practical effect either? Hardly likely. If people who are intimidated have not the courage to make a complaint, how can one expect persons to come forward to bear witness against the intimidators, and how are the magistrates to convict in the absence of evidence? It is difficult to resist the impression that the Government have passed this bill only in order to satisfy the clamour of industrialists, when they know that by itself it cannot be very effective and that the proper remedy against the ills of the industrial order does not consist in taking any special measures like this.

Granting the need for special powers, it must be confessed that no more powers are taken than would be required in an emergency. All reasonable precautions have been taken to prevent misuse of these powers. In the first place the area in which the measure may be invoked has been reduced; the life of the Act is limited; and within this limit a period has been set to the operation of the measure under one notification. All these provisions tend to minimise the evil by bringing the operation of the Bill periodically under the review of the legislature. We may even say that almost the limit of concessions has been reached within the framework of an act conferring extraordinary powers. But we deny the necessity of such powers, and our objection is to the very principle of the bill. In any case Government ought to have waited till the findings of the Court of Inquiry, which will surely have something to say on the matter. With one of the amendments moved from the non-official benches we must say we have no sympathy; it is the amendment allowing the bill to be used only in industrial strikes. The fear apparently is that under the cover of this measure political workers will be hit and they were sought to be excluded from the operation of the act. There is of course this possibility. But such misuse would help to remove the act from the statute book more effectively than anything else. Even if it is not used, politicians are more likely to keep up an agitation against it, as they have done against Regulation III of 1818, if the act is applicable to themselves as well as to workers. If its scope were limited, the workers alone would be left to fight it, which would probably prolong its life more than is necessary. Apart from this Mr. Hotson was quite right in saying that to restrict the act to workers would make it class legislation of the worst character. If intimidation is to be stopped all intimidation ought to be stopped; not merely that practised by one section of the people. Surely politicians are as capable of intimidation as workers. We therefore have no quarrel with the somewhat wide scope of the measure, believing that the wide scope itself may bring about its end. The Goondas Bill too will have an equally easy passage through the present Council.

A SCHEME OF SELF-GOVERNMENT.

A GREAT opportunity is to hand for leaders of public opinion to do some hard constructive thinking and devise a constitution which will be acceptable to all important sections of the community. To the call of this opportunity Sir Ibrahim Rahimatoola has now responded by making a few suggestions in the columns of the *Times of India*. His title to playing this rôle cannot be questioned, for he has had to his credit, a long and meritorious career of public service both in the official and non-official spheres. His contribution will be read all over the country with particular avidity as likely to be of the greatest value inasmuch as he is known to have championed the national cause when most of his co-religionists in Bombay were either indifferent to politics or were immersed in narrow communal politics. Thanks to the traditions handed down by earlier generations of politicians, very few questions were allowed in Bombay to assume a sectional character, but when one or two questions did arise in which the interests of one community were supposed to conflict with those of others, Sir Ibrahim Rahimatoola, whether in the Corporation or in the Council, was invariably found to advocate a policy making for the common weal instead of one which conduced to the advantage of this or that community. With such a record behind him, Sir Ibrahim had indeed a unique opportunity now, when a bitter communal strife is raging, to intervene for the purpose of reprimanding extreme communalists on either side and putting the politics of the country once again on the right track. To those who cherished such expectations, his scheme will bring keen disappointment; for the scheme, though it studiously eschews all violence of language, is in its essential contents frankly communal. He has evidently conceived it to be his duty to provide a sort of plausible political philosophy to those who are carrying on a wild communal propaganda, not recking what injury it does to national interests. No one knows better than we that such rank sectional aim ill accords with Sir Ibrahim's reputation, and we have done our best to search for any other possible interpretation, but we are regretfully driven to the conclusion that communal interests now make a stronger appeal to him than they used to do before and that he has made himself the spokesman, only more decent than most others, of unashamed Moslem communalism.

The central ideas in Sir Ibrahim Rahimatoola's memorandum are two: the division of India into a large number of small states, and the establishment of a federal system in which the central government will have only enumerated powers, all residuary powers vesting in the state governments. Neither of these ideas is novel. Both have been mooted and traversed at great length before. Whatever his many accomplishments may be, wide academic learning is not Sir Ibrahim's forte; and whenever he invokes some political principle in support of what he conceives to be a generally applicable theory and quotes the examples of other countries he

is hopelessly askew and sometimes makes himself almost ridiculous. The question of small vs. big states is a very intricate one and requires examination from several points of view. One advantage which we may expect to flow from small states is the more intensive political education which their citizens receive than those of big states. Freeman has discussed this subject in his "History of Federal Government." In smaller states individual citizens are found to bring a more cultivated intelligence to bear on the examination of public questions. But this advantage, great as it is, is neutralised by several other considerations in a contrary sense. In smaller states political dissensions are apt to be more acrimonious than in larger. A small state develops a parochial outlook while a large state is more favourable to the growth of a large spirit, which is the great desideratum in India at present. The obvious disadvantage of additional cost which smaller states necessarily involve is also a matter of no little importance. The breaking up of a country into petty states necessitates multiplication of administrative machinery, often to the serious detriment of efficiency. This aspect of the question presented enormous difficulties in the redrawing of the map of Europe after the War. As has been said, there are probably twice as many customs officials in Europe now as before the war, ten times as many transport officials, and twenty times as many diplomats. In applying the principle of self-determination, the question of small vs. big states had to be considered, and the limitations which must needs be put on the application had to be determined, as, e.g., in the case of the Aaland Islands to which we had occasion to refer last week. The general tendency of carving out a large number of small states is well expressed in the following passage: "In the 19th century, self-determination was an integrating force, bringing about the creation of single and coherent nation-states, such as Germany and Italy, out of a mass of smaller, snarling units. But in the 20th century, self-determination has become a disintegrating force, which, uncontrolled, will lead to very serious consequences for the peace of the world and for the welfare of the nations themselves." This should serve as a grave warning against dividing the country into minute fragments such as Sir Ibrahim has in mind.

