

The Servant of India

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

VOL. XII, No. 49. }

POONA—THURSDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1929.

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

CONTENTS.

	Page.
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	599
ARTICLES :—	
The Nagpur Split and After. By R. R. Bakhale ...	591
Change of Overlordship.	592
REVIEWS :—	
French Imperialism. By O. L. Marion, LL. D. ...	595
Japan and the U. S. By N. Kasturi, M. A., B. L. ...	596
The German Constitution. By Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyer, K. O. S. I.	597
Asquith's Reminiscences. By M. V. Subrahmanyam, M. A., L. T.	598
Short Notices	599
Books Received	600

Topics of the Week.

Mr. Jayakar's Untouchability Bill.

IN view of the legal difficulties experienced by several trustees of Hindu temples in giving practical effect to their resolution to admit untouchables to the shrines in their charge every one interested in establishing social equality will welcome the Bill which Mr. Jayakar proposes to move at the next session of the Assembly. The statement of objects and reasons attached to the Bill explains how British Indian adjudication respecting Hindu usages has tended to confirm the custom of excluding untouchable classes from participating in the benefits of endowments which have created temples and other institutions for the general benefit of persons professing the Hindu religion. In particular the statement refers to a ruling of the Privy Council which obligates the trustees of Hindu religious endowments to follow the ancient custom. The worst of it is that it is difficult to obtain by legal decision a variation of the custom which injures the self-respect of those classes and deprives them of the benefits of association with other sections of the Hindus. The Bill not only tackles the problem of temple-entry but in the latter part of section 4 removes the disabilities of the untouchables in regard to the use of public wells and public services which are licensed for the use of the general public. The preamble makes clear what every reflecting Indian has thought out and felt all these years that the relieving of the disabilities imposed on the untouchables by the impurity imputed to them by usage and custom will tend to the promotion of public welfare and the solidarity of the Hindu community. The Bill when it passes into law will remove a great

impediment in the way of trustees of temples who are sincere in their desire to admit all Hindus to them irrespective of caste; as for those who are unwilling to admit the untouchables they will simply be compelled to do so in virtue of the legislation. The problem which has been brought into great prominence by recent acts of satyagraha will thus be much nearer the point of solution after the passing of this measure. Far from such a piece of legislation being premature, one is rather inclined to think that it should have been placed on the statute-book long ago.

* * *

A Conference about the Cotton Industry.

THE Conference that is arranged to take place during the next week between the Finance and Commerce Members of the Government of India and the Cotton mill-owners from all parts of India will give the latter a splendid opportunity to put forward their views not only on the causes of the present breakdown of the industry but also on the advisability of a change in the tariff on imported cloth. The Conference will discuss matters touched by the Bombay mill-owners deputation to the Viceroy in June last as well as other cognate matters dealing with the industry in general; it is even hinted that the question of Imperial Preference might be touched at the Conference and the possibility of levying higher import duties on goods hailing from countries outside the Empire considered. Mr. Hardy's report has conclusively proved the severity of the competition from Japanese goods in various lines and although the consideration of the question whether protection is to be given to the Indian industry was beyond his purview, the Conference will be called upon to deal with it seriously. In his address to the Maharashtra Merchants' Conference Mr. Birla has already suggested the levying of an additional duty of 9 per cent. on all imported cloth but in the same address he has emphasized the real function of capitalists as servants of society and not as exploiters for the sake of personal profit. The mill-owners owe it to the public that in case the industry is protected by a higher tariff they would be more mindful of the interests of labour than they have hitherto shown themselves to be; otherwise the higher duties will simply mean greater supineness and greater indifference to the interests of men in their charge. Further the public has a right to demand what attempts have been made by the owners to effect economies in the management of the mills except abortive proposals for wage-cutting.

One of the primary duties of the Conference will thus be to elicit assurances from the owners about a living wage and about decent conditions of living. Without these assurances protection to mill industry will only be a one-side measure of relief.

* * *

The Rupee Tender for Stores Purchase.

THE Resolution issued by the Government in connection with the rupee tender system for the purchase of Indian stores ought to be welcomed as an admission of Indian demands, however belated. Already the branch office of the firm of consulting engineers to the High Commissioner for India has been opened in Calcutta for the purpose of giving advice about tenders received for the supply of stores, and in connection with the preparation of technical projects. The Government of India, while declaring that the freedom enjoyed by provincial and local administrations would not be interfered with, suggest the utilization by them of the services of the branch office for various advice in connection with the purchase of stores. All references in respect of projects are to be made through the Industries Department of the Government of India. The services of this branch office can be availed of by the provincial governments and local bodies without payment for the present; but the Government of India propose later on to examine the question of the fees to be paid to the consulting engineers and devise a system of recovering the cost of this arrangement, from the administrations benefitting by their advice and other services. The sterling tender system has led to a systematic neglect of Indian industries and given a practical monopoly to British industrialists who were nearer the spot and could settle contracts far more expeditiously than foreign firms could. The principal effect of the substitution of the rupee tender system for the present system, however, to which the Indians are looking forward, is that it will afford facilities for indigenous firms to undertake the supply of stores and if the system is worked on sound lines it may even usher new concerns into existence. When Britishers talk glibly about the absence or paucity of engineering firms in India they fail to remember that everything in India has so far conspired to discourage their existence and the odds against Indian enterprise have been too heavy. It is doubtful however if the Local Governments would of their own accord encourage the indigenous industry and select stores locally, as far as possible, and it will be one of the most important duties of Legislative Councils to keep them up to the mark and prevent their lapsing into old ways by frequent ventilation of stores purchase transactions.

* * *

The Indian Medical Council.

THE Legislative Assembly having turned down the proposal to appoint a Medical Adviser to determine medical standards in India the General Medical Council in Great Britain has threatened to withhold recognition of the Indian degrees. One of the grounds of this withholding of recognition is the low level of the knowledge of midwifery of the Indian medical men and in this connection it may be noted that the same failing is leniently treated when displayed in the medical institutions of the United Kingdom. This aspect of the matter has been brought out very prominently by Dr. Jivraj N. Mehta in a letter to the *Times of India*; he has quoted ample authorities to show how the recommendations of the General Medical Council have been completely ignored by several medical schools and examining bodies. Dr. Berkeley for instance in a recent address delivered in Dublin declared that there was no evidence to show that those who had passed the examination possessed the required knowledge and skill

for the practice of midwifery. Dr. Mehta has emphasized the fact that the Medical Council did not withhold recognition from the various bodies in the United Kingdom who have persistently ignored its regulations and refused to make up their deficiencies. The fact of the matter is that the General Medical Council is chagrined at the weakening hold of the I.M.S. in this country and it is anxious that medical education in India should be completely dominated by it in order to make up for the imminent Indianisation of that service. Indians do not relish the dictation of a far-off body and for this reason they have been demanding the inauguration of an Indian Medical Council. As for the bugbear of midwifery we wonder why something could not be done in India to raise the standard in that subject. We regret to observe that the whole discussion of this subject is vitiated by race prejudice and a hostile attitude towards Indianisation displayed by British medical men.

* * *

The Madras Muslim Conference.

