

The Servant of India

EDITOR : S. G. VAZE.—OFFICE : SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY'S HOME, POONA 4.

VOL. XII, No. 48.

POONA—THURSDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1929.

INDIAN SUBSN. Rs. 6.
FOREIGN 15s

CONTENTS.

	Page.
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	577
ARTICLES :—	
Exclusion of States' People	580
The Sino-Soviet Crisis	581
Marriage and Divorce. By "Fettered Yet Free" ...	582
OUR LONDON LETTER :—	
Prospects of Indian Reform. By A. Fenner Brookway, M.P.	583
OUR EUROPEAN LETTER :—	
The Méléé	584
REVIEWS :—	
Earliest Social History of India. By Professor C. S. Srinivasachari	586
The Unitarian Movement. By the Hon'ble Mr. Justice P. K. Sen	587
Short Notice	588

Topics of the Week.

Trade Union Congress.

FOR some years past a struggle has been going on within the bosom of the All-India Trade Union Congress between the so-called "reformist" and communist elements and it was only a question of time as to when a permanent cleavage between them would come about. In spite of the fact that most of the prominent leaders of the communist persuasion were disabled from being present at Nagpur to stampede the Congress into a position of subordination to Moscow, it was known for some time before the Congress actually convened that a crisis would develop and that the final rupture would be consummated at this year's session. The person selected for the presidency of the Congress was expected to throw in his influence unreservedly on the side of the communists. This expectation itself was due to the flirtation that Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru has been very cautiously carrying on with those who are bent upon bringing the labour movement in this country under the domination of the Comintern; but it was found that the Pandit would like to stay a little longer on the fence, which he would not leave to come down either on one side or on the other. In his presidential address he vigorously advocated the boycott of the Whitley Commission basing his arguments not on anything specially connected with labour but on his general political bias. But the crucial point was whether he would counsel the affiliation of the Congress with the Communist International as has been proposed. On this point he was undecided, as well befits the rôle that he has been playing in the labour movement. He was of course quite convinced that the Second International was not the body to which the Congress should be affiliated. (We might say here parenthetically that the First Interna-

tional was organised in 1864 and was in existence for twelve years. The Second International was formed in 1889 and the Two-and-a-Half International or the Vienna Union in 1921. These two bodies were merged in 1923 into the Labour and Socialist International. The total membership of the groups affiliated to the L.S.I. in 1928 was 6,637,622, the strongest constituent units thereof being the British Labour Party and the Social Democratic Party of Germany. The Third International or the Communist International was organised in Moscow in 1919. It has 1,707,769 members, chiefly in Russia and Germany.) The reasons advanced by Pandit Nehru for not affiliating the Trade Union Congress to the Second International were of the flimsiest and will not bear a moment's examination. But we are chiefly concerned here to note what his reasons were for not advising the Congress to seek affiliation with the Comintern. The Comintern's aims are apparently quite unexceptionable, but some of its methods are open to question. What these methods are to which the Pandit feels inclined to take objection he took care not to mention. He thus ended by saying that the Congress should be independent of both bodies, establishing a contact with either as might be found useful. He might have told his audience, if he wanted to instruct them, that the Third International is committed to a programme of world revolution and then perhaps its objective as well as its method would have been disowned by them.

* * *

The Split.

AS it was, the evasive speech of the President made little difference to the resolutions which the Congress adopted in the end. The resolutions for the affiliation to the League against Imperialism and to the Pan-Pacific Trade Union Secretariat, rejection of the proposal to hold an Asiatic Labour Congress, refusal to send delegations on behalf of Indian workers to the I.L.C., recognition of the Workers' Welfare League, all of which made it clear that the majority wanted to leave on the Congress the stamp of communism. In face of such resolutions it was impossible for the older leaders of the Labour movement like Mr. Joshi, Dewan Chaman Lall, Mr. Sanjiva Rao, Mr. Giri, Mr. Ernest Kirk and others to continue in the Congress any longer. They at once seceded, clearly explaining the reasons of their secession in a statement. Not only have they come out of the Congress but have decided on forming a separate body entirely free from communistic influences. The breach is very regrettable but was in the circumstances inevitable. The anxiety of the older leaders to keep divers element together is well-known, but they could not obviously allow the infant labour movement in this country to be tied to the chariot wheels of Moscow. We have no doubt that the practitioners of communism in India will not appreciate overmuch the position of isolation in which they will

now find themselves. We suspect that what they desired was that the moderate leaders should continue in the Congress, throwing the shield of their reputation before them and yet submitting to them all the time. This of course was quite impossible. The extreme wing must be prepared, if they want to take the communist road, to face the consequences of such a step. The Labour movement is now split into two sections, and when both are at work for some time workers will be in a position to decide each one where his place is. And so we hope will Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru also be able to decide. For time will certainly come when he will find it possible to come off the fence and take his stand either on one platform or the other.

* * *

Fenner Brockway.

WE publish to-day the third of the fortnightly London letters which Mr. A. Fenner Brockway, M. P., has very kindly promised to contribute to our columns. He is of course too well-known as editor of the *New Leader* till the other day to need introduction. Yet a few biographical facts regarding him may be here reproduced from the *World Tomorrow* of October last. "In 1917 he was secretary of the No-Conscription Fellowship and served a term in prison at hard labour, having appeared nine times before police courts or courts martial for war opposition. He is chairman of the No More War Movement and War Resisters' International. In 1919 he was joint secretary of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress and in 1920 joint secretary of the Prison System Inquiry Committee. He was executive secretary of the Labour and Socialist International 1926-1928 and in 1929 was fraternal delegate to the Indian Trade Union Congress and Indian National Congress. He is the author of numerous books including *Non-Co-operation*, *The Government of India*, and *A New Way with Crime*." We are sure his articles will be warmly welcomed by our readers. He is one of the most prominent of the left-wingers who will push the MacDonald Government the farthest. In a brilliant survey of the Labour Party's position Professor Harold Laski says in *Foreign Affairs* that the danger for Mr. MacDonald, who obviously has mapped out a policy of "cautious radicalism" for himself, does not consist in the opposition of Tories or Liberals, but in the revolt of the extremists among his followers. Mr. MacDonald (says Mr. Laski) "can count on five or six months of ample support from them, but after that timidity on the part of the Cabinet might easily have serious consequences in the Lobby of the House." It is of the utmost importance to have this left-wing view fully represented and we are glad to be able to provide it. It will be noticed that even this left-wing justifies the indecisive and almost evasive replies given by the Secretary of State for India on the intentions of Government in regard to India, which confirms us in our belief that the support given by Indian leaders to the Viceregal statement is fully justified.

* * *

A Review of Indian Shipping.