Descending from the abstract to the concrete, Sir Ibrahim holds up to our admiration the example of the partition of Ireland into Northern and Southern portions. It may be possible to defend the position which Ulster took up in the Irish controversy, but we had never thought it conceivable that any Indian would deliberately urge upon us the partition of a country as the best means of securing internal peace. The factors in that controversy are too fresh in the minds of all of us to require a detailed refutation of Sir Ibrahim's contention. We can only wonder how a publicist of his calibre can fall into such a grave error. Indeed Sir Ibrahim seems to have entirely misread history. Look, for instance, at what he says about Egypt. In pleading for a generous

treatment to be meted out by the majority community to minority communities, he cites the example of what Saad Pasha Zagloul did to the Christians in Egypt. He appears to think that Zagloul's sensitive regard for the rights and interests of the Copts persuaded the latter to accept the rule of the Moslems. The facts however are just the contrary. It is the throwing in by the Copts of their lot unreservedly with the nationalists in Egypt that has persuaded the Moslems to treat them so liberally as they have done. The Copts were not entirely free from persecution before. The Coptic Congress of Assiut had to pass resolutions demanding among other things, equality of treatment for applicants for public posts, candidates to be chosen according to their merits. For statistics were published at the time showing, e. g., that in the Ministry of the Interior 1,908 Moslems received £E.18,881 a year, and 3,643 Copts received only £E.19,447; or roughly £E.10 a month on the average for Moslem employees and half that amount for Copts. How did the majority community treat this and the other resolutions? The Moslem Congress held two months later at Heliopolis declared that the religion of the state was the Moslem religion, which alone should be taught in the schools. "An excellent resolution was proposed demanding that Government posts should be accorded on the merits of candidates after examination, but when passed, a rider was added to the effect that when two or more candidates were of equal merit, preference should be given to the Moslem." Their position has now improved, but the improvement was solely due to the fact that they were not only not hostile or indifferent to the national campaign for freedom, but took a very prominent part in the Wafd. This was a very wise policy for the Coptic community to follow, to which they owe the inclusion of Copts in the Ministry. Their attitude has really a moral for the minority communities in India. If they will only join the national movement and give up their separatist tendencies they will receive better treatment than reliance on the British Government will ever secure. But Sir Ibrahim draws from it a moral to which history gives a flat contradiction. Did the Copts in Egypt insist upon a dismemberment of the country in such a way that they would be in a majority in some provinces? Did they demand a proportionate share in the Cabinets, as the Moslems are now doing, thus destroying the very basis on which joint responsibility of the Cabinet ministers could be established? On the contrary they of their own initiative offered to do without any special constitutional guarantees for their own sake, knowing as they did that whole-hearted participation in the national struggle would be a more effectual safeguard than any reservation of seats in Parliament and such-like measures could possibly be. There is very great need for Sir Ibrahim to re-read history if he desires to base any part of his advocacy of the Indian Moslems on it. On the second suggestion of Sir Ibrahim, that state governments should have residuary powers, we do not say anything just now, particularly because Sir Ibrahim

has put forward arguments in its support, which have been answered a number of times before. It is a great tragedy of Indian public life that a great many of our nationalists are fair-whether nationalists, whom the spirit of communalism prevailing around them easily turns into communalists.

ANDERSON'S FALLACIES. *g. a. m. v.*

MR. ANDERSON'S main propositions* may thus be summarised. He first enunciates the proposition that the taxation of land rent is entirely in a class by itself. He then asserts that the Bombay land revenue has rent as its basis and maintains that the rental statistics at present available to the settlement officer are sufficient for purposes of assessing land revenue. Incidentally he attacks some "fallacies" as that of comparing land revenue with income tax and the plea for the exemption of the poorest cultivators from taxation. He also puts in a word for the need of a uniform standard in the system, for tenancy legislation and for the heavier taxation of non-agricultural land. The book is thus mainly a defence of last year's Bombay Land Revenue Bill. Its tone is pontifical and the author evidently rates low the intelligence of his readers. Frequent recourse is had to simple stories like that of Cain and Abel for explaining points of theory and though this makes at times for better understanding of comparatively simple problems it really leads to an artificial simplification of complex issues in Mr. Anderson's mind.