WE have repeatedly urged on those who took part in the All-Parties Conference to seek further contact with the Muslims in order to consider rational objections to the Nehru Report and to arrive at further compromises with regard to minority rights. This has not been done and the remissness of the signatories of the Nehru Report is now bearing fruit in the widening cleavage between the Hindus and the Muslims. A recent evidence of this is given by the Madras Presidency Muslims' Conference, the proceedings of which are extremely disheartening to any one who is intent on securing unity and good-will between the two communities. Mr. Shafee Dawoodi in his presidential address drew a picture of a domination by a group of Hindu leaders, who forced their views on the Congress as well as on the British Parliament and who had a firm hold on the administration of the country and vested interests in every department of the Government, which is certainly a highly coloured picture. If the caste Hindus, as Mr. Dawoodi said, increased their influence in the affairs of State it was because they were first in the field of education while their Muslim brethren neglected it woefully. Throughout his address Mr. Dawoodi was inveighing against a Hindu oligarchy which the Government were trying to conciliate at the expense of the Muslims. Nothing can be further from the truth; the Hindus have no desire to adopt anything but a democratic constitution which will give due weight to all elements of the population in proportion to their numbers, and the Nehru Report against which Mr. Dawoodi seems to be strongly biassed is far from recommending an oligarchic system. Mr. Dawoodi harks back to the Delhi Conference resolutions which by making excessive demands on the part of Muslims has widened the breach. One of the most ill-advised resolutions proposed at the Conference urged the organisation of one single Muslim party with powers to nominate its own candidates for election to the various legislatures and public bodies in order that only such persons as are true representatives of the Muslim point of view may be returned. After working for nearly half a century in the direction of nationalism this is certainly a retrograde move since it would curtail the right of an individual Muslim to join political parties based on some principle and force him into a procrustean bed of communal interests. The Conference must be congratulated on showing the good sense of throwing out the resolution in spite of the strong advocacy of the president. We would earnestly appeal to the signatories of the Nehru Report to convene a joint Conference with a view to minimize the differences between the two communities.

Articles.

THE NAGPUR SPLIT AND AFTER.

"The dissatisfaction at the practical achievement of Geneva is growing. Geneva itself has created expectations in the hearts of the workers of the world which still remain to be even partially fulfilled. Moreover, the influence of Geneva is not the only influence which is affecting the imagination of the workers of the world, particularly those of the East. There is the other influence centred in Moscow, differing from Geneva in ideals and methods, which is making a strong appeal to their imagination by the grandeur of its promise. We must, therefore, seriously consider whether the results achieved so far by this (I. L.) Organisation are adequate to satisfy the workers and to strengthen the lines of peaceful and evolutionary progress. The "just and humane conditions of work" are still a far-off ideal. Ignorance promotes pathetic contentment, if left undisturbed. But hearts and imaginations having once been touched, it is dangerous to ignore the discontent. It is futile to argue that the translation of ideals into actuality is a slow progress. The slowness of evolution makes the revolution attractive. The workers of Asia and Africa will not wait for many decades to achieve what the European workers may have achieved in a century. Evolution must, therefore, be sufficiently fast and sufficiently substantial for its own safety. If the workers of these regions are to be satisfied merely by Geneva ideals being dangled before them and by very tardy and insignificant action, we shall not be justified in blaming them if they cannot resist the attraction of the grand, though unrealisable, promises of Moscow and what it represents. It is true that the results will be calamitous; but Geneva will not be able to absolve itself of its share of blame."—N. M. JOSHI at I.L.O., Geneva.

IN less than six months after these grave and prophetic words were uttered, the All-India Trade Union Congress at its 10th session cut itself off from its old moorings and took its position, in the labour world, which is far removed from Geneva, its ideals and methods and which approximates to the ideals and methods generally and commonly associated with Moscow. No connection in any shape or form with the International Labour Conference held under the auspices of the League of Nations; boycott of the Whitley Commission appointed by the foreign Imperialist Government for the purpose of "stabilising and perpetuating the exploitation of the Indian workers and peasants"; declaration of Indian Independence and establishment of the Socialist Republican Government of the working classes; condemnation of the *bourgeois* Nehru Report; affiliation with the League against Imperialism; recognition of the Workers' Welfare League of India (of which Mr. Shapurjee Saklatwala is the Indian Secretary) as Indian labour's representative in Great Britain; affiliation (and a subsequent postponement of it, mark, only a *postponement*) with the Pan-Pacific Trade Union Secretariat, a Moscow organisation every inch of it; prospective affiliation with the Third International; such were the decisions taken and declarations made at Nagpur in the midst of cries like "Long Live Revolution", "Remember your Comrades in Meerut Jail", "Down with Imperialism", "Down with Joshi and Chamanlal", &c.

Indeed the Nagpur session marks the close of the first, and the beginning of the second, chapter in the history of the Trade Union Movement in India.

Looking back to the period of the last nine years during which the trade union movement took an organised shape and developed, the pioneers of the movement and the organisers, of the Congress can take legitimate credit for the progress made and the achievements secured. After the wave of enthusiasm receded on the termination of the first session of the Congress in 1920, there was for some time a comparative lull in the organised activities of the workers, although the annual Congress sessions continued to be held almost every year. At the sixth session of the Congress, the General Secretary reported that there were only eight unions with a membership of a few thousand duly affiliated to the Congress. At the tenth session, the register of the affiliated unions stood at 62, of which the credentials of 51 unions with 189,436 membership were accepted. In 1924-25 Messrs. Ginwala and N. M. Joshi, the then General Secretaries, began their work without any balance from previous sessions and without previous record. Today, Mr. Joshi hands over the charge of the Congress with a balance of between Rs. 3000 to 4000, with a complete and up-to-date record, with provincial organisations of the Congress in five out of nine provinces and with an honourable position for it both in the national and international world. The Congress to-day possesses a modest monthly journal, the *All-India Trade Union Bulletin*, which has been chronicling the trade union activities in this country since July 1924. A "Directory of Trade Union Literature on Indian Labour" and a few other pamphlets stand to the credit of the Congress. In the field of labour legislation that has taken place since 1921, the pressure of the organised strength of the movement on the Government is not insignificant. In the International world of labour, Indian workers' delegations have made a name, enhanced the reputation of their country and created a respect for the Indian workers and their movement. No delegation from any country has championed the cause of the coloured workers of the world with such patience and tenacity as did the Indian Workers' delegations. In the British Commonwealth Labour Conference, the Indian delegates secured, for the first time, the support of its constituent bodies, including the British Labour Party and the Trades Union Congress, to India's demand for the immediate grant of self-government. The high prestige of some of the officials of the Congress, particularly Mr. Joshi's, brought in during the last five years over Rs. 150,000 from foreign labour movements either for the purpose of organisation or for relief operations during strikes and lock-outs. This is a record of work in which any organisation or any set of men can take legitimate pride. It is not without a wrench that the pioneers of the movement now feel constrained to sever their connection with an organisation with such achievements behind its back. But the future of the cause is a matter of greater concern to them than its past achievements.