THE woeful plight of Indian shipping and the uneven struggle which it has to carry on against European shipping have been described by Mr. Walchand Hirachand in his address to the general meeting of the shareholders of the Scindia Steam Navigation Company. To begin with there were uneconomic rates forced on the Company by foreign interests wishing to hit it hard; along with this there was superfluous tonnage owing its existence to the same motive, the foreign companies making up their losses by larger earnings on the

monopolised routes. Mr. Walchand referred to the various irregular practices adopted by competing companies in order to divert custom from Indian shipowners. Reviewing the history since 1858 Mr. Walchand showed how the Government had taken active steps to replace Indian shipping by British shipping and how just before the Great War the British companies were contemplating measures to keep the foreigners out of the Indian waters so as to effect the reservation of the coastal trade for British ships. The wonder is that these very companies to which apparently coastal reservation was not anathema are now very actively opposing the coastal reservation for Indian shipping on various grounds, historical, legal as well as economic. There is nothing in his opinion to show that during the last decade or so the attitude of the Government of India towards an Indian mercantile marine has altered, for he believes that they have not loyally carried out the main recommendations of the Mercantile Marine Committee, although these recommendations fall far short of Indian demands. On the contrary, judging from the speeches of Sir Charles Innes in the debate on Mr. Haji's Bill he declared the attitude of the Government as positively hostile to the development of Indian shipping. As for the argument about the expropriation involved in Mr. Haji's Bill Mr. Walchand said it was surprising that this point had escaped the scrutiny of all the signatories of the report of the Mercantile Marine Committee including Sir A. Froom who represented the foreign interests. As for the contention of the custodians of foreign interests that the Australian legislation is only a piece of labour legislation perfectly irrelevant as a precedent for coastal reservation in India, Mr. Walchand quoted actual words from the report of the Royal Commission on the Australian Navigation Act which clearly indicate that the main reason which actuated the Parliament in placing the Act upon the statute book was the desire to build up the Australian Mercantile Marine.

* * *

Foreign Competition with Cotton Mills.

THE Report of Mr. Hardy who was appointed in July last to report what changes had taken place in the volume, classes of goods and the severity of competition with regard to imports of cotton piece-goods has again brought to the fore the seriousness of the Japanese competition and the necessity of effective protection. The poor progress of Indian mills is proved by the fact that 80 per cent. of the total output of goods in these mills is woven from counts 25s. and only 3 per cent. from counts over 40s. Japan's progress since the Tariff Board reported has been rapid and uninterrupted. In colour-woven goods the principal competition is from Japanese striped shirtings, twills, and coarse drills. It should be noted by the Bombay mill-owners that Bombay competes with difficulty against Ahmedabad in the line of dhoties; it appears also that Bombay is not taking care to retain its overseas markets in sheetings which have all been captured by Japan. The Japanese competition is not due to undercutting since the report says that there has been no general reduction in the price of Japanese cloth since the Tariff Board reported.

After weighing the advantages and difficulties of classification and administration Mr. Hardy decides against the substitution of specific duties for the present 'ad valorem' duties. On the basis of the facts supplied by Mr. Hardy, the Government of India have now to decide whether any higher import duties are desirable. As however every import duty imposes a greater or less sacrifice on the consumers it

must be found out how much of the increase in imports is due to the supineness of the mill-owners and their failure to put their house in order as recommended by the Tariff Board. Again if higher duties are decided upon they should be so arranged as to give protection not only against Japanese goods but against those of Lancashire and Italy as well, otherwise they would simply change the avenue of competition.

The Coming Decision on East Africa.

It is understood that the Cabinet's decision on East Africa will be taken some time before Christmas. Ordinarily we should have welcomed a prompt decision on this important question, but considering that the decision, if now taken, would be taken by Lord Passfield who next to Mr. Thomas is about the worst imperialist in the Labour Government, it would be well if a few months' delay be now interposed. It is believed that Lord Passfield is but a temporary incumbent of his office, and that he will be superseded by Mr. Hartshorn as soon as he is free from the Statutory Commission's labours. We do not of course intend to convey by this that Mr. Hartshorn would be a much better choice; that remains to be seen. But almost any other man in the Labour Party, would be better than Lord Passfield and to this extent we would gain if the decision is postponed to February or March next. In the meanwhile it is gratifying to note that sane opinion in England is rallying behind the Young Commission's Report and against the Wilson Mission's Report. For one thing it is now being realised that the latter does not merely propose some minor changes in the former, but is entirely subversive of it. No compromise is therefore possible between the two; but one of them must be entirely scrapped, the only question being which will be accorded that honour. Walter H. Moberley of the Manchester University, e. g., makes it clear in the *Manchester Guardian* of 11th November, that while the Young Report proposes the appointment of a High Commissioner "charged primarily with the duty of regulating native policy and only secondly and subordinately with the unification of certain economic services," the Wilson Report proposes that the High Commissioner should at once take in hand the co-ordination of economic services while postponing the co-ordination of native policy, and Mr. Moberley proceeds:

Whatever the merits of this (Young) proposal, it cannot be properly estimated until it is understood that it is not an instalment of the Hilton Young recommendations but is a direct negation of the primary contention of that report. According to the report closer union is only desirable, or even tolerable, if the protection of native interests is first assured, since decisions as to such matters as Railways and Customs affect vitally the native races. The Government, therefore, has now to choose between two inconsistent policies.

Will the Labour Government have the hardihood to choose a frankly native exploitation policy in favour of a native protection policy? We wonder. If they will satisfy the natives' claims, by that very act they will satisfy the Indians' claims; for both are at bottom identical.

"Expropriation" of Smaller States.

IN an article contributed to the *Nation and the Athenaeum*, of Nov. 9, Mr. G. T. Garratt, I.C.S. (retd.) refers to the question of the smaller Indian States. Of the 700 States only about a hundred exceed 500 sq. miles in extent; the others have a smaller area. Mr. Garratt writes regarding these:—"One reform which should be completed before there is any idea

of Dominion rule is the expropriation upon suitable financial terms of the many hundreds of very little States which are now complete anachronisms. Some of these are only a few square miles, and the ruler is really a landlord whose mediæval territorial rights have been given permanence by our Government. Many of them are shapeless areas lying in some district of British India with 'island' villages separated from the rest of the State. Shortly before the war it was estimated that a third of the Indian Princes were drawing incomes of less than Rs. 10,000 from their States, but there is no clear line of demarcation between Princes who are only country squires and those who are at the head of Governments ruling areas as large as England and Wales. . . . These small States are a legacy of the haphazard manner in which the Indian Empire was acquired, and we owe it to India that we should not leave the problem of the Indian States with all its present complications to be solved by a newly formed Central Government based upon an untried electorate." In a sense the problem of the smaller States is even more difficult than that of the larger, for while some sort of co-ordination is possible between the latter and British India, nothing less than the remedy suggested by Mr. Garratt, it would appear, would suffice in the case of the former.

Protecting the Indian Civil Servant!