Mr. Anderson is obviously a fanatical Ricardian; for he not only accepts Ricardo's theory of rent which at present is generally accepted but also Ricardo's theory of distribution which on the other hand is generally discredited. There is nothing to object in the statement that agricultural rent being communally created is a specially suitable object of taxation; but when Mr. Anderson further goes on to state that agricultural rent is entirely in a class by itself and that all taxation is a sort of confiscation but taxation of rent is not, it is certainly time to demur. He does not seem to be aware of or does not seem to accept the extension of the rent analogy to parts of other distributive shares established since the time of Ricardo by writers like Senior, Marshall and Webb, and continually writes as if land rent were the only form of wealth which is created or increased by the establishment of peace and order and the development of a community. He would evidently differentiate sharply between income from inherited land and inherited government bonds; the one would be to him "unearned" while the other "earned". In fact, Mr. Anderson still clings to the old habit of regarding agricultural property as something essentially different from other kinds of property; and it is chiefly from this prejudice that a great many fallacies in his thinking arise.

Mr. Anderson's next proposition that the British have deliberately changed the basis of Land Revenue

* *Facts and Fallacies about the Bombay Land Revenue System.* By F. G. H. ANDERSON. (Author, Queen's Garden, Poona.) 1929. 22cm. 161p. Rs. 2-8.

from the old "gross produce" to "rental value" is open to serious doubt. We frankly recognize that this particular question admits of a variety of interpretations. So many different officials were concerned in shaping early land revenue policy and so many different terms were used in the early official pronouncements that a fair case could be made out for almost any contention. But at least as far as Bombay Land Revenue goes the words "profits of Agriculture" in section 107 of the Bombay Code are a convincing answer to all Mr. Anderson's arguments. For it could only be a Mr. Anderson who could blandly write that "profits of agriculture" is used [in the Code] as a term synonymous with rental value, meaning the same thing!! For this statement no reason is adduced; it would be very easy to prove anything with such latitude in the interpretation of terms.

The real point of attack in last year's agitation—for example in this pamphlet—was, however, the adequacy and value of the rental statistics at present available as the sole criterion for levying assessments. Mr. Anderson had in his minute of dissent to the Land Revenue Committee's report claimed that this rental value basis was as exact as the basis of income tax, and now when it has been pointed out that even with a large number of rental statistics available the settlement officer will have necessarily to depend on guess-work to a considerable extent his only reply is that there would be even more guess-work in the "profits of cultivation" basis (p. 81). The reply is irrelevant and amounts to a giving up of the old claim that rental basis is as exact as the basis in income tax. In trying to prove the case of the rental statistics and their precise character Mr. Anderson is induced to claim for the index the quality of being determinate and reliable; he avers that there are ample rental statistics available everywhere and that even in the case of crop-share leases and in the case of fields where the cultivator is himself the owner it is easy separately to determine the rental value. It is because I had contested these statements that he curtly dismissed me as merely a college professor totally ignorant of facts. It is well for me that since the publication of Mr. Anderson's book two civilians have had occasion to opine on the reliability of rental statistics and Mr. Anderson's use of them. Since Messrs. Broomfield and Maxwell have reported on the collection and interpretation of rental statistics in Mr. Anderson's régime it is hardly necessary for me to labour the old points. They have found the method of using rental statistics established—chiefly by Mr. Anderson—both unsound in theory and unworkable in practice; and even though they still rely chiefly on rental statistics they lay very great emphasis on the necessity for scrutiny of transactions and for caution in the use of statistics. While Mr. Anderson ridicules the idea of excluding any particular figures as too high or otherwise abnormal (p. 79), Messrs. Broomfield and Maxwell tell us that in Sarbhon they had actually to reject 152 out of 202 entries. And as regards the famous "index" the Bardoli Committee are sceptical as to its value and remark that any

attempt to use the figures as though they were capable of yielding a direct calculation of the "full standard assessment" should be regarded as "wholly untrustworthy." It is undoubtedly gratifying to us to observe that it has been left to two civilian brothers of Mr. Anderson to accuse him of "confusion of principles" and "inconsistency in the use of indices." After the Bardoli Enquiry report it is hardly necessary again to refute Mr. Anderson's proposition that rental statistics by themselves alone afford a determinate basis for the levying of assessments.

So far with regard to Mr. Anderson's constructive case. Amongst the fallacies he seeks to expose the most important is what he calls the income tax illusion." The claim for exempting the poorest cultivators from land revenue he calls a "wicked heresy." For he maintains that land revenue, falling as it does only on the "unearned" portion of the cultivator's income, has naturally exempted earned portions of the income from taxation and further that if the cultivator's income is small that is his own fault and he cannot expect a full day's share for half-a-day's work. As regards the first part of the argument it is enough to reply that while it is equitable to distinguish between the treatment of "earned" and "unearned" incomes, no income tax is levied from even "unearned" incomes below a certain limit in any country in the world. The second argument—which curiously enough the Bardoli Enquiry Committee also seem to consider as particularly convincing—proceeds on the assumption that the cultivator's misfortune, i.e., the uneconomic holding is of his own making. And even if it were, that is no reason for not exempting very low incomes from the burden of taxation. In exempting certain classes from income tax the only relevant consideration is that their income is so small that it cannot support them even at a very low accepted standard of living and that, therefore, they have no "ability" to bear taxation. It would be entirely irrelevant in this connection to urge that the smallness of the income of a particular man was due to his own fault. It is absurd to urge that a measure of taxation could or should be used as a goad for people to work. A further plea sometimes urged for not exempting small holders from land revenue is that it is a tax on things and not on persons, that being a tax on land values it must fall on all lands and cannot take account of the income of the owners of land. This, however, is not true; and it may be noted that the most eulogised system of land value taxation, that of New Zealand, allows exemption to holders of the smallest plots and a special abatement to smaller holders.