In spite of this record of work, it cannot be denied that so far as the working conditions and standard of life of the workers are concerned, very little change for the better has taken place during the last nine years. Evils arising out of the systems of recruitment, long hours, low wages, fines, indebtedness, absence of leave, dismissals and victimization, etc. are still there, perhaps in an aggravated form and the volume of discontent has increased out of all proportion. Strikes and lock-outs are on the increase causing untold misery to the workers and paralysing the industries. The Government and the capitalist-class are on the whole more responsible for this unfortunate state of affairs than the workers. If only the former had given prompt effect to the Geneva Conventions and Recommendations and the latter had shown a little breadth of vision in allowing the *bona fide* trade unions to function on purely trade union lines, the Communist doctrines would not have appealed to the workers to the extent to which they have done today and the situation would not have been so menacing. But they failed to take a long view and not only allowed themselves to drift but passed some pieces of repressive legislation which only added fuel to the fire and made the work of the *bona fide* trade unionists extremely difficult. Repression is no cure for extremism, anarchy or communism. It may for the moment check its growth; but the reaction that follows becomes even more dangerous in the sense that it produces new symptoms which it may be found impossible either to check or cure. Reactionary policy and rank conservatism produce extremism and communism; and the latter can disappear only when the former are changed for a liberal policy and broad vision. The present unsatisfactory political situation

has added not a little to the difficulties in the industrial field. It is now recognised that political advance is not possible and sustainable without the support of the masses; and some of our politicians have found out that the workers and peasants cannot be won over and used in the political struggle without dangling before them the Communist Utopia. Extremism plays this game well and there it is.

What of the future? It is dark and ominous. But it can still be changed only if the sane and advanced elements in the country combine and bring pressure on the Government and capitalists to cast off their conservative and reactionary policy and compel them to put the workers on the plane of humanity. So far as the non-Communist trade unionists are concerned, their path and duty are clear. They cannot have anything in common with the Communists. They propose to carry on their work independently of and in opposition to the Communists. Parallel organisations of the industrial workers on trade union and Communist lines are inevitable for some time. Merging or amalgamation can come only when the one or the other is defeated in a fair fight. The ideal of the trade unionists is an all-round improvement of the working classes; their policy will be the same as before, bold and even aggressive; and their methods constitutional and democratic. Their success or defeat will determine the future history of the trade union movement in India. The Government, the capitalists and the public are on their trial. Will they show statesmanship betimes or will they betray the workers and drive them into the arms of Communism?

R. R. BAKHALE.

CHANGE OF OVERLORDSHIP.

PROFESSOR BERRIEDALE KEITH was, we believe, the first amongst the leading constitutional writers who maintained that it was constitutionally impossible for the Imperial Government to hand over, without the consent of the Princes, the control now exercised by it over the Indian States to a responsible government when this comes to be established in India. He put forward this contention in his *Constitution, Administration and Laws of the Empire* (written in 1924), in which he said: "The relations of the Native States . . . are essentially relations with the British Crown, and not without the Indian Government. . . . It is clear that it is not possible for the Crown to transfer its rights under treaty without the assent of the Native States to the Government of India under responsible government." The Princes naturally found this argument very serviceable and, adopting it with eagerness, they put it forth with great vehemence. It will be seen that Professor Keith adduces only one reason to support his conclusion, viz. that the relations of the States are directly with the Crown. It was not very difficult for British Indian publicists, after it had become a live issue by reason of the Princes raising this formidable-looking objection to the conferment of self-

governing powers on British India, to show, first, that the premiss itself was incorrect, and, secondly, that even if it were correct, Professor Keith's conclusion did not flow therefrom. Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyer did this in masterly fashion in his *Indian Constitutional Problems*, and the chapter in the Nehru Report on this subject is more or less a restatement of the views here expressed by Sir Sivaswamy. This apparently made a great impression on Professor Keith for in reviewing *Indian Constitutional Problems* he had to admit that the Princes' claim not to be turned over to the control of a self-governing British India was at best a moral one and that it had no legal validity.*

It is a great climb-down for Dr. Keith to base

* "Can the rights of the British Crown be handed over by authority of the British Parliament to a responsible Ministry in India without the sanction of the Princes? Legally, of course, the issue does not admit of discussion, but the question raised is not one of legal right, but justice. For the British Government to transfer to any British Indian Government power to deal finally with the treaty relations between the Crown and the States would clearly be a revolutionary change, to which the Princes would have a strong moral right to object."—*Journal of Comparative Legislation and International Law*, Vol. X, Part IV, pp. 301-2.

the objection which it is open to the Princes to take to the establishment of full autonomy in British India on grounds of moral justice instead of constitutional rights. What the moral objection is, as he sees it, is made a little clearer in his work (just published), *The Sovereignty of the British Dominions* (Macmillan, 18/-). At pp. 71-2 he says:-

It is clear that a serious question arises as to the validity of the transfer of the territories, Basutoland, the Bechuanaland Protectorate, and Swaziland, to the control of the Union, for these territories were originally in direct relations with the Crown in the United Kingdom, acting through the High Commissioner in South Africa. Their inhabitants, therefore, have a right to rely on treatment in harmony with the traditional British policy of trusteeship for the native races, and they cannot be expected to acquiesce in any action which would transfer their lands to the control of the Union, if the Union policy of racial supremacy and postponement of native to European interests were to be held applicable. Hence the transfer of the territories which was originally expected to follow shortly on Union has been postponed. There is an obvious analogy between the position as regards these territories and the claim of the rulers of the Indian States that they cannot be made subject, without their consent, to the control of a responsible government in India, in lieu of that of the King exercised through the Governor-General, responsible to the Secretary of State for India and to the Imperial Parliament.

According to Professor Keith, it would be as unjust for the Imperial Government to allow British India, on the attainment of self-government, to take over the control of the Indian States as to allow General Hertzog, who has, as he himself says, adopted "a policy of racial supremacy and European domination" (p. xvi) towards the natives, to have the three Protectorates of South Africa added to the Union. In order to appreciate the force, or rather the weakness, of Professor Keith's argument it is necessary to refer here briefly to the history of the relations between the Union Government and the Protectorates (or, strictly speaking, the Colony of Basutoland and the Protectorates of Bechuanaland and Swaziland). When the Union was about to be formed the Imperial Government felt considerable misgivings as to the security of the rights and welfare of the native population in these three territories, which were till then under its own administration, in case these were transferred to the administration of the Union Government. The Imperial Government was, therefore, unwilling to surrender its control over these territories to a local responsible government till the latter could provide guarantees for the protection of the rights and interests of the native tribes. The solution that it eventually found was this: the Protectorates were not immediately incorporated into the Union, but their ultimate transfer was definitively contemplated, it being laid down that the transfer, when it is effected, should take place under certain

conditions. That is to say, the Imperial Government prescribed for the Protectorates a form of government appropriate to the administration of backward territories and imposed certain other restrictions with a view to preventing the sale of intoxicants and the alienation of native lands. Subject to these safeguards which were embodied in the Union Act itself, His Majesty's Government made specific provision in advance for the transfer of the Protectorates to the control of the South African Government.