BEING alarmed by the new political developments the All-India Association of European Servants is making an attempt to interest the British public in the case of the Civil Service in India. The Association has already submitted a memorandum to the Simon Commission in which they admit that the position occupied by the British services in India is inconsistent with the realization of the 1919 Reforms. They however point out that there is a consensus of opinion about the necessity of maintaining a large body of British officers in India for a long time to come. Now in view of a change in the constitution of India the memorandum claims adequate compensation in case the rights and privileges of civil servant guaranteed by the Act of 1919 are curtailed. This is certainly an astounding demand since in any country the Civil Service is expected to be loyal to the Government for the time being irrespective of changes in administrative forms or modifications of the constitution. The memorandum says that under the Reforms a situation is created at times which is wholly intolerable to a British Civil Servant who desires to retain his self-respect. Most probably this refers to the possibility of receiving orders from an Indian Minister or an Indian superior or receiving cold shoulder from local self-governing bodies. We would respectfully ask the civil servants who entertain such strange notions of self-respect to quit the service and India can afford to be the poorer for their renunciation. Finally the memorandum prognosticates the eventual extinction of all British Services if Parliament decides to proceed steadily along the path leading to responsible government. This is the usual stuff of the die-hard school of politicians to which India has been accustomed for the last few years. As a matter of fact we know that very few civil servants have taken advantage of the option offered to them of retiring voluntarily on proportionate pension, on the advent of the present Reforms. We do not think either that many more will retire even if responsible government becomes an accomplished fact; the unpopularity of the Civil Service is a simple myth. By the bye it is a conundrum how the Trustees are thinking of renouncing their duties.

Articles.

EXCLUSION OF STATES' PEOPLE.

IT is apparently a definitive decision which the Viceroy has now announced of excluding the people of Indian States from the proposed Round Table Conference. This need not prevent us however from examining, or rather re-examining, the reasons adduced by him for such exclusion (for we had anticipated all of them) and registering our firm protest against this action which is as unwise as unjust. We shall first turn to the injustice, for the Viceroy would almost make the Indian public believe that, in spite of all his sympathy with them, rules of constitutional morality make it impossible for him to include the people of Indian States among the States' representatives to be invited to the Conference. Is that really so? Are the inhibitions imposed by constitutional theory so stern and rigid? Let us see.

What is the Conference to do, in so far as the States are concerned? To bring about a readjustment of relations between the two parts of India? Emphatically not. The Conference is intended to do no such thing. It is only to "discuss" in what way and to what extent a readjustment is possible. And what can be the constitutional bar against a mere discussion with leaders of the people in Indian States? If there were such a bar it would operate against the people in British India as well.

But the prime object of the Conference is to consult with British Indian leaders. We do not suppose that they will be kept out of the Conference when the possibilities of readjusting the relations between British and Indian India will be considered. If they are going to be kept out then at least the Indian States' people will receive the same measure as their brethren across the borders. But if the British Indian people are admitted to the Conference while the States' people are shut out—when the States problem is under discussion—then the latter will without reason be discriminated against, which is obviously unjust.

In a preliminary discussion of which the only object is to find out the greatest common measure of agreement the people of Indian States as well as of British India can certainly participate. The final decisions will rest, in the case of the Indian States, with their rulers alone. The States' people are realist enough to understand that they cannot share in such decisions at the present time. Nor can British Indian leaders do so. The constitution under which they live gives them no voice in the determination of the question we are now considering. In this respect therefore the people in British India and Indian States occupy the same position. They have no power of deciding on or carrying out any readjustment of relations, but there is no constitutional objection to their being consulted; in fact there is every political reason for admitting them to a consultation.

We would therefore ask a plain question: are the British Indian people to be allowed to participate in the Conference only so long as the question of the internal government of British India will be discussed but asked to withdraw when the question of the Indian States comes on? If the answer to this is in the affirmative, we think Mahatma Gandhi and Pandit Nehru, who are now silent on the matter, will have something to say to it. If the answer is in the negative, we would further ask on what ground of constitutional law or practice is a differentiation to be made between them and the Indian States' people to the advantage of the former and the disadvantage of the latter?

In fact, the States' people have a far greater claim, legal as well as moral, to participation in the discussion of the States' problem at the Conference than the British Indian people. The latter can well take up an attitude of isolation and detachment from concern with the affairs of Indian States. But the former cannot. They have, as the Viceroy himself in announcing this very decision has reminded us, been guaranteed protection against gross misgovernment on the part of the Princes. This protection can only be secured by the British Government's intervention in the domestic affairs of Indian States. Will not the Princes ask at the Conference for an enlargement of the internal sovereignty which they now enjoy? Will not they ask that that the interference of the paramount power should cease? The Maharaja of Patiala only the other day suggested that the States be given *vis a vis* the Government of India not merely the internal, but also the external, sovereignty which the Dominions are now recognised to have in relation to the British Government. Such a demand is sure to be put forward at the Conference. The people of British India may possibly disinterest themselves in this; how can the people of Indian States?

A readjustment of relations implies a change in the existing situation. This change may possibly result in weakening or even removing the guarantees which the British Government have given to the people of the States. The guarantees are embodied in specific clauses in the treaties made with the Princes and are not merely to be deduced as implicit in the rights of paramountcy. They constitute obligations solemnly undertaken by the British Government in the States' people's behalf. Can the Government now renounce these obligations without the consent of the people? Can it, speaking purely constitutionally and without importing ethical considerations into the discussion, thus bargain away the interests of its trustees?

Possibly—unfortunately we cannot put it higher—possibly Government has no intention of allowing any changes in its existing relations with the Princes which will whittle away its pledges to the people. But since the Princes are sure to put forward a demand to this effect at the Conference it is but right that the people, in whose interest the pledges are given, should be afforded an opportunity to say how the proposed changes will affect them. Thus even if the British Indian people did not show

much interest in these matters the Indian States' people have a vital concern in them, and for this reason they cannot be excluded from the Conference even if the British Indian people were to be.

So much for the justice of the States' peoples' claim for separate representation at the Conference. The requirements of justice receive little attention, however, at the hands of authorities unless they happen also to be the requirements of expediency, and we wish to record here our conviction that, powerless as the Indian States' people appear at the present time, it would be highly inexpedient and politically unwise to ignore their just claims. The Princes, though theoretically all-powerful, would soon find themselves, owing to the strength which their subjects are rapidly developing, unable to implement agreements that they may arrive at with the British Government behind the backs of their subjects. If denied normal opportunities of giving vent to their opposition, the opposition will show itself in action which the British Government as responsi-

ble for the preservation of order will have cause to regret no less than the Princes themselves.

It may be said, the British rulers are quite willing to sit with their subjects at the Round Table Conference; but the Princes are not so willing. In these circumstances how can the British Government force the Princes against their will to take part in a discussion with their subjects? To such a plea our answer is simple. If the subjects of Indian States do not find admission into the Conference Chamber on account of the opposition of the Princes, let the British Government throw the responsibility for exclusion publicly on the Princes. At present it is shouldering the responsibility itself. Let it first extend an invitation to the subjects of the States along with the Princes and leave it to the latter to raise objection. Then the world will know at whose doors the blame really lies; and possibly the States' people will discover suitable means of dealing with their rulers. But it is of the utmost importance that the British Government should openly disown responsibility which does not really belong to it.

THE SINO-SOVIET CRISIS.