We have dealt above with the main propositions of Mr. Anderson's book. Apart from these he has much that is valuable to say on the necessity of tenancy legislation, guaranteeing a long term of tenure to the tenants and also on the taxation of non-agricultural land. There is little doubt that as compared with agricultural land "urban site rent" is being let off very lightly in India. Mr. Anderson's book shares more the nature of a controversial pamphlet

than of a careful exposition of principles and he tilts his lance against a great many adversaries throughout the book. This is not the place to comment on his methods of controversy or to defend oneself against his attacks. But we may be permitted to express surprise that a writer who poses as being so accurate and well-informed should translate "kulaki" as "khatedar rayat" (p. 26) or should be unable to identify a quotation from the famous Government of India resolution of 1902 and should, therefore, be tempted to attribute it to a writer as ill-informed as ourselves (p. 59)!! Mr. Anderson shows himself in these pages an able reasoner and a writer with a trenchant style and it is unfortunate that his fragmentary knowledge of economic theory and his blind faith in the value of the "facts" collected by his department prevented him from writing a more useful book on this all important subject.

D. R. GADGIL.

Reviews.

WAR ON WAR.

THE WARFARE OF RECONCILIATION. BY JOHN S. HOYLAND. (Allen & Unwin.) 1928. 7¼ × 5. 189 p. 5/-.

THE writer of this volume has given some years of noteworthy service to India. Latterly he assisted in the work of the Hislop College of the United Free Church of Scotland at Nagpur, but his influence, through literature such as "A Book of Prayers written for use in an Indian College", has extended far beyond the bounds of the Central Provinces. It must be regretted that a man of his devotion and ability should be unable for health reasons to return to this land, which in these critical years of her history needs so greatly such "soldiers of reconciliation."

Perhaps the best written chapter of the book for it is somewhat unequal in merit) is the first, in which "the enemy" is described. Here we are reminded of the tragic facts that, notwithstanding the terrible illustration which the "great war" provided of the evil of the old style of national life, there were two million more soldiers in Europe in 1924 than in 1914; that, outside of Europe, populations totalling well over half the entire human race are still being trained in the old bad mentality on the subject of war; and that modern scientific research has so perfected the instruments of destruction that in the next war—if it ever comes—half an hour's air raid may wipe out the city of London. Then we are given an analysis of the antagonisms of the world. Nationality, developed in a narrow spirit, has made for division. In addition to the numerous vertical separations thus effected, there has been the horizontal separation of the world's manual workers from the employing and controlling capitalists. And, lastly, there is the separation that is the outcome of bitter racial feeling.

As befits the subject of the book, it indulges in no easy optimism. The writer looks at the dark side of every picture. No doubt those movements in European history known as the Renaissance and the Reformation contributed much to the emancipation of the human spirit. But, glorious as was their achievement in this direction, it is impressed upon us in these pages that the sixteenth century (and the reference is particularly to events in Europe) was "a black age in human history." The old spiritual authority of the Roman Church lost its hold, and the men who were formerly bound together by a common allegiance to it were separated by the lesser loyalties that then began to prevail. Even the appeal from the authority of the Church to the authority of the Bible, so welcome for many reasons, had its unwholesome side. For Christians, failing to discriminate between the different stages of religious development, found in the historical books of the Old Testament, with their narrow Jewish exclusiveness and their primitive moral standards, sanction for military exploits indefensible at the bar of the modern conscience.

Several times it is pointed out that the warfare of reconciliation is a religious problem. Indeed, to emphasise this seems to be the main purport of the book. As a Christian, Mr. Hoyland expounds his own religious faith frankly, without wishing in any way to dogmatise or to belittle those who do not share his religious experience. Whatever be our particular religious outlook, we certainly cannot be too often reminded of Christ's way of reconciliation, "the way of that self-sacrificing love which gladly takes upon itself the worst that hatred can do."

Of the many different kinds of Christians, the members of the Society of Friends—commonly known as "Quakers"—have been the most uncompromising in their refusal to take part in physical warfare. Mr. Hoyland has the distinction of belonging to this honourable body and is manifestly grateful for his heritage. With deep satisfaction he tells the story of how William Penn on his estates in Pennsylvania tried the policy of just dealing, conciliation and brotherhood, in his attitude towards the Red Indians:

"Penn launched his new colony amongst bloodthirsty savages—and savages who had been justly incensed by the unfair and even treacherous dealings of other colonies to north and south of Pennsylvania—without any means of defence against the appalling horrors of Red Indian warfare. So long as the experiment was continued, that is, for more than two generations, it proved entirely successful. The neighbouring colonies suffered severely from Indian wars, but Pennsylvania was spared, and the only Quakers killed by the savages in all this time were one or two who had betrayed their faith by taking arms."

ANDREW R. LOW.

THE NEW EUROPE.

NEW GOVERNMENTS OF CENTRAL EUROPE and NEW GOVERNMENTS OF EASTERN EUROPE. By MALBONE W. GRAHAM, Jr. (Pitman.) 21cm. 683p. and 826p. 21/-each.

THESE two volumes from the pen of Prof. Graham, Adjunct Professor of Government University of Texas, are exhaustive treatises giving in detail the history of the far-reaching changes effected in the governments of Central and Eastern Europe resulting from the revolutions and the consequent rise of new states on the ruins of the Central and Russian Empires. The author has set out on his task after a thorough and intimate study of those changes from several original sources and the rich material available in the Hoover War Library.