Before we revert to Professor Keith's argument, we should like to draw the especial attention of the reader to two points. First, there is no legal objection to the transfer of a Protectorate from the British people to another self-governing people within the British Empire. If there were, the South African Constitution would not have provided for it. Professor Keith seems now to have waived the constitutional objection, but the Indian Princes trot it out now and then. The Union Act is a sufficient answer to them. The only question is whether the Imperial Government should not exact from a self-governing Dominion adequate safeguards of native rights before permitting the transfer. We for our part have not the least quarrel with such limitations on the powers of the Dominion as may be required by the interests of the native population. And here we come to the second point. The reservations that it is not only the right but the duty of the Imperial Government to make while giving autonomy are those that are suggested by the interests of the native population and not the native chiefs. The two are certainly not identical; they are not only different but often have widely conflicting interests. In the South African Protectorates too there were tribal chiefs, in whom vested the rights of internal administration; but when the propriety of transferring the Protectorates was considered by His Majesty's Government, nobody thought of the chiefs but every body of the people. There are eloquent passages in the letters of Lord Selborne who was then High Commissioner in South Africa and in the speeches of Col. Seeley, Colonial Under Secretary, laying down the duties of trusteeship, but the Government considered themselves to be trustees for the people, and not for the chiefs. Before the Union Act was passed, Lord Selborne went to every Protectorate, collected the people round him, explained to them what safeguards were going to be inserted in the Act in their interest and thus reassured them about their future. There is nothing to show—and we have now a full and intimate record of the subject—that he ever troubled to think about the chiefs. While applying, however, the same argument to India, the people of the States are completely ignored and the Princes are made to fill the whole picture. While Lord Selborne made a personal appeal to the people of the S. African Protectorates with a view to winning their consent, Sir Harcourt Butler's Committee would not let the people of the Indian States go near it to make their own representations. The Viceroy and everybody else in the seats of authority profess equal unconcern for the interests of the people, and their solicitude is reserved exclusively for the Princes, who in South Africa did

not matter at all. Compare how the argument turns and twists from people to Prince in the hands of Professor Keith himself in the extract given above. "Their *inhabitants*", he says, i. e. the inhabitants of the S. African Protectorates, "have a right to rely on treatment in harmony with the traditional British policy of trusteeship for the native races, and they cannot be expected to acquiesce in any action which would transfer their lands to the control of the Union. . . . There is an obvious analogy between the position as regards these territories and the claim of the *rulers* of the Indian States that they cannot be made subject, without their consent, to the control of a responsible government in India."

This sudden transition from "inhabitants" to "rulers" vitiates the whole argument. There is no analogy here. While the South African policy of His Majesty's Government is intended to assure necessary protection for millions of native people who are unable to look after their own interests, the substitution of "rulers" for "people" in the same policy as applied to India would merely entrench autocrats in their autocracy. Such an interpretation of the Trusteeship Policy would surely be a cruel joke, which unfortunately British politicians are unable to understand. Our reply therefore to Professor Keith is that the analogy should be made more complete by consulting the interests, and if you please the wishes, of the people of Indian States as in South Africa the Imperial Government consulted the interests of the people of the Protectorates, without consulting their wishes. The Imperial Government is at liberty to make the conditions of transfer as stringent as it pleases. The correspondence published in *Lord de Villiers and His Times* by Professor Eric A. Walker shows that His Majesty's Government had at first intended to impose far greater restrictions on the powers of the Union Government than were eventually agreed to in the Convention and passed by the British Parliament. The Commission provided for in the Schedule to the Union Act was at first intended to have very large powers. It was to be, as Professor Walker puts it, "the real ruler of the Protectorates". But in the succeeding negotiations its powers were progressively cut down so that ultimately it was reduced to the position of a purely advisory body. Its right of prior consultation and even its right of publishing its own views when they were set aside by the Prime Minister were subjected to serious qualifications, which naturally resulted very largely in emasculating the special machinery provided. British Indians, we feel certain, will not seek to curtail the powers of such a Commission if one is required in India in the interests of the States' people. Why, the people themselves may be consulted. The Basutos, Bechuanas and Swazis were perhaps too backward to be consulted in formal manner. But Indian States' people are sufficiently educated and self-conscious to speak in distinct accents when consulted. If they prefer to remain under the Imperial Government to coming over under a responsible government in British India, British Indians, we have no doubt, will abide by their choice. A people struggling for self-government is too sensible

of the evils of foreign rule to desire to impose its own will upon others. If the States' people would have any restrictions placed upon the authority of British India as a condition precedent to a change of overlordship, again British Indians will not object, but will heartily acquiesce. Only the States' people must speak, not their rulers. Unfortunately in India the Government harkens to the voice only of the Princes and never of their subjects.

The Hertzog Government has been trying ever since it came into power to acquire the Protectorates. The Imperial Government has not yet decided whether to retain control over them or to abandon it to the Union Government. But what Professor Keith says about it is not true, viz. that "the transfer of the territories which was originally expected to follow shortly on Union has been postponed" because of General Hertzog's plan to abolish the native franchise in the Cape and the treatment meted out by his Government to the natives of South-West Africa. Professor Keith for his own part thinks that the policy of unashamed racialism he is pursuing disentitles not only himself and his party but the South African people as a whole to claim the Protectorates. We should of course agree with Professor Keith, but as a fact the Imperial Government has not made it the reason for refusing or even for postponing the transfer of these territories. The point that we would make here is that if British Indians ever betray such a pernicious spirit of racialism or domination, the Imperial Government may well refuse to them the transfer of control over the Indian States. British Indians are incapable of depriving the States' people of any franchise which they may possess. But really they will not have the power, even after they acquire control of the States, to do any such thing. The States possess practically full internal autonomy and that will be maintained intact. All that will happen after the transfer is that British Indians will exercise paramountcy rights instead of the Imperial Government. Paramountcy gives a very limited right of intervention in the internal affairs of Indian States, i. e., only in cases of gross misgovernment. This shows that there is very little scope for the British Indian people to abuse their trust if the Imperial Government transfers its trusteeship of the Indian States' people to them. Nor is British India unwilling to have the proposed transfer cancelled if it shows itself unfit by its selfish and unjust policy, as General Hertzog has done, to shoulder the responsibilities of trusteeship. There should in any case be no objection to settle, when responsible government is granted, the terms on which transfer is possible and embody them in the Government of India Act. There is no inconsistency between resisting transfer of trusteeship in East Africa and demanding it here, since the transfer in India, as we conceive it, is to be made contingent on the free consent of the States' people. Anyhow we have proved we think, that the very example of South Africa which Professor Keith cites is a conclusive reason for transferring the Indian States to the control of a responsible government when one comes to be established in British India.

Reviews.

FRENCH IMPERIALISM.

HISTORY OF FRENCH COLONIAL POLICY, 1870-1925. By STEPHEN H. ROBERTS. 2 vols. (King.) 1929. 42/—.

THE writer of these two exhaustive volumes dealing with the history of French Colonial policy has rendered a great service to students of comparative colonial policy. Hitherto we had no single monograph in English treating exclusively and in detail the method of French Colonisation. The author has filled up this gap with the two volumes before us. He has made a thorough and intimate study of the subject from original sources and from the vast colonial literature available in the French language.

It was a known fact that the French Colonial policy was distinct and differed in many respects from those of other nations. But the present volume passes that policy in review in its several aspects. It will be surprising that the French, starting almost with a *tabula rasa* in 1878, were able to build up a colonial empire comprising the vast regions of N.W. Africa, from Cape Bon to the river Congo and from the Atlantic to the Nile, Indo-China, Madagascar and many scattered islands in the Pacific within the short period of half a century. The success of this achievement, despite the anti-colonial attitude of the French statesmen in particular and the French nation in general, clearly testifies that France set out on this venture with a policy and a method which was by no means inefficient and inadequate.