EVERY one interested in the effective carrying out of the Kellogg Pact will be relieved to hear that saner counsels have been prevailing and that both China and Russia have proposed to arrange a Sino-Soviet Conference with a view to restore the pre-conflict situation with regard to the Chinese Eastern Railway. The settlement of the Sino-Soviet dispute is just one of those current questions which ought to be the acid test of the peace mentality so ostentatiously proclaimed by Soviet Russia during the last few months and an amicable settlement of the dispute will assist in laying the firm foundation of the new era of peace adumbrated by the Pact. It is to be deplored that so far neither of the parties to the dispute have thought of referring the dispute to the League of Nations and get it settled through such an impartial and disinterested agency.

In order to have a proper perspective of the present crisis, it is necessary to review the history of the Russian and Chinese interests in the Chinese Eastern Railway, the proper adjudication of which has proved to be the main source of the latter day disagreements and bellicose actions. During the Great War the Allies placed the Chinese E. Railway under the control of an Inter-Allied technical board with a view to its ultimate return to those in interest without the impairing of existing rights. In 1920, subsequent to an agreement between China and the Russo-Asiatic Bank, Chinese officials took over provisionally the administration of the line, in view of the absence of a recognized government in Russia and appointed a board of ten Directors consisting of an equal number of Chinese and Russians, presided over by a nominee of the Chinese Government; this agreement also stipulated that all important posts were to be equally divided between the Chinese and the Russians. The Soviet Government denied the

title of the Russo-Asiatic Bank to represent Russian interests and put forward a claim to the Tsarist Government's rights in Chinese E. Railway. Accordingly the Sino-Soviet Agreement signed in May 1924 affirmed the following principles as governing the settlement of the railway question:—judicial and administrative matters, outside the range of purely business operations to be administered by Chinese authorities; the redemption of the Railway and its appurtenances by the Republic of China with Chinese capital; the Soviet Government being responsible for all claims of creditors incurred prior to 1917; pending the final settlement the rights of the two Governments arising out of the Agreement of September 1896 to be maintained intact and an arrangement for the provisional management of the Railway to be drawn up conjointly. Since then the policy of the Board was directed to the transference of all control in the hands of the Russian manager and the gradual modification of the joint control of the two partners with the object of the progressive substitution of the Russian influence. Most of the happenings after the signing of this Agreement have tended to widen the gulf between the two nationalities and very little has been achieved in reconciling the conflicting points of view.

One important part of the Agreement which has a noted significance in the light of recent events was the provision regarding propaganda; the two Governments mutually pledged themselves not to permit within their respective territories the existence of any organizations whose aim is to struggle against their Governments and pledge themselves not to engage in any propaganda directed against the political and social system of either party. In spite of this the Russians in Manchuria have been incessantly carrying on communist propaganda directed against capitalism and imperialism in China and documents found

in the Russian embassy in Peking, which was raided by the Chinese Government in 1927, have since been published. Another complication is that the Soviet Government concluded a separate Agreement in September 1924 in Mukden with Chang-Tso-lin the Governor, who was in open revolt against the Central Government. The question therefore has arisen whether the status of the Chinese E. Railway is governed by the Mukden Agreement or the previous one signed at Peking.

In July Chinese and Manchurian officials seized control of the telegraph systems of the Chinese E. Railway and closed down the offices of the General Trades Union and other unions and deported the General Manager of the Railway. Although the ostensible object of this and other previous raids on the Soviet Consulates in several places in May is the suppression of the communist propaganda it is believed that these actions are prompted by the long-cherished desire of the Chinese authorities to obtain complete control of the Railway and exclude the Russian influence. After this the Soviet Commissar for Foreign Affairs addressed a note to Nanking, protesting against the violation of the existing treaties, proposing the immediate summoning of a Conference to regulate all questions connected with the Chinese E. Railway and demanding a release of all arrested Russian citizens. Having failed to get a satisfactory reply, the Soviet Government addressed another note threatening the rupture of diplomatic relations. Mr. Stimson and M. Briand brought to the notice of the Chinese and Soviet representatives in New York and Paris the undesirability of going to war in contravention of the Kellogg Pact to which both China and the Soviet Republic were signatories, and both the representatives gave assurances that they intended to take no action exceeding legitimate self-defence. In August the Chinese Foreign Minister declared in an interview to the Press that with ample proofs of underground and subversive propaganda carried on by Russians, China could not possibly agree to return to the *status quo ante* as a preliminary to opening negotiations. In September the Chinese Government pointed out to the Soviet authorities the futility of their propaganda concerning the alleged ill-treatment of Russian citizens in China and assured them that the latter were absolutely free and enjoyed the protection of the Government. The irritation caused by these utterances has shown itself in continuous skirmishing and military reprisals during the last few months and it cannot be denied that both parties have violated existing treaties. Even as regards disruptive propaganda impartial observers have declared that the Chinese themselves have not observed the terms of the Agreement of 1924 having frequently encouraged the 'White' Russians within their territory to plot against the Soviet régime.

It will thus be seen that the problem is by no means simple and a mere restitution of the *status quo* before the present conflict would not lead to a final settlement. The conference which will be called now will have to reverse the preponderance of Russians in the management of the Railway and

carry into effect the equal representation of the two nationalities; the question of the jurisdiction over the telegraph system will have to be settled equitably as also the question of the land acquired by the Chinese E. Railway for purposes unconnected with railway business. On the question of the reversion of the Railway to China it is likely that the Chinese Government will demand a shorter period than 60 years from the date of the opening of the Railway fixed by the 1924 Agreement, since redemption by payment of the whole expenditure incurred up-to-date is absolutely impossible. But most of the Chinese demands cannot be satisfied without revising the original Agreement of 1896 and the recent Agreement of 1924. On the other side Russia cannot be expected to hand over complete control to China over the line which constitutes the shortest route to the ice-free port of Vladivostok. In view of the complicated nature of the problem a reference to the League of Nations will unquestionably be a better guarantee of a lasting agreement than a conference between the parties themselves. Instead of merely appealing to the League to stop Russian invasion of Chinese territory, the Chinese Government would do better to invite the League to adjudicate in the matter of the dispute about the rights and interests of the two countries in Manchuria.

MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE.

I AM very well aware that it is somewhat of a foolhardy venture for a mere man to rush in where the angels are engaged in a deadly conflict with one another at the Women's Conference in Madras. But the question of equal laws for marriage and divorce is a matter of some concern to the men also. We have, surely, a right to be heard before the controversy is finally settled.

The claim that men and women should have equal laws in respect of marriage and divorce is not such a startling proposition, although it seems to have upset the equanimity of some of the elderly dames of Madras. When I read the resolution passed by the Women's Conference I felt rather relieved. The Hindu law does not permit divorce; and numberless men are forced to go through life in the company of their ill-matched partners. The more daring sometimes marry again only to discover that the remedy is worse than the disease. Either the home is turned into a forum for the never-ending polemics and mutual recriminations of rival wives, or the husband is compelled to send away wife No. 1 on a handsome monthly pension which he could ill afford to pay. Now if the wife is given the right of divorce, I take it the husband will have the reciprocal right of parting from the wife. I am sure there are many long-suffering husbands who will be inclined to thank the Conference for putting forward a claim which the men themselves have not had the courage to advance.