The French Revolution set at liberty the ideas of individual liberty and nationality; but it was only the western states that learnt the lessons of the Revolution with any certainty. The Central Empires and Russia remained all through the 19th century autocracies sustained by a highly intelligent, industrious and self-seeking oligarchy and bureaucracy. The Industrial Revolution added to the complications of society. The New Nationalism of the latter 19th century further embittered the relations between Teuton and Slav. In spite of the Hague Conference and professions of a desire for peace, it was evident, towards the beginning of the present century, that Europe was heading to a never-to-be-forgotten catastrophe. It is no wonder that in the World War the democracies of the West should have triumphed with the assistance of the great democracy across the Atlantic.

In the cataclysm that overtook Europe after the War, the old world autocracies crumbled to pieces and the principle of Liberty and Nationality finally triumphed with the aid of the League of Nations. The three Empires, which for nearly two centuries had followed the path of self-aggrandisement and extension of territory without any regard to public morality or claims of Nationality, dissolved into their component parts, and from out of these there arose a number of national states based on the principle of self-determination and animated by a sincere desire to perpetuate the principles of liberty and equality. The volumes under review relate in a clear manner under what circumstances and by what means the New Europe has attempted to realise these fundamental principles.

The earlier volume deals with the Central Empires and the five states that arose on their ruins, viz. Germany, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Yugoslavia. It is distinctly interesting to note the degree of conformity in the reactions of the countries to the various psychological and economic forces to which the people of these states have been subjected by war, blockade, revolution, and reaction. The forces do not always assume the same external form, as they act, not by some predetermined formula, or by some prescribed gospel, but by the necessities of a national psychology. Yet there is a marked interrelation. The movements, constitutional and otherwise, in Germany reflect themselves in the policies of Vienna; communism inflames Hungary and Bavaria at the same time; monarchism raises its head simultaneously, in Berlin and Budapest; the political orientations in Belgrade, Vienna, and Bucharest are inseparable from the lines of policy laid down in Prague.

In all the Central States the young republic was severely assailed by monarchist and bolshevist; after

much travail, the democratic republic triumphed in Germany, Austria and Czechoslovakia; while, from the very nature of the political groups in Hungary and Yugoslavia, monarchy was found to be best suited to keep together the several antagonising influences.

The principle that it is the duty of the state to secure a living wage to every individual has been accepted and the rights of minorities guaranteed. From the institutional point of view, the experience of a century and a half of democracy in other lands has indicated, with a degree of certainty, the lines on which the nascent democracies of Central Europe would have to organize themselves. The Sovereignty of the People, a parliamentary system of government with ultimate control by the people through the Referendum, the Initiative and the Recall, have been adopted in some form or another. The experience of the past eight years seems to indicate that democracy has started on right lines and that it has definitely come to stay. Yugoslavia, alone among the new states, has passed, in recent years, under the dictatorship of the Crown by reason of the bitter antagonisms of the Croats and the Serbs. It is to be hoped that in a short time these two branches of the Slav nation will come to understand each other and help to realise the great Slovene nationhood which has been the dream of the Slavs for over half a century.

The second volume is a continuation, treating on the same lines with the territories of Eastern Europe. The Russian Empire was largely the creation of its able Czars and Czaritsas from the time of Peter the Great. In the course of two centuries Russia, looked upon as an eastern power and barbarian, emerged as one of the great powers becoming rapidly Europeanised and accepting the civilization of the west. Fighting continuously for over two centuries and following a consistent policy of aggrandisement, it extended its territories at the expense of Poland, Turkey and Sweden. While the western powers looked on helplessly, Poland was dismembered and finally swallowed up by Prussia, Austria and Russia. Napoleon gave Finland as a birthday present to Czar Alexander, but till the end of the last century the Finns maintained their autonomy. To the problem of nationalities was added the economic, resulting from the rapid growth of population in Russia, enfranchisement of the agricultural serf and rapid industrialisation after 1881. It is no wonder if, with so many discordant elements in the land, the Russian Monarchy, served as it was by a selfish bureaucracy and equally selfish oligarchy, floundered in the whirlpool towards which it was rapidly moving and met the nemesis that awaits all autocracies. The disappearance of the Russian Monarchy in 1917 and the defeat of the Central Powers gave rise to a new disposition of Eastern Europe and the rise of a number of independent states, the federation of Russian and other Soviet Republics, Finland, Esthonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Poland.

Many and varying influences were at work in the latter half of the 19th century to bring Russia into closer touch with the system of society dominating Western Europe. The democratic ideology of the French Revolution and the outbursts of 1848 had, by 1900 gone far toward undermining autocratic authority in the Russian Empire. In addition, the political and economic consequences of the spread of the industrial revolution, the calling into existence of new and powerful classes, made imperative a transfer of the locus of political authority and worked with a certain slow but dramatic inevitability to accomplish

the eventual destruction, in economic root and intellectual branch, of the autocracy of the Romanovs. When the March revolution broke, the controls that had bound the vast masses of Russia in passive, inert submission to the throne, the dynasty, the state and the church were all removed. Although the initial unity of feeling produced by the joy of liberation was universal, it was not long before the operation of the disintegrating forces was manifest. The removal of repression expressed by the March revolution and the breakdown of the old economic order combined to accentuate the demands of the various regions for a greater largess of freedom. Under such conditions, with a provisional government that practised temporisation, the time was ripe, the moment incentive to far-reaching political and economic experimentation. The situation played definitely into the hands of extremist leaders who, crystallising the amorphous sentiment of revolution around the concrete catchwords of the historic peace-land-bread trilogy, drew to themselves, despite their terroristic methods, the masses of rural and urban workers. Realists that they were, they preferred not to check the centrifugal forces for which they were not responsible. Sensing the incentive moment for assuming power, they then gave free rein to the nationalist and agrarian movements as the price of the retention of political control.