The writer has spared no pains to bring into prominence the underlying principles in French Colonial policy. He has shown how the highly logically-minded Frenchman starts his schemes on theory first and then labours to put theory in practice, however inapplicable the theory might be to existing facts. This in a way explains the failure of the French policy of "Assimilation," "Cantonment" "Re-foulement" in Algeria and Cochin China. But to her also lay the credit of developing a policy of "Association" which has contributed to her success in Tunisia, Madagascar, Tonkin and elsewhere. The personal experience of the writer with the French colonial life in the Pacific, his highly impartial and judicial mind, and his great powers of discernment clearly manifest themselves in his just appreciation of the difficulties the French had to face with a native population ranging from the cannibal to the highly organised and turbulent Arab, from the indolent and lazy Tabitian to the shrewd and cunning Tonkinite, the peace-loving and happy-go-lucky Cambodian and the warlike Hava.

Unlike other works on colonial policy, the method adopted here is one of systematic exposition of the policy in theory as distinct from the policy in practice. The author himself admits that this has certain disadvantages, but in our opinion the disadvantages are trivial when compared with the

facility it enjoys in giving a thorough and coherent exposition of the policy in general. The student has not to search in a maze of historical matter to find out the policy pursued and the changes it has undergone in course of time or changes in political ideals. The further sub-division of policy in theory into general colonial policy, general economic policy, general political policy, and general native policy gives the reader a clear perception of the French Colonial policy in detail and enables him to realise the gradual development and the changes it has undergone, due to the trend of events at home and to the difficulties and hindrances encountered in the colonies from time to time. More than that he has laid special emphasis on the part played by the French national character in shaping their colonial policy. The national aspiration of the French to reach the Rhine frontier, an aspiration which embroiled her in a series of European scuffles for nearly three centuries culminating in the disasters of 1870, brought home to her sober-minded statesmen the futility of holding tenaciously to a frontier policy, the realisation of which has almost become an impossibility after 1870. What she failed to achieve at home she realised abroad. During the 17th and 18th centuries she sacrificed her colonies to the will-o'-the-wisp of a policy of European aggrandisement and expansion. In the early nineties her great colonial statesmen like Ferry, Gambetta, and Etienne realised that a colonial empire rich in resources would enhance her national strength and would even bring to fruition her Rhineland policy in future and with this end in view they strengthened her position in N. Africa and Indo-China. That they were not mistaken in their calculations is emphatically proved by the War of 1914. Legion on legion of colonials—black, yellow, tawny and brown—parading the streets of Paris during the war brought the stay-at-home Frenchman in close contact with the empire. The colonies became a reality now, the more so because it has definitely contributed to the defence of the fatherland. The war years also saw that the colonies are a source of food and raw products in emergency. This brought about a new orientation in colonial policy.

The outstanding feature of the book is the chapter on comparative study where the French, British and incidentally the German, Dutch and Japanese methods are compared. The author unhesitatingly criticises where criticisms are necessary, of course, always basing himself on facts, and here and there makes his own suggestions. The suggestions may be wise or otherwise, but since they come from an unbiassed critic and a great thinker, they deserve consideration. This could be best illustrated by the opinion of the author with reference to the Anglo-French condominium over the New Hebrides, where he emphatically repudiates the idea of a condominium and opines that the islands must be left entirely to the French.

C. L. MARION.

JAPAN AND THE U.S.

JAPAN AND THE UNITED STATES, 1853-1921. (Revised and continued to 1928.) By PAYSON J. TREAT. (Stanford University Press.) 1928, 18cm. 307p. \$3.50.

AFTER briefly sketching the twilight days of old Japan, Prof. Treat narrates the story of American relations from the days of the trouble over whalers and the agreements with Perry and Harris to the long conflict between the pro-foreigner Shogunate and the old feudal lords controlling the Imperial palace itself. The early commercial conventions, not ratified by the Mikado, were thus in great jeopardy, having been "involved beyond extrication with the domestic political situation". Some strong measures of retaliation against the anti-foreign leaders adopted by the United States in conjunction with Britain, France and Holland brought round the Emperor and sanction was accorded in 1865.

Prof. Treat then relates the restoration of the Emperor and the extinction of the Shogunate, marking "the emergence of Japan from the intolerance of past ages to the open-mindedness of the modern world." He explains how America was able to "help the Japanese bridge the gap between the days of seclusion and the days of modern international intercourse." Great significance is attached to the part played by General Grant, during whose visit advice was called for in the settlement of acute questions of foreign policy. He wrote, while concluding his despatches—

"This arrangement . . . will shut the door to unfriendly European interference in Oriental affairs, which above all things else should be the policy of both China and Japan. Any amicable adjustment of these questions between the two countries is better than war. Your quarrels are their opportunity for unfriendly intervention and, if war should ensue . . . , the powers of Europe will end it in their own way, in their own interests, and to the lasting and incalculable injury of both nations."

Prophetic words indeed! Prof. Treat is careful to point out a series of "deeds, rather than words," indicating American good-will during the troubled years (1872-1894) when Japan was, "persistently, insistently, and consistently" agitating for a revision of the treaties in order to secure tariff autonomy and the abolition of extra-territorial rights.

Two chapters of the book deal with the policy of America during the Sino-Japanese war over Korea, and are concluded by a letter from the Emperor to the President, thanking for America's "wise directions, which not only tended to mitigate the severities and hardships of the war and finally to promote the successful issue of the negotiations for peace, but served to draw still closer the bonds of friendship and good neighbourhood which happily unite our two countries."

"The war between China and Japan," observes Prof. Treat, "settled one problem but gave birth to others more serious," like the menace of Russia in Korea and Manchuria, the East Asiatic Driebund, and the economic and political exploitation of prostrate China by every European power. Japan and the United States alone took no part in the scramble for concessions, says Prof. Treat.

Meanwhile, in 1898, the United States, "without premeditation or warning," became an Asiatic power, when, "in the interests of the Filipino people for whose welfare we cannot escape responsibility" America conquered the Philippine Islands. Mr. Hay, Secretary of State, immediately recognised the 'spheres of interest' already carved out of China, though he insisted on an Open Door! During the Boxer crisis, the United States, Britain and Japan, worked in harmony, for "each believed in the wisdom of the Open Door and the territorial integrity of China."

America was uninterested in the Russo-Japanese war but, after the disaster in the Sea of Japan, it was President Roosevelt who hastened peace and actually moulded the terms to secure acceptance. Victorious Japan, hailed as the leader of all Asia, aroused suspicion and fear and there were, for the first time in America, alarming predictions of a 'Yellow Peril' Prof. Treat is willing to admit that Japanese policy in Korea and China alienated public sympathy, though relations between the Governments of Japan and America were "friendly and correct". In 1910, the Japanese annexed Korea and Prof. Treat gilds the act by stating, "But in a world where precedents count for much, be they good or ill, the Japanese could defend their conduct by many examples", and as for the Koreans, he says—"There is no reason why Korea should not develop into an autonomous, prosperous, and contented part of the Japanese State, enjoying the advantages which come from membership in a strong enterprising community."

The Anglo-Japanese alliance of 1902 reviewed in 1911 brought Japan into the vortex of the World War and she was of incalculable service to the British Empire and Russia, "in an hour of serious and very critical need". During her campaigns in Shantung, "Japanese diplomacy followed the sinister precedents of European diplomacy in China" and friction between the two powers increased. Shortly after America entered the War, a Japanese mission was able to get an American note published, which said, "The Governments of the United States and Japan recognise that territorial propinquity creates special relations between countries", which Prof. Treat rather unconvincingly interprets as a mere "geographical truism".