The protest of the elderly ladies of Madras really amuses me. They seem to think that the proposition if carried out into law will be subversive of religion, tradition and morality. I shrewdly suspect that the motive underlying the protest is not a desire to

preserve ancient ideals and traditions, because I know at least two of the ladies concerned have broken all traditions and taken advantage of modern legislative provisions which are against the accepted rules of orthodox Hindu law. A charming and intimate friend of mine sitting by my side as I write this suggests that the objectors fear so much because they are "elderly" ladies. They say, "Look on this picture (the matrons) and then on that (mostly maids)." The Misses seem to be confident that they will be able to hold the affections of a mere man in bondage even with equal divorce laws. For one thing their youth is in their favour, and if things do not turn out very well, there will be more chances opened to them. As for the elderly matrons I do not wonder that they do not feel so safe or so confident. With advancing years they must have felt the reins slipping between their fingers, and one never knows what the vagabond affections of the brute man will do. What is worse, freedom will have come too late for them, for they are on their own showing "elderly". The significance of the protest is clear. One understands it and duly sympathises with it. But how about those husbands of elderly wives who will be only too glad to have equal laws of marriage and divorce? Is it not fair to take into account their views as well?

All this apart, does the proposal involve any serious danger to society or morality? Which is better—for a man and woman to go through life mawling each other like two bears tied to a stake, or to part from each other as friends when they find that they are not able to hit it off together? When husband and wife have established a state of war in the domestic arena, what usually happens is that the former goes out seeking and finding pleasure elsewhere; and human nature being what it is, the injured and neglected wife does very much what she likes in the limited sphere allowed to her. Supposing there are children of the union who daily witness what goes on under their very eyes, it will corrupt and demoralize them. In the interest of man and wife as well as their children it is of the utmost importance that when such an unfortunate situation has arisen there should be freedom of separation for the parties concerned.

Then, is it the idea of the elderly ladies of Madras that equality in this matter will lead to immorality and frequent divorce? Let me venture to contradict them. There is a community in Malabar and South Kanara which has no legally recognised system of marriage. In theory, men and women are free to get rid of each other when and as they choose. The result is not frequent divorce and unbridled immorality, but a state of society in which domestic happiness and conjugal fidelity are at their height. One seldom hears of women turning out their husbands for sheer wantonness and men have seldom been found to throw up their wives. The equality which both sexes enjoy is not abused; it serves as a check on the vagaries of the wife as well as the husband.

The beneficial influence of equal divorce laws has been handsomely recognised in recent legisla-

tion in Cochin and Travancore. These progressive States have passed laws giving legal validity to Nair marriages, but they have carefully provided for free divorce. I believe I am right in saying that the latter provision has seldom been called into requisition. It is not in human nature to ask for frequent changes of husbands and wives. Instinct, tradition, culture, religion, in fact every social influence is against it. But the provision is a safeguard against evils which do exist and demand a cure. It is noteworthy that among those who supported the resolution is a number of Malayali ladies. They know the practical advantages of equality in respect of marriage and divorce and it is not surprising that they desire to have it introduced among their less fortunate sisters beyond the ghats. However, I do not quite like the way the elderly ones have paraded their superiority over those from whom they differ. It argues a woeful want of good taste. The list of the latter contains names quite as respectable and honoured as those of the former.

This is what a mere man thinks. I should have been pleased to subscribe my name to this article. But the intimate friend to whom I have already referred prohibits it. And her word is law to me... the Cochin Nair Regulation and equal divorce laws notwithstanding.

FETTERED YET FREE.

Our London Letter.

PROSPECTS OF INDIAN REFORM.

THE announcement of British policy towards India has been made. What does it mean? What will be the response in India? Will it succeed in bringing about co-operation between the Indian people and the British administration? These are the questions which we are asking.

During the very unsatisfactory debate in the House of Lords, Lord Parmoor and Lord Passfield sought to emphasise that there is no change of policy. During the much more satisfactory debate in the House of Commons, Mr. Wedgwood Benn sought to emphasise that there is at any rate a definite change in the *spirit* of the policy. In his reply to Mr. Baldwin's letter this week, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald reverts to the House of Lords position.

I can imagine the uncertainty which this indefiniteness must arouse in India. Nor will the efforts of those in India who are seeking to bring about co-operation be helped by the refusal of the Government to do anything at present in regard to political prisoners. I made two suggestions to Mr. Wedgwood Benn this week in the House of Commons. The first was that political prosecutions should be limited to acts of violence or actual incitements to violence. The second was that the cases of political offenders now in Indian prisons should be reviewed, with a view to granting an amnesty compatible with the prevention of violence.

Mr. Benn was not prepared at the moment to meet either request. He acknowledged that many of the prosecutions are taking place under the very wide provisions of Clause 124 A of the Indian Penal Code, but said that the decision regarding prosecutions must be left in the hands of the authorities in India. A reply to Commander Kenworthy indicated, however, that the Secretary of State for India is considering the treatment of political offenders in prison. I think it likely that some new regulations may be issued in this respect.

Whilst the political persecution continues, it is too much to expect a wholehearted response from India. Our Indian friends can count upon continued pressure being exerted on this matter by the I.L.P. The Committee of the I.L.P. which deals with the struggle against Imperialism has decided at a meeting to-day to maintain a weekly bombardment of questions regarding prosecutions. I believe if the agitation is maintained in India, supplemented by constant activity here, we shall in time succeed. Indeed, it is impossible to expect full co-operation in India without a political amnesty, and Mr. Wedgwood Benn must be quite aware of this. In every similar struggle—Ireland is a recent example—an amnesty has proved a necessary part of the settlement.

When we turn to the wider question of the Government's intentions on Dominion Status, certain points must be borne in mind. In the first place, the Labour Party's participation in the Simon Commission makes a more definite declaration impossible until that Commission has reported. Even the indefinite pronouncement already made has been strongly criticised as an unjustifiable anticipation of the Commission's report. But India should realise that the Labour Party is absolutely committed to Dominion Status. In "Labour and the Nation," the programme adopted for the General Election at the Labour Party Conference last year, the clearest possible declaration was made for Dominion Status. At the Dominion Labour Conference held in London fifteen months ago, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald expressed the hope that India would become a Dominion within a period of months rather than years. These are indications of Labour's intentions. If the Labour Government does not maintain the promise of these statements, there will be keen disappointment within the Party here as well as in India.

But one point should be understood in India. This Parliament will not pass a Dominion Status Bill. So much has been clearly revealed by the events of the past ten days. Both the Conservative and Liberal Parties will relentlessly oppose any Dominion Status measure, and they can defeat any attempt by the Labour Government to carry it through. Until Labour has a majority there is no hope at Westminster.

This important fact in the situation must be

kept in mind in India when policy is being determined. I imagine that events will work out something like this. The Round Table Conference will not meet until next autumn. It will probably sit for six months at least. That will bring us to the summer of 1931. It is my view that we shall have an election during the autumn of 1931. I do not believe for a moment that the Opposition Parties, with their majority, will allow the Labour Government to continue much beyond then, though I think they will hesitate to defeat the Government much before then. If the Government plays its cards rightly, Labour should obtain an absolute majority at that election. Then, it seems to me, will be India's chance... But the determining factor will be not political occurrences in England but the strength of the organisation and demand in India.