The author then shows how the Bolsheviks solved the problems of political and economic organisation of Russia. Where rampant communalism, militant and unashamed, endeavoured to sovietise by force and convert by coercion the keenly nationalistic middle classes, bred and reared on the bourgeois tradition of middle class rule inherited from industrialised Western Europe, the effort was a dismal, if bloody, failure. But its allurements were strong in the case of the propertyless muzhik in both European Russia and Central Asia. But even there, there were enough factors of an inauspicious character to make even a casual approximation to real communism impossible. Even in Russia itself, communism perished among the economic brambles. With the defeat of Wrangel, with the ending of the intervention and the civil war, a change was inevitable. The New Economic Policy was the result.

Once war, civil and international, was ended, recuperation set in. Henceforth communism was an end to be approximated and not a goal to be reached. It then became possible for more moderate policies to dominate in the Kremlin. Cultural autonomy and national self-determination with guarantees for minorities became the guiding principle of Soviet reconstruction and in due course led to the U.S.S.R. In the Soviet union artificial trade barriers have been largely removed. In a very real sense it may be said that the Soviet union has established a stronger unit of economic life than had ever been created by the Czars; the very regional regrouping of the vast area under Soviet control according to scientifically ascertained needs and purposes will serve to accentuate the economic usefulness of the union and enhance its power. Regarding its future, one thing is certain; the régime of undiluted communism is over. The trend of even official communist policy is ever more conservative. Despite the outlawry that the Soviet power has suffered till recently the U.S.S.R. has been steadily improving the intellectual and economic position of her peoples. The true path of Soviet Russia seems to lie in the median zone of compromise, in the path which the Soviet commissaries have followed since 1921, in continuous compromise with the forms of capitalism and the spirit of agrarian revolution.

While Russia passed under the régime of the

Bolsheviks and, gradually shedding its communism, organised a government based on private property, the Baltic Provinces of the Russian Empire suffered for a time under the blows of the communist Bolsheviks and the victorious Germans. Carried away by the joy of liberation after the March revolution, Finns, Estonians and Letts declared their independence and with feverish haste and without any regard to the realities of the situation they began organising their governments. With no political experience, having been subject to foreign domination for ages past, they were caught between two powerful forces, the Bolsheviks from Russia and the Germans. The menace of communism had been hardly overcome when German armies, released after the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, poured over and occupied these lands. It seemed as though the Baltic states had freed themselves from the Russian autocrat to fall into the hands of a more rigorous, because more efficient, foreign domination. The final collapse of the Central Powers and the organisation of the League of Nations came as a real God-send to these provinces. The League of Nations consistently supported their right to independent existence and gave them moral and material help in the organisation of independent democratic republics. By 1919, Finland, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania had been set on foot. A government based on the consent of the governed, an elective President and Legislature, a reorganised judiciary with trial by jury—such, in brief, is the structure of the new governments. Till recently, it was a universally accepted view that a well-organised legislature must be bicameral in structure. In the small, compact states of the Baltic, the experiment is being tried of a unicameral legislature with an appeal to the people by the referendum as a safeguard to minorities, and the experiment seems to be working satisfactorily. With minor differences, the course of development has been very nearly the same in all these states. A land-law as the first step to the growth of a healthy peasant class, a scheme of education for all classes, respect for the rights of minorities and constitutional guarantees therefor, a sincere effort to budget wisely, a wise foreign policy under which all outstanding differences between themselves and with Russia have been sought to be solved in a spirit of give and take at periodical congresses—such have been the items of the programme of reconstruction followed by the statesmen of all schools in these states. Monarchism and communism have alike attempted to establish themselves at one time or another, but both alike have been defeated and all these states on the Baltic littoral have settled down to a democratic mould.

Poland has, all through the period after 1918, been the favoured child of the League of Nations, almost a spoilt child. The Kingdom of Poland was one of the earliest Slavonic states to accept the civilisation of the west and was for centuries the bulwark of Christendom against the onrush of the Turk. With a highly selfish, mediæval oligarchy dominating the government, an elective monarchy, emaciated, worn out and reduced to a mere figure-head, and a servile, impoverished peasantry ground down by a powerful oligarchy, Poland fell an easy prey to the cupidity of the crowned robbers of Prussia, Austria and Russia and was easily stripped and partitioned among themselves while Europe looked on. Time and again, the Polish patriots fought hard to recover their independence, but each attempt made the situation even more hopeless, and for a century Polish patriots lived a life of exile in America or France or other states fondly hoping for the day of redemption. Even before the

Powers met at Versailles, it was well understood that Poland would be raised to the position of an independent state. But the history of the Polish nation after 1918 has not been very happy. Long suffering does not seem to have given them the virtues of patience and forgiveness. In a spirit of vengefulness the Poles have tried to hit hard against their neighbours, Lithuania and Russia, and the League of Nations seemed to feel helpless to redress the obvious wrong done to Lithuania in regard to Vilnius. Even her internal development has not been peaceful. After various experiments, she has eventually passed into the hands of a dictator, Marshal Pilsudski. With the reopening of negotiations with Russia and the Baltic powers and the signing of a security pact, Poland seems to have eventually landed on sure ground at last, but the Vilnius and Danzig questions still make the position a little awkward. With Jugoslavia Poland offers yet another instance of the difficulty of organising a democratic state in the absence of a healthy middle class and where the rights of minorities are not sufficiently respected.