A good analysis is given of the negotiations of Chinese and Japanese representatives at Versailles, China seeking liberation from all her bondages and Japan insisting on the German islands north of the Equator, the transfer of German rights in Shantung, and a declaration, in the Covenant of the League of Nations, of racial equality. China was pained considerably by the transfer of Shantung and it was only the Washington Conference that healed the wound. The Conference further guaranteed insular possessions in the Pacific, prepared the ground for arbitration, defined anew and in clearer terms the open Door in China and thus "removed a lowering cloud of suspicion and alarm which had hung over the Pacific."

"There is not a fairer page in the whole history of America's foreign relations than that which re-

records its efforts to further the just claims of Japan. If all international intercourse were conducted with equal sympathy and good understanding, there would be little need of armaments." These sentences from the book could very well have been the text of Prof. Treat's lectures to Japanese students which are here published in book form. The origin of the book in the spoken word has affected it adversely in more respects than one. It is not as fully documented as the big claim quoted above as well as maintained throughout the book naturally requires. Again, there is noticeable a tendency to justify, to assuage and to console, rather than to probe even if it should pain.

And the influence of factors other than pure philanthropy or disinterestedness or the desire to set up, in Japan, "an enlightened example" which "would be an influence for good upon all the other peoples of the East," is not emphasised. One special feature of the book, however, is the analysis of the motives behind public opinion in Japan and the United States which moulded the actions of Governments. Prof. Treat is a staunch friend of Japan and has pleaded most strenuously, in the last chapter of the book, for the abolition of the statutory exclusion of the Japanese from the soil of America.

N. KASTURI.

THE GERMAN CONSTITUTION.

PRINCIPLES OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL JURISPRUDENCE OF THE GERMAN NATIONAL REPUBLIC. By JOHANNES METTERN. (The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore.) 1928. 24cm. 682p. \$5.00.

THE constitution of the German National Republic has engaged the attention of a large number of writers. Dr. Mattern's treatise is based upon a course of lectures delivered by him in the Johns Hopkins University. His object is not to provide a commentary on the constitution, but to expound the general principles which were adopted as the basis of the constitution by its framers. He has however not confined himself to a bare statement of the fundamental principles, but has given a summary of the discussions in the National Constituent Assembly which culminated in the adoption of the constitution. In these discussions, many eminent jurists and constitutional lawyers took part and the provisions of the proposed constitution were subjected to a searching scrutiny and fully thrashed out. The arguments for and against the principles adopted are given at length by Dr. Mattern and the reader is thus able to appreciate the reasons underlying the provisions.

Dr. Mattern deals with a number of important topics which cannot fail to be of interest in this country at the present time when the thoughts of the people are turned to the impending changes in the constitution. Part I is concerned with the constitutional history of Germany and with the conceptions of state and sovereignty in German jurisprudence. The legal continuity of the Empire and the Republic is discussed at length and the author's conclusion in favour of the legal continuity of the Republic is supported by his theory of the state and must be recognised as sound. In Part II the author discusses the relations between the National and the State Governments, or, to use language more familiar to people in this country, between the Central and the Provincial Governments. In Part III he deals *inter alia* with the type of the National Government with the relations between the Execu-

tive and Legislative Departments, the emergency powers of the National Government and the National judicial system. In view of the fact that the German Empire included a large number of States jealous of their integrity and claiming internal autonomy, the conditions which prevailed at the time the new constitution was framed bear some resemblance to those prevalent in India, consisting as it does of British India and a large number of States under Indian rulers claiming internal independence. That Germany found it necessary for the purpose of national consolidation to adopt the unitary type of Government is not without interest or significance for the people of India.

One of the most interesting chapters is that which deals with the National control over the administrative activities of the State Governments. This control is exercised either on a purely judicial basis, i.e., by the decision of a National Supreme Court at the request of the National or State Cabinets, or on the administrative decision by the National Cabinet subject to judicial review by the Supreme Court. The methods of National administrative supervision with judicial review are described in detail. In the extreme case of a conflict between the National Government and a State Government ending in the refusal on the part of a State to carry out the obligations imposed upon it by the National Government, the constitution authorizes the National President to employ the armed forces of the Reich or Commonwealth to enforce compliance with the national will by the State Government. Another interesting topic which is discussed at length is the power of issuing emergency ordinances under article 48 of the national constitution. The style of the book is characterised by the dry ponderosity which is generally associated with German treatises. The book admits of a great deal of compression of the matter and clearer presentation. It would have greatly added to the usefulness of the book if it had contained an appendix giving the text of the new German Constitution.

P. S. SIVASWAMY AIYER.

ASQUITH'S REMINISCENCES.

MEMORIES AND REFLECTIONS, 1852-1927.

By the Earl of OXFORD AND ASQUITH. Vols. 2.
(Cassell.) 1928. 24cm. 284+288p.

THE addition of a new member to the company of those who are writing reminiscences is indeed a thing to be glad about. And the happiness is certainly increased when we find that the new member is no less a distinguished person than the late Earl of Oxford and Asquith himself. Asquith led the Liberal party for eighteen years and was the Prime Minister during the most critical epoch in the history of the British Commonwealth. His 'Memoirs and Reflections' are bound to interest everyone, as they cover a period big with events.

It was Lord Balfour who persuaded Asquith to write his Reminiscences so that the world may have an authoritative version of the events of a most critical time in the history of the British Empire. Asquith began to write the book under review in 1926, but illness prevented him from completing it. He had drafted for the printer nearly two-thirds of the book and prepared the material for the remainder. The publication of the 'Memoirs and Reminiscences' has been done by the executors, and though they have arranged and revised the matter, nothing now appears which has not been written or prepared by Asquith himself.

The value of any 'Reminiscences' depends not only on the person who writes them, but also on the *manner* in which they are written. Impartial and interesting though the 'Memoirs and Reminiscences' of Asquith are, they lack the literary polish of Morley's 'Recollections' or the intimate touch of Margot's Autobiography. Asquith is mercilessly silent where one would expect him to speak out his mind. He does not give his estimate of the moral and intellectual qualities of his colleagues, both civil and military, who played a part in the Great War. No doubt he gives some pen sketches of some of the publicists and politicians of his time, but one misses such men as Lloyd George, Winston Churchill, Kitchener and MacDonald. This omission detracts from the excellence of the book.

Herbert Henry Asquith was born at Morley in Yorkshire on September 12, 1852. He was sent to a school near Leeds, then to Huddersfield College, and finally to the City of London School, then under the remarkable headmastership of Dr. Abbot. Asquith acknowledges his debt to Abbot, whose care in training him in Classics and English literature he repaid by winning a Balliol scholarship. In 1870 he went up to Oxford where he took a Craven University scholarship, besides firsts in Mods. and Greats. He became President of the Union and was elected a Fellow of Balliol.

Asquith was called to the Bar in 1876. Success came slowly, but when it came it was striking and complete. The Parnell Commission, where he appeared on behalf of Parnell as junior to Charles Russell, established his fame. After this brilliant performance briefs poured in upon him and he began to specialise in work before the House of Lords and the Privy Council. This prosperous career was clouded by one misfortune. In 1891 he lost his first wife.