A. FENNER BROCKWAY.

House of Commons,
November 14.

Our European Letter.

THE MÊLÉE

IF the reactions of London opinion to the Viceroy's statement may be said to resemble the effects of a blast, the debate on India in the Commons may be likened to a *mêlée*. The issues were indefinite, Parties were fighting each other on a question of which unanimity was supposed to exist officially, partisanship had run high within the ranks of the Opposition, and there was a great deal of meaningless hand-to-hand encounter. The debate would have almost certainly led to "demoralisation" but for one of those skilful turns of Parliamentary tactics which the Premier has lately so often displayed. Mr. MacDonald masterfully seized the occasion of Sir John Simon's plea not to complicate the complex task of the Commission by the vitiating atmosphere of Parliamentary controversies to put an end to what was obviously useless talk. Our Secretary of State showed a fine sense of confidence when he bluntly declared that, faced with Conservative and Liberal opposition to a course which the Viceroy urged, he acted in the only conceivable way in which the Government could have acted—"We Governed," and he showed a no less sense of tact when he stuck to his guns about the Viceroy's statement being taken at its face value and refused to expound or interpret it notwithstanding Mr. Lloyd George's rather monotonous volleys of questioning. India has reason to be gratified at the result of the debates in both Houses and to be grateful, but it is justifiable to remark that in neither one place nor the other was her cause fully represented. In the House of Lords, as Lord Lytton has observed a letter to the *Times*, Lord Parmoor was far from being a match to such a bully as Lord Birkenhead. In the Commons the passage at arms between Mr. Benn and Mr. George was hardly calculated to facilitate the discussion of a bold measure by a

minority Government. Fortunately there was Mr. MacDonald to intervene.

It is now commonly agreed that the "India crisis" was concocted.

"The more one looks into the so-called crisis about India, the more foolish it seems," says the *Spectator*. "Suppose that a mistake of the Government—it is arguable that there was a mistake—were pressed home and the Government chose to make the whole question one of confidence. Nobody would gain and everybody would lose by the sequel. The Government would be unnecessarily forced from office. Then either they would ask for a dissolution, which, if we may judge from the signs, would mean an assured majority for them at a General Election, or the Unionists would carry on the present policy towards India, with the lamentable difference that unanimity would have been shaken and that the policy would have been robbed of a large part of its prestige. Surely those who lightly brought into play the incalculable forces of this "crisis" cannot have looked beyond the end of their noses. Everything has been distorted, either for the sake, we may suppose, of injuring the Government, or for the sake of injuring Mr. Baldwin."

It would serve no useful purpose to go into the origins of this crisis beyond noticing that Lord Reading's conduct as well as Mr. Lloyd George's should leave no doubt about the nature of the whole affair. That there should be elements, and vociferous elements, within the Tory ranks marked by a pronounced hostility towards India is comprehensible; pride as well as self-interest could be made to explain it; and of all the accidents which tended to make the present occasion a happy coincidence from India's point of view, none was so fortunate as the character of our Viceroy. But who would have expected British Liberals to have taken up such a position in this matter? The *Manchester Guardian's* editorial in this connection reads strangely unlike previous observations of this nature, and not the least laughable aspect of the situation was the striking metamorphosis which had come over the *Times* and the *Guardian* with regard to the situation in India. Mr. George said something about the Liberals of yesterday becoming the extremists of to-day in India, but even should this be true their achievement would fall far short of this.

Much may be explained by Mr. Lloyd George's pique—the Commons debate made it quite clear that he was affected by Mr. Bann's anxiety to consult Mr. Baldwin about the India policy without showing equal concern for his opinion—but pique alone may not explain the Liberal attitude. Liberalism, as Prof. Spear has pointed out in the first of a series of articles on Democracy in these columns, is the product of the nineteenth century British political idealism, and, as Mr. Delisle Burns says in his new book on Democracy, almost all of its programme has been accomplished in Britain. The British Liberals find it difficult to realise that the spirit of Democracy in different countries and at different times must create for itself an embodiment in accordance with the general context of social conditions and philosophical outlook from which it emerged. They ignore that for Liberalism to be true it need always be a true imitation of British Liberalism as they have known it. Consequently in their calculations of Indian self-government, except of course in time of war, they are

always hampered by considerations which, as a matter of fact, have never yet existed in the Dominions and never shall exist again in Great Britain itself.

Be that as it may, these are definite gains from recent happenings. The breakdown in the unanimity of British political Parties concerning Indian policy—almost the last principal item in the programme before the country to be brought into the region of controversy—would, it may be hoped, change the character of Parliamentary rule from administration through a mechanical bureaucracy to an intelligent deliberation and decision about the fortunes of a great country and a great connection. Of such a definite break with the past we have ample assurance in Mr. Bann's pointed declaration about the abandonment of Lord Birkenhead's methods and in the necessity in which the Political Correspondent of the *Times* found himself to refer to the attitude which the ex-Secretary of State assumed as "irresponsible" and that of a "free lance". Not so very long ago, after a visit to London and the Hague, I had occasion to refer in this correspondence to a change of angle of vision on the part of the British people with regard to India and the Empire, due to diverse considerations. No one could have foreseen that that change would be tested and confirmed so soon, and although those of our countrymen who expect a dramatic or metaphysical change in British policy are foredoomed to disappointment the salutary effects of a vital interest in India on the part of British politicians cannot be minimised.

The Viceroy's statement which in many ways has been a challenge on the part of local authority against officious interference, taken together with the support given to it by the European Association, may well be considered the beginning of the identification of Europeans in India with the country's interests which we have urged so long. All nationalists who have some notion of political sanity will not be slow to realise the value of annexing in their struggle the forces of local self-government which forms an essential part of Anglo-Saxon political idealism and will not be deterred by racial prejudices. In the next few years at any rate, while we must insist on Indians representing our Government in such of our foreign affairs as relations with the League and so on, we might well let Britishers whose interests are identified with India's to assert their claims against the authority of their countrymen at home, taking care, however, not to give rise to a community of settlers as in Africa, for practical psychology is the most important factor in international relations. It would be far more easy for people of the same race and minds to come to an understanding.

Finally, the history of the Jews should be a warning to us of the danger of cultivating an exclusive national temperament based on the discipline of non-co-operation. Whatever may be said of the virtues of this form of struggle for independence, its one effect is to encourage the non-political habit of mind. No Indian who wishes his country to take an honourable part in the life of

nations can but rejoice in every change that eradicates the non-co-operation habit.

Geneva, November 12.

Reviews.

EARLIEST SOCIAL HISTORY OF INDIA.

SOME ASPECTS OF THE EARLIEST SOCIAL HISTORY OF INDIA. (PRE-BUDDHISTIC AGES.) By S. C. SARKAR. (Oxford University Press.) 1928. 25cm. 225p.