Summing up the position in the Baltic world, it may be said that the future of the states is in the hands of the countries that comprise it. Out of a period of historic subjugation to one mighty empire, out of the dire peril of being incorporated by another, more ruthless and more efficient, has come the day of independence coupled with strivings for co-operative union. Fortunate in being born the same time as a new order in international affairs, the Baltic countries have been privileged to help in the ushering in of the era of frank and open diplomatic collaboration. Once the Baltic republics and Russia, living on the frontier zones of two vastly different civilisations, find the common measure of their security, it will be possible to achieve a far greater degree of co-operation and build up a common economic life for the Balticum.

Such, in brief, is the highly interesting story of the growth of the several states that have grown out of the autocracies of the three Empires. The author not merely narrates the process of transformation and its course, but describes in a vivid manner, the party forces that piloted the new states. Charts are given to explain pictorially the interrelation of the several parties in each state from the time of organisation to 1927, and these charts are sure to be very helpful in understanding the forces at work. At the end of each volume, an English version of the text not merely of the existing constitution, but also of all the important constitutional documents relating to the period after the War, has been added which enhances the value of the books by making the original sources directly available.

S. V. KRISHNASWAMI IYENGAR.

THE NEW WAY IN EDUCATION.

HOW WE LEARN. By WILLIAM H. KILPATRICK
(Association Press, Calcutta.) 1928. 19 cm.
100p. Rs. 1.

FOURTEEN EXPERIMENTS IN RURAL EDUCATION. Ed. by ALICE B. VAN DOREN.
(Association Press, Calcutta.) 1928. 19 cm.
127p. Rs. 1-4.

IN the present decade, India, like all civilised countries, has made a big advance in the matter of educational thinking. There is a definite feeling in the minds of all of us—officials, parents, students and teachers—that there is something wrong with the system of education that has developed during the British period. Accordingly the Government,

private bodies and the Christian missions—the three agencies responsible for the expansion of education in our country—are trying in their own way to reconstruct the educational machinery at their disposal. The two books under review represent the missionary endeavour in respect of educational reconstruction, particularly in the field of Rural Education.

The first book gives us an easy and interesting exposition of the psychological basis of the 'Project Method.' The exposition is based on the talks delivered by Dr. W. H. Kilpatrick—a leading professor at the Teachers' College of Columbia University. The book is divided into three parts. The first part discusses the psychology of the learning process. The second part brings out the mutual relation of learning and life. The remaining part considers the application of the new conceptions of learning to actual school work, i. e., the project-method.

Learning, as it takes place in rural schools, is connected with examinations. The process is un-psychological and is based on a restricted practice and experience. The pupils try to know only those facts which are likely to be tested. This formal learning according to mechanical methods is absolutely out of keeping with the conditions of life under which pupils live. But the kind of learning discussed in this book is broader than the learning connected with examinations. It includes all that is most characteristic of life. It is learning as the basis of efficient character. Its aim is to produce in pupils self-confidence, self-respect, responsibility and interest in doing things. It is based on the psychological law, "Whatever brings success and satisfaction we learn to do. Whatever brings failure and annoyance we learn not to do." Accordingly the new method of learning attaches a great importance to the feelings of pupils. It never forces them to practise things with any annoyance. It makes their minds, hearts and bodies work together under the guidance of a strong purpose.

This new method of teaching or learning is technically called the 'Project Method.' It requires much of teachers. They should have a sympathetic understanding of their pupils and must possess a broad fund of knowledge upon which to draw. On the basis of this method, children are allowed to form their own purposes and plans, to carry them out and to judge their value. If skilfully employed, the method is calculated to furnish the children of the village-community with an environment which will help them to become a living force in moulding village-life.

The second book, as its title indicates, presents in its pages the chronicle of fourteen interesting and instructive experiments in the application of the Project Method. These experiments are chosen as typical samples of what is done by enthusiastic missionaries in many out-of-the-way places of our country.

The Alec Fraser Commission of 1920 (sent out to India by the Missionary Conference of Great Britain and Ireland) courageously stated in its report that the supreme need of rural India was a kind of education quite different from what prevailed. The first missionary teacher to be inspired by this report was William McKee. With characteristic fervour he studied the secrets of the success in the uplift of the Negro and went to Columbia to master the new psychology of education. With this equipment he returned to his school at Moga in the Punjab and started his wonderful experiment. The success of this experiment was so remarkable that the staff of the National Christian Council constantly kept 'Moga' before the attention of all the mission-

under their control. And there is no wonder that 'Moga' at present stands for a movement in Rural Education which is essentially practical.