Success at the Bar was followed by success in politics. In 1896 he was returned to Parliament to represent East Fife, and when Gladstone formed his last Administration in 1892, Asquith was chosen as Home Secretary. In this book Asquith does not give a full account of his work as Home Secretary as he has narrated it fully in his earlier book, "Fifty Years of Parliament." But he deals with two incidents, the Feathenstone Riots which earned for

him for some years in the rhetoric of the Labour platform the name of 'Asquith the Murderer' and the case of the Irish Dynamiters. Asquith justifies his action in both cases, but our knowledge of the records of the period incline us to the view that Asquith, though a sympathetic man, spoke on those occasions with the cold formalism of a lawyer, and it was his *manner* that made him unpopular.

Perhaps the most important event in Asquith's career in his first Cabinet office was his second marriage with Miss Margot Tennant, a brilliant society lady. The marriage proved a very happy one and as Asquith himself says, "My life has since that date been lived in full partnership with her, and all our experiences, both of joy and sorrow—and there has been a large measure of both—have been shared in common." (Vol. 1, p. 139.)

The resignation of the Premiership by Lord Rosebery in 1895, followed by Harcourt's resignation of the Leadership of the Opposition in the Commons and the outbreak of the Boer War, brought a definite split in the ranks of the Liberal party. The Tariff Reform crusade of Joseph Chamberlain brought unity to the Liberals and discord to the Unionists. Campbell-Bannermann formed a Liberal Ministry with Asquith as the Chancellor of the Exchequer. On the death of C.B., Asquith became Premier with Lloyd George as Chancellor of the Exchequer. From 1908 to 1916 Asquith was Premier and this was a momentous period in the history of the British Empire. No Prime Minister since Pitt had had to face such a series of sensations, excitements and emergencies as those which Asquith had to face in this period. Two capital issues reached a crisis—the relation of the Lords to the Commons and the relation of Ireland to Great Britain. These alone would have made Asquith's tenure of office a specially vivid and searching chapter of history. But to add to his difficulties the Great War broke out. It tested his equanimity, his grasp, his courage and his imagination. This performance in the two years during which he was Prime Minister in war time is described at great length in the second volume. On going through the second volume we are led irresistibly to the conclusion that what Asquith sowed Lloyd George reaped. But unfortunately the ways of Lloyd George and his allies were not too clean and the factions and mischievous influences set in motion by Lloyd George forced Asquith to resign his office at the end of 1916. Asquith does not speak out his mind on the events leading to his resignation. In Chapter XIV, Vol. II, he makes the Marquess of Crewe and Lords Lansdowne and Cecil say what they thought of the unfortunate situation which forced him to resign his Premiership.

There can be only one opinion about Asquith's conduct when he found himself out of office. In a situation full of bitter memories he behaved with the most admirable temper and dignity. He was unmoved by the vulgar attacks of the Northcliffe Press. The speeches that he delivered in Parliament bore no trace of the factious spirit. In the famous Maurice episode his magnanimity and his generosity towards opponents were shown in a remarkable way. On the strength of certain allegations made by General Maurice, the Director of Military Operations regarding the strength of the Army in France, Asquith wanted the Government to examine the allegations. Bonar Law replied that the Government would invite two judges to hold an inquiry. Having no faith in the proposed tribunal Asquith asked for a Select Committee. But in moving the motion for a Select Committee Asquith made it clear that it was not a vote of censure on the Lloyd

Geogre Ministry. Yet he was misunderstood. About 99 Liberals voted for Asquith's motion and the motion was defeated. Asquith and those that voted with him were regarded by Lloyd George as persons who attempted to trip up the Government in a moment of great danger. Lloyd George's platform oratory and the Northcliffe Press produced the desired effect. In the 'coupon election' of 1918 Asquith lost his seat in East Fife, a constituency which had represented for 32 years and his fellow Liberals suffered a similar fate. The disintegration of the Liberal Party began.

Early in 1920 Asquith returned to Parliament from Paisley and took an active part in the campaign for Irish freedom. He condemned the Black and Tans regime and recommended to Ireland Dominion Home Rule. In 1923 the two wings of the Liberal Party reunited under the leadership of Asquith, and when Baldwin was defeated on the Tariff question, Asquith put Labour in office. The Campbell case led to the fall of the first MacDonald Cabinet and in the election that followed Asquith lost his seat at Paisley. He accepted a Peerage, being first made Viscount Asquith of Morley and then Earl of Oxford and Asquith, and was made a Knight of the Garter. In October 1926 Lord Oxford resigned the Leadership of the Liberal party, and it was then that he began to write the book under review.

The 'Memoirs and Reflections' of a statesman who brought to public life sterling abilities and an unblemished character, who bore success with serene dignity and adversity with noble courage, ought to prove a source of inspiration to the publicists and politicians of our country. It is a book which no educated man should be without.

M. V. SUBRAHMANYAM.

SHORT NOTICE.

INTERNATIONAL CARTELS, COMBINES AND TRUSTS By ROBERT LIEFMANN. (Europa Hand-Book Series.) Europa Publishing Co. 1928. 20cm. 152p. 5/-

THIS is an English translation of Dr. Liefmann's Essay published in the *Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv* by Miss F. Stella Brown. This book, besides this Essay, has two more points, (1) containing a brief digest of discussions regarding cartels at the International Economic Conference at Geneva in 1927 and (2) a review of legislation on cartels and trusts in the United States of America, Germany, Great Britain, Norway and France. And the whole subject has been introduced by Mr. Hallinan with a neat and precise introduction.

This small book contains plenty of information regarding international cartels. Within a short compass, Dr. Liefmann has not only given us their aims and structures, but has tried very successfully to analyse the various reasons for their rapid increase especially after the war. The historical evolution, both before and after the war, has not escaped his notice. He deals with almost every one of the international cartels that has been formed after the world war.

Dr. Liefmann is of opinion that international cartels, like ordinary national ones, are also the children of necessity. When, after 1918, there was decrease of purchasing power in the world's markets owing to the general impoverishment after the war, simultaneously with an enormous increase in the output of certain types of wares due to progress in technique, it was found impossible to distribute this surplus output satisfactorily through the traditional methods; and "the leaders of industry, throughout

the affected countries, were, therefore, forced to make efforts at mastering of the situation by private agreement, and cartels were the obvious method of accomplishing this aim."

Professor Liefmann subscribes to the view that "tariff is the mother of trusts". He opines that a protective tariff is the fundamental cause of national cartels which, in their turn leading to international combines, causes an intense international competition and a great increase of large-scale production. The result is dumping in third neutral countries. That again leads "to an increased tendency to tariffs in them as well, to the rise of 'new outsiders' and an excess of world production". The solution, according to Dr. Liefmann, lies in international agreements on output. But he expresses doubts as to its immediate feasibility and is of opinion that the chief aim of such cartels, viz., to avoid international overproduction and overcapitalisation "is only very imperfectly realised at the present time." But he seems to be very hopeful as to their future. He says that the activities of these cartels will, for the present, be limited to "prevention and minimising of dumping" resulting in the steadying of prices and promoting greater economic stability. He concludes that "international cartels have a prodigious future before them, that they are another instance of the 'power that evil wills, yet good creates,' and that war has again, against the wish and intention of those concerned, provided the dynamics of progress."

P. M.

LEAVES FROM THE NOTE-BOOK OF A TAMED CYNIC. By REINHOLD NIEBUHR. (Willet, Clark & Colby, New York.) 1929. 21cm. 189p. \$2'00.