THIS book is the dissertation submitted by the author for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the University of Oxford; and it is intended to be regarded as a companion volume to Mr. F. E. Pargiter's *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition* (Oxford, 1922), which seeks to determine the political history of India from the earliest times to the seventh century B.C., based on an examination of Pauranic and epic tradition as well as of the Rig Veda and Vedic literature. Dr. Sarkar attempts to picture some aspects of the social history of this period on the basis of an exhaustive examination of Vedic, Brahmanic and Pauranic literature, unaffected by preconceived ideas which are largely based on the Veda and Vedic literature, excluding historical material to a large extent. Mr. Pargiter has stressed the distinction between Kshatriya and Brahmanic tradition which must have existed from the earliest times and cautioned that Vedic literature not only lacks the historical sense, but is not always to be trusted in matters that concerned Brahmanical claims and pretensions. He has been however careful to point out that historical tradition in the Vedic literature has one great merit over that in the epics and the Puranas, inasmuch as it has been most carefully preserved, which is certainly not the case with the latter; but he insists that the Kshatriya tales found in the Puranas, belonged to the ancient body of tradition prior to the composition of the Puranas and were subsequently taken over by the Pauranic Brahmans and modified. Like Mr. Pargiter, our author has derived from the Puranas many startling facts and suggestions which are bound to evoke a quantity of warm controversy but which at the same time try to shed some light by means of secular tradition of the Epics and the Puranas on the history of the Vedic period.

The first part of the book deals with the material life of the early Aryans, their household furniture, dress, costumes, architecture, village activities and industries. In these he has displayed great industry and powers of analysis and classification and thrown interesting and useful side-lights on the social and economic condition of the people. He explains the various types of *sabha* which must have been early divided into several correlated institutions. He rejects the view held by Zimmer and others that Vedic India was a land of villages and hamlets only and holds that the Vedic Indians, like the Iranians, Hellenes and Italians, were superimposed upon an earlier civilisation which was probably of the same type as well as of cognate origin and that the recent discove-

ries of the Indus valley sites would be found to corroborate literary evidences on which he himself proceeds. Apart from many interesting topics like the meaning and origin of *pur*, *pura*, *nagara* etc., Dr Sarkar brings our attention to bear on the different styles of architecture, deltaic, sub-montane and plain (*i.e.* riparian). One style is associated with Brahmanism and the *Manva* regions; another with the *Vratyas* and the *Māgadhās* and a third with the *Ailās*, brought into the plains from the Mongoloid mountainous areas they passed through or came in contact with. Stressing on the ethnic and historical significance of such indications, he would agree with Mr. Pargiter in concluding that the Aila dominant stock in Hindustan supplied the Kshatriya class and spread down to Vidarbha with the exception of the three *Manva* kingdoms of Ayodya, Videha and Vaisali. "What we call the Aryan race is what Indian tradition calls the Aila race, and so Aila = Aryan." (Pargiter, *A.I.H.T.*, p. 295). The *Manva* stock would naturally declare itself to be Dravidian; and tradition would indicate that the *Ailās* entered India from the mid-Himalayan region and there is no support for any migration from the north-west. The evidence of inscriptions discovered at Boghazkwei is that the folk of the Mitanni worshipped Aryan gods about 1400 B.C. The Iranians might very well have been an offshoot from India; and the linguistic and religious differences of Iran may be explained quite as well in this way as in any other.

The second part of the book is even more startling in some of its conclusions, particularly those which bear on sex-relations and the status of women. The practice of sister-marriage seems to be supported by strong evidence. The use of the metonymics can be regarded as a survival of earlier conditions. The practice of *niyoga* might be "a later special case of an earlier general practice". But side by side with polygamy and laxity, monogamy is approved in the Rig Veda as an ideal. Intermarriages between the several *varnas* was easier; and restrictions on *sagotra* and *sapinda* marriages were far less rigid. According to tradition sister marriage continued far down after the Bharata age; while we find the same feature in the fragments of non-Puranised tradition embodied in the Buddhist texts. Our author would say that the trans-Indus peoples were originally Aila that migrated thither from *Madhya-desa* from time to time; and the more easterly sections of them again and again returned to India. This interpretation of Puranic tradition would help one "in viewing the so-called Iranian influences in their proper perspective." Thus Persian influences which prevailed in Taxila and Gandhara would be mainly "reversions to, or modifications of, those common features of Indo-Iranian (*i.e.* early Aila) culture, which may have been retained longer or specially developed in the Iranian sections." The prevalence of parental incest is supported by Vedic evidence. Sister-marriages in this period were more patriarchal and more definitely connected with polygamy than with polyandry; but polyandry was not altogether un-Vedic; and it seems to have continued longer among certain priestly sections, among whom.

metonymics were largely used; it continued as a well-known institution in the post-Mauryan age among some communities in the western sub-Himalayan regions. Niyoga goes hand in hand with widow remarriage and brother-in-law marriage; while there is no *sati* of Brahmans known to tradition; the earlier references to widow-burning belong to the Manva group; and this feature occurs only later among the Yadavas and the Pauravas.

The foregoing features and others so well documented and explained should raise a storm in orthodox circles; and opposition to them is expressed even by a deep and critical scholar like Winternitz who, in the foreword, doubts whether Dr. Sarkar's conclusions will stand the test of criticism and of the progress of further research. Possibly these suggestions regarding the Ailas and the sexual institutions of the Bharata age seem to us to be so unnatural and startling, as well as the point maintained by the author that the niyoga and other practices were much encouraged by the priestly classes.

Dr. Sarkar is a close pupil of Mr. Pargiter regarding the origin of the Ailas and the reverse origin of the Iranians; the conclusions that he has put forward, though tentative, have all the force of freshness and independence of preconceived ideas and accepted conclusions; they present the social conditions of the Bharata age in new connections and in a new light. For this contribution the world of Indian scholarship should be thankful to the author, who is Professor in Patna College.

C. S. SRINIVASACHARI.

THE UNITARIAN MOVEMENT.

OUR UNITARIAN HERITAGE. By EARL MORSE WIBBUR. (The Beacon Press, Boston.) 21cm. 495p. \$2'00.

THE book, though primarily designed for the use of the young in the highest forms of the Sunday School classes in Unitarian Churches, can be used very profitably by adult students who want to acquaint themselves with the history of Unitarianism as developed in Christendom in its broadest aspects through the post-Christian ages beginning with the New Testament times.

It is written in a cold and clear-cut style and without the slightest trace of emotionalism so characteristic of New England Unitarians. As the product of twenty years' labour on the part of its author, who is President of the Pacific Unitarian School for the Ministry, Bexley, California, the book may be described as his *magnum opus* and will surely give him a place of honour in that group of Church historians who specialize in the art of writing the story of a denomination or a communion from the inside. The only work which can lay any claim to being its rival is that by the late J. H. Allen. But since its publication forty years ago so much valuable material has been brought to light that a book like that written by Dr. Wilbur will surely meet the scholar's need for accuracy of fact and exactness of statement. We are glad that for the first time so much valuable and interesting material from many

new sources has been placed before the English-knowing reading public.