The story of the fourteen experiments under this movement is divided into three parts. The first part deals with eight middle schools for boys. All of them make use of the Project Method and regard the use of hands as educationally very valuable. With the exception of the Sangli school, all are literary schools which have developed the vocational side. Moga gives interesting examples of agricultural projects. Ushagrama presents the reader with a picture of the cottage system. Manmad has worked out a balanced curriculum of a number of pre-vocational activities. Three experiments in respect of rural schools for girls are described in Part II. The primary aim of these schools has been the preparation of girls for home-life. Whatever home they will go to, the girls are expected to carry with them intelligence, interest and spiritual purpose. Part III describes experiments of a different order. The school at Dornakal (Madras) is engaged in an experiment in co-education. At Vellore attempts are made to organise school supervision with a view to afford skilled and sympathetic guidance to village-teachers. The last chapter describes an experiment which represents rural education in its broadest and deepest sense. It is an attempt to reclaim the criminal tribes among the Salem Hills by means of education.

Since the introduction of the Montford reforms, expansion of rural education has become the problem of problems both for Government and the people. The education that is given at present is unpractical in character. And the problem is how to prevent the village-pupil from being alienated from his village. It is our belief that the books under review contain some very valuable suggestions in this connection. Hence we have no hesitation in concluding that their study is indispensable not only for those who are engaged in rural education but also for those who are responsible for the expansion of primary education.

K.

SHORT NOTICES.

INDIAN STATES REGISTER & DIRECTORY
Ed. by A. N. SUDARISANAM. (Egmore, Madras.)
1929. 19cm. 651p. Rs. 5/-.

THIS is the first annual regarding Indian States that has ever been published, and considering the fact that the administration of most of the smaller States remains a sealed book on account of the persistent refusal by the Princes to let their reports see the light of day, it is marvellous how much information the Editor has been able to put together in this volume. Some gaps will no doubt be discovered as one handles its pages, though the present reviewer was not able to discover any serious ones though he started with the express purpose of doing so; but the author who, as the editor of the *Indian States Review*, now unfortunately defunct, has established his competence for the task, will gradually fill up all such gaps and introduce other improvements in future editions. This edition contains the speeches made by the Princes at various banquets to the Viceroy and the Viceroy's replies, extracts from the Nehru Reports, original and supplementary, on the States problem Sir Leslie Scott's legal opinion, the views of Pandit Nehru, Dr. Sapru and Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer on the Princes' case presented to the Butler Committee, the full

text of the Memorandum by the Ramachandra Rao delegation, an account of the States' Peoples' Conference, &c. &c., in addition to other sundry information about the States. At a time when almost every other paper writes every other day on one State or another, this annual is indispensable to every person who claims to be a publicist. The printing and the get-up of the book are excellent. We hope the editor's labours will be rewarded by a good commercial return in heavy sales, which will enable him to keep alive this annual which truly one cannot do without.

V.

INDUSTRIAL YEAR BOOK AND DIRECTORY, 1929. (Industry Book Department, 22 Shambazar Bridge Road, Calcutta.) 1929. 22cm. 518p.

THIS is the first book of its kind, attempting as it does to present up-to-date information regarding the trade and industries of the country which is required by practical businessmen. The publishers have evidently taken great pains in making the volume as comprehensive as possible. The book will no doubt undergo additions and improvements in future, but even as it is, it is an admirable work of reference, giving a factual description of the present industrial and economic conditions in India.

N. S. B.

DELHI: ITS STORY AND BUILDINGS. By HENRY SHARP. (Oxford University Press.) 1928. 19cm. 133p. Rs. 2/8.

THIS second edition of a book which has already proved of inestimable value to the numerous visitors of the new Capital will be of still greater usefulness to them as it now includes a new chapter on New Delhi. As the author says: this is "the eighth city of Delhi, surpassing its predecessors in magnificence and in the great ideals which it symbolizes—the blending of oriental art and achievement with the sterner influences of the west; the maintenance of ordered rule through a continent of heterogeneous peoples; the tradition of a beneficent administration which, in its kind, is without parallel." Sir Henry Sharp obviously does not share the severe criticisms one hears of the new city, the latest of which is by Mr. H. G. Alexander in "The Indian Ferment." that "taken all together, it is a poor affair, and a wicked waste of money."

T. S. K.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- THE DISTRIBUTION OF POWER TO REGULATE INTER-STATE CARRIERS BETWEEN THE NATION AND THE STATES.** By GEORGE G. REYNOLDS. (Columbia University Press.) 1928. 23cm. 434p.
- ECONOMIC BASES OF DISUNION IN SOUTH CAROLINA.** By JOHN G. VAN DEUSEN. (Columbia University Press.) 1928. 23cm. 360p.
- CARTELS, COMBINES AND TRUSTS IN POST-WAR GERMANY.** By RUDOLF K. MICHELS. (Columbia University Press.) 1928. 23cm. 186p.
- THE BUNKHOUSE MAN.** By EDMUND W. BRADWIN. (Columbia University Press, New York.) 1928. 22cm. 308p.
- PRESSURE POLITICS.** The Story of the Anti-Saloon League. By PETER H. ODEGARD. (Columbia University Press, New York) 1928. 22cm. 299p.
- POPULAR MAP READING.** By E. D. LABORDE. (Cambridge University Press, London.) 1928. 19cm. 118p. 6s.