UNDER the pretentious garb of a cynic, Reinhold Niebuhr indulges in a rigmarole of paradoxical thinking which partially strikes the logical line and then loses its way on the quicksands of faith and dogma. A convinced minister of Christ, his instinct is to take a convenient refuge in the exclusive divinity of Christ, rather than sink in the mire of doubt and despair. Unlike other moribund pastors however, he has the hardihood to look at the confronting facts of civilisation which in all their profanity frustrate Christian endeavour. Between his pulpit of platitudes and the realities of life regulated by a productive zeal there yawns a chasm, a compromising bridge across which lies if at all in "a moral goal somewhere, between Christ and Aristotle, between an ethic of love and an ethic of moderation." All around him, pious appearances masquerade for religion, and industry has invaded religious houses with the result that they are more engaged in organising sales and markets than in discharging their spiritual obligations. Albeit, the churches are as little to blame as the priests in charge of them, for it is only natural that where the Gospel has ceased to be the holy Water of life to the thirsty souls, the Church should degenerate into a farcical eyewash, "from the red hat of the rather too sensuously pretty soprano soloist and the frock-coat of the rather too self-conscious parson to the comfortable pew cushions and the splendiferous pew holders."

It is this wholesale collapse of spiritual heritage that is responsible for "the ethical impotence" of the Trinitarian ingredients of religion—the temple, the priest and the text. And "were the absurdities and irrationalities in which narrow types of religion issue" to run riot, manslaughter, and war for sacred reasons, tyranny of "moral anachronism" and priestly corruption would be the order of the day. But for the policeman and the secular power, a more abominable spirit than Satan (who after all is not such a

diabolical being as he is represented to be) would long ago have established his infamous rule.

So grim are the full implications of a merciless cynicism. But Niebuhr possesses a conscience devoted to Christ, which prevents him from stretching his imagination to the full length of its impious reasoning. For all that, the book is far from being commonplace. It is full of such blunt and flashing observations as will set sluggish minds thinking.

K. VENUGOPAL RAO.

THE REIGN OF AURANZEB. By UPENDRA NATH BALL. (Atma Ram & Sons, Lahore.) 19cm. 184p. Rs. 1/10.

IN this little volume Prof. Ball has attempted to give within a short compass a running account of the very interesting reign of Aurangzib Alamgir, which saw the decline of the Timuride power in India and the rise of the Marathas. It is evidently meant for undergraduates of the Indian Universities and might have been of considerable use to them but for two deplorable defects. Prof. Ball never refers to his sources and his reader therefore is left without any guidance if he wants to pursue his enquiries further. And the narrative is sometimes marred by some serious inaccuracies that may be attributed to the proof reader's oversight. Thus on p. 95 we read that Shivaji was born on the 10th April 1677. On p. 98 he repeats the now discarded story of Shah Jahan's intervention on Shahaji's behalf. On p. 99 Afzal Khan is described as the Sultan of Bijapur's cousin, but we do not know on what evidence. The author might have been more careful about his method of transliteration. Netaji and Sambhaji for instance have been invariably converted into Netoji and Sambhuji.

S. N. S.

THE DELIVERENCE OR THE ESCAPE OF SHIVAJI THE GREAT FROM AGRA. By G. K. DESHPANDE. (Author, Vishramdham, Poona.) 1929. 20cm. 130+108p. Rs. 3/-

THE author has selected for his enquiry one of the most interesting theme in Maratha history. Shivaji's flight from Agra gave rise to much speculation at the time and as very few people were in the know, widely different accounts were given by writers of different nationalities. Thus Cosme da Guarda of Marmugao, who wrote in 1695, gives a version of this incident which is totally different from that recorded by Michaud, a Frenchman, who wrote in the closing years of the 18th century. With an industry that does him credit Rao Saheb Deshpande has brought together all the available accounts of Shivaji's flight and his own comments also deserve attention.

S. N. S.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

THE SOVEREIGNTY OF THE BRITISH DOMINIONS. By ARTHUR BERRIEDALE KEITH. (Macmillan.) 1929. 22cm. 524p. 18/-

HUMAN MERCHANDISE. A Study of the International Traffic in Women. By H. WILSON HARRIS. (Benn.) 1928. 20cm. 272p. 6/-

THE DILEMMA IN INDIA. By REGINALD CRADDOCK. (Constable.) 1929. 23cm. 379p. 15/-

TRENDS IN PHILANTHROPY. By WILLFORD ISBELL KING and KATE E. HUNTLEY. (National Bureau of Economic Research, New York.) 1928. 23cm. 78p. \$1.75.

THOUGHTS ON INDIAN DISCONTENTS. By EDWYN BEVAN. (Allen & Unwin.) 1929. 20cm. 178p. 6/-

A QUAKER ADVENTURE. By A. RUTH FRY. (Nisbet.) 1927. 23cm. 389p. 5/-

THE STORY OF BARDOLI. By MAHADEV DESAI. (Navajivan Press, Ahmedabad.) 1929. 22cm. 363p. Rs. 2-8.

TAE SOVIET UNION. (Soviet Union Information Bureau, Washington.) 1929. 20cm. 288p. \$1.50.

LETTERS FROM A FATHER TO HIS DAUGHTER. By JAWAHARLAL NEHRU. (Allahabad Law Journal Press.) 1929. 22cm. 121p.

THE STORY OF ICHALKARANJI. By H. GEORGE FRANKS. (Author, Poona.) 1929. 21cm. 138p.

LEISURE AND ITS USE. By HERBERT L. MAY and DOROTHY PETGEN. (Barnes, New York.) 1928. 20cm. 268p. \$2.00.

AFTER MOTHER INDIA. By HARRY H. FIELD. (Cape.) 1929. 20cm. 299p. 7/6.

PEEPS AT MANY LANDS: INDIA. (3rd Edn.) By JOHN FINNEMORE. (Black.) 1928. 20cm. 92p. 2/6.

SWARAJ—CULTURAL AND POLITICAL. By PRAMATHA NATH BOSE. (Newman, Calcutta.) 1929. 20cm. 290p. Rs. 4.

HISTORY OF BISHNUPUR-RAJ. By ABHAYA PADA MALLIK. (Author, Calcutta.) 1921. 18cm. 148p.

MEDIEVAL INDIA. From the Beginning of the Arab Invasions to the Downfall of the Mughals. By UPENDRA NATH BALL. (Sudhabindu Biswas, Calcutta.) 18cm. 582p. Rs. 3-12.

MONEY IN HANDICRAFTS. By AN INDUSTRIAL EXPERT. (Industry Book Dept, Calcutta.) 18cm. 117p.

AN INTRODUCTION TO INDIVIDUAL PSYCHOLOGY. By ALICE RAVEN. (Hefner.) 1929. 20cm. 143p. 3/6.

FALSEHOOD IN WAR-TIME. By ARTHUR PONSONBY. (Allen & Unwin.) 1929. 18cm. 192p. 2/6.

EDUCATIONAL SURVEY. (League of Nations, Geneva.) 1929. 24cm. 152p. 2/-

CONGRESS ADDRESSES. By CARDINAL FRANCIS BOURNE. (Burns Oates.) 1929. 20cm. 233p. 5/-

ANAKATA POLITICS. By RICHARD HOPE. (John Bale.) 1929. 20cm. 103p. 2/6.

SOBS AND THROBS OR SOME SPIRITUAL SIDELIGHTS. By ABDUL KAREEM ABDULLAH. (N. N. Satha, 'Meherbad,' Ahmednagar.) 1929. 21cm. 169p. Re. 1.

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.