"Unitarianism, considered as the doctrine of the Unity of Godhead, is older than Christianity." But in the course of centuries of Christian Church history, it has acquired a specific meaning with references to the doctrinal controversy around the Trinity, the Deity of Jesus, the Atonement, etc. "Our Unitarian Heritage" describes the panoramic progress of the theological controversies which culminated in adding a new denomination to the already sect-ridden Christendom. It is interesting to note, as in the case of the members of the Brahma Samaj who still claim to be true Hindus, the majority of the Unitarians of the present day claim to be true Christians, though the orthodox consider them worse than pagans or heathens. Without making any reference to the present day attitude of the Fundamentalists (the extreme orthodox) and the Modernists (amongst whom may be counted many liberal orthodox) towards the Unitarians, our author leads us through chapters on the History of Christianity before Unitarianism, the Pioneers of Unitarianism in Europe, the Development of Unitarianism in Poland, Transylvania, England and last, though not least, in his own America. The history of the pioneers of the free faith is full of inspiration to all seekers after spiritual truth in which freedom of belief and freedom of worship play important parts. Unitarian history has not been without its martyrs and the records of the deeds of Adam Duff, Edward Wightman, Michael Servetus, John Ridley and many others will fill the pages of the Martyrology of this free faith. The present book has placed at the disposal of the reader a systematic account of the martyrdom of the pioneers.

Inasmuch as the approach of the present work is historical, the personal element in the religious experiences of the great heroes of Unitarianism has been kept in the background and attempts have been made to follow the historical trend throughout the four hundred and seventy-six pages of reading matter. The interesting character of the book has not suffered in the least owing to this mode of treatment. In fact, the simple and direct style employed by the author will, it is hoped, serve as an example to authors who write for young people.

The book has a list of important dates in Unitarian history which will enable readers to discover at a glance the high spots in Unitarian history. In the Appendix are to be found the three historic creeds of Christendom (the Apostles' creed, the Nicene creed, and the Athanasian creed). To all students of Christian theology and church history they are of immense significance inasmuch as they represent man's attempt to express through the medium of language something which cannot be adequately expressed. The Trinitarian Controversy (as opposed to the Unitarian) has always veered round these creeds.

The Unitarian Church is creedless. Unitarians are in agreement as to the five points of their faith which offer them a platform to unite. They are: (1) the Fatherhood of God (2) the Brotherhood of

Man (3) The Leadership of Jesus (4) Salvation by Character (5) Progress of Man onward and upward for ever. In England the Church has developed out of the Presbyterian body whereas in the United States it is Congregational in Church Government. In England at the time of Joseph Priestly, the discoverer of oxygen, the denial of the Trinity amounted to blasphemy. It was not until 1813 that the Unitarians were placed on a level with the Dissenters. The history of English Unitarianism has been very well described by Dr. Wilbur in the course of seven chapters. Very seldom does one come across such a well written account of the rise and growth of a denomination which claims among its adherents or members such noted Englishmen as John Milton, John Locke, Theophilus Lindsay, John Bidle, Joseph Priestly, Sir Charles Lyall, Sir William Jones, Josiah Wedgwood, W. S. Jevons, David Ricardo, Florence Nightingale, Mary Carpenter, John Pounds, Maria Wedgeworth, and, in our own times, James Martineau, James Drummond, Estlin Carpenter, P. H. Wicksteed, and L. P. Jacks.

Notwithstanding all the good features of the book, it is to be regretted that the author has completely ignored the new tendency to study the history of a religion or a Church as a study in social origins as shown by Prof. Case in his "Social Origins of Christianity." In his treatment of Unitarianism in America, the author has not done justice (as it appears to the present reviewer) to the social implications of Unitarianism, as seen by the social radicals of the type of Theodore Parker. Perhaps it is due to his doctrinal and exclusively theological interest in the march of historical events. The author has not mentioned the new developments towards a growing Humanism in the body of present day Unitarian ministers and workers. In fact, the section devoted to developments in America has not reached the high watermark as that of "Unitarianism in America" by G. W. Cooke. The book would have been a well-rounded one, if it had contained a bibliography at the end which might have offered inducement to young people for further study in this field.

P. K. SEN.

SHORT NOTICE.

SADHANA CHIKITSA. By V. S. BENDRE. 1928. 314p. Rs. 3-8-0.

THIS is a critical appreciation in Marathi of the historical material for Shivaji period, and the work forms the 7th number of the Bharat Itihasa Sanshodhak Mandal's "Puraskrit" series. During the last 150 years, from Orme and Grant Duff down to Jadunath Sarkar, English material bearing on Shivaji period has engaged the attention of English readers. But during the last 40 years Marathi, Persian, Dutch and Portuguese sources have been more systematically tapped and so much material has been published that an attempt at enumeration and classification has become a necessity. Standard works in English or French on historical criticism prove of very little avail, the problems that face a researcher dealing with Marathi material being of an entirely different

nature from theirs. Mr. Bendre, therefore, is right in putting forward his classification of the material, which is based on his experience for the last 12 years in the Bharat Itihasa Sanshodhak Mandal. He has reviewed the whole material and given very useful hints and suggestions. And although it is not a regular treatise on historical criticism it places conveniently before the reader in a handy volume his notes in 51 paragraphs. The subject could have been dealt with in a more logical manner by dividing the work in welldefined separate chapters.

R. P.

Notice to Minor Defendant & Guardian.

(O. 32, R. 3.)

In the Court of the Munsif of Mahaban at Muttra.

Suit No. 138 of 1929.

Suja Ram s/o Mohanlal, Vaish, resident of Mauza Tatrauta, Pergana Mahaban, Dist. Muttra.—*Plaintiff.*

Versus

Jagannath aged about 17 years minor s/o Udey Ram, under guardianship of Mst. Naraini his mother, by caste Brahman, resident of M. Lahrauli, Pergana Sadabad, Dt. Muttra at present residing at Bholeshwar Chakla, Lalbaba ka Mandir, Narhauli walon ki Kothi at Bombay.—*Defendant.*

To Jagannath aforesaid—

Whereas an application has been presented on the part of the plff. in the above suit for the appointment of a guardian for the suit to the minor defendant, you the said minor and you Mst. Naraini are hereby required to take notice that unless, within seven days from the service upon you of this notice, an application is made to this court for the appointment of you or of some friend of you, the minor, to act as guardian for the suit, the court will proceed to appoint some other person to act as a guardian to the minor for the purpose of the said suit.

Given under my hand and the seal of the Court, this 23rd day of November 1929.

(Sd.) BENI MADHO,

Munasarim,

for Munsif.

CURE FOR DEAFNESS.

FINE OLD REMEDY.

THE wonderful curative power possessed by many old herbs has never been surpassed by modern treatment, and one of the most important of these old-fashioned remedies is the "AURAL HERB COMPOUND," which has been found remarkably successful in cases of nasal catarrh, noises in the head and deafness. Severe and long-standing cases, which had resisted all modern remedies, have been quickly and permanently cured by this old herbal preparation. Recommended with the utmost confidence. Price Rs. 4 per tin, post free, direct from

AURAL MEDICATION Co.,
160 Birkbeck Road, Beckenham, England.,