

Servant of India

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

VOL. XIII No. 5. }

POONA—THURSDAY, JANUARY 30, 1930.

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

CONTENTS.

	Page.
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	49
ARTICLES :—	
The Viceroy's Speech.	52
States' Subjects and the Sapru Conference. By "Practical Politics"	52
A One-Day Strike. By R. R. Bakhale	53
India and U. S. By V. N. G.	54
OUR EUROPEAN LETTER :—	
The London Naval Conference. By R. Raghunatha Row.	55
REVIEWS :—	
The Nature of Law. By Dr. Nares Chandra Sen-Gupta.	57
The Mandate System. By V. M. Bhat.	58
The Burden of Population. By Dr. D. D. Karve.	59
Democrat and Dictator. By S. P. Sarma.	59
CORRESPONDENCE :—	60
BOOKS RECEIVED	60

Topics of the Week.

Another Slap in the Face.

"I have always maintained and still maintain, the change in the Congress creed in favour of complete independence notwithstanding, that the relations between Great Britain and India can only be finally adjusted on the basis of India's right to Dominion Status being acknowledged without any reservation and the methods of giving effect to that decision being examined in some joint and equal conference between plenipotentiaries of the two countries and that the greater the delay in finding a solution of the problem on these lines, the lesser the chances for a favourable atmosphere for the purpose and its general acceptance in this country. I am aware that the Viceregal announcement does not go so far; but viewing the situation as a whole, I am bound to admit that it represents a genuine and honest attempt of a sincere Viceroy, anxious to find a way for peace in most difficult circumstances." These are not the words of a Moderate or a Liberal accused of wishing to prolong foreign domination but of Mr. V. J. Patel, the President of the Legislative Assembly, spoken in defence of his decision to resist the pressure of the Congress to resign his place. Mr. Patel entered the Assembly as a Swarajist, with the sole object of wrecking the Montford Reforms, and of ending the present system of government. Experience and responsibility have worked a sea-change in him; he now surpasses the Liberals in his devotion to co-operation. He is content with Dominion Status, and seeks to obtain it by means of the Round Table Conference. No independence and no non-coopera-

tion for him! His wise and sensible action is nothing short of a slap in the face of the non-co-operators.

Who came to Scoff remained to Pray.

MR. V. J. PATEL is not alone in his recantation of non-co-operation. It is intensely gratifying, if somewhat amusing, to find such great stalwart Congressmen and erstwhile non-co-operators as Messrs. Jamnadas Metha, T. Prakasam and V. Ramadas waxing eloquent about the work in the Councils and in the Assembly. These were among those who set out to destroy the Councils and to bring the Government to a standstill. The Councils were mere toys, were a snare and a delusion, were traps to perpetuate foreign domination and so on and so forth. They were untouchable and unapproachable. Since their contemptuous scorn did not succeed in killing the Councils, the non-co-operators decided to swallow their defeated pride and enter the Councils, professing thus to destroy them. Far from achieving their object, they have now retreated from it in utter confusion and demoralisation, leaving the Councils stronger than ever. Pandit Motilal Nehru complains that the wreckers succeeded in wrecking their own policy, discipline and solidarity and that some of them actually scrambled for co-operation on committees etc., the Pandit himself, according to Mr. Prakasam, being the "principal offender". And now to cap it all, we find Messrs. Jamnadas Mehta, Prakasam and Ramadas Pantulu actually taking credit, almost exclusive credit, for the good work done in the Councils. At the Andhra Provincial Congress Committee meeting held in Coconada on the 21st inst. Mr. Ramadas Pantulu is reported to have emphatically repudiated the assertion that no good work was done in the Councils and instanced several beneficial measures carried by the Congress Party votes. Mr. Prakasam vehemently protested that he could serve the Congress and the country better by seeking re-election to the Assembly. Mr. Jamnadas has gone one step further and claimed that non-co-operators were the best co-operators in the Councils. We are thankful to these non-co-operators for this emphatic vindication of the Liberal faith and policy.

To Vote or Not to Vote.

EVEN avowed Congressmen do not seem to be fully acquainted with the resolutions of the Congress and the instructions of the Working Committee. At the meeting of the Andhra Congress Provincial Committee held last week, there was a difference of opinion as to the duty of Congress voters and the intentions of the Working Committee. Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao, who reluctantly resigned his seat in the Madras Legislative Council, stood for the no-vote campaign. Mr. B. Pattabhi-Seetharamayya, a member of the Working Committee, opined that it was the intention of the Working Committee to under-

take a no-vote campaign. Messrs. Konda Venkatappayya and K. Nageswara Rao however were of opinion that the Working Committee did not advocate it and the Congress resolution was not explicit on the subject. It was finally resolved to refer the matter to the Working Committee for directions. This is an obvious case of shutting one's eyes to unpleasant facts. For both the Congress and the Working Committee are explicit in their mandate that Congressman should not vote at all. According to the "Congress Bulletin" issued by the Office of the All-India Congress Committee, the Congress Resolution on "Complete Independence" says, among other things, "this Congress resolves upon a complete boycott of the central and provincial legislatures and committees constituted by the Government and calls upon Congressmen and others taking part in the national movement to abstain from *participating directly or indirectly in future elections*" (Italics ours). Further, the very first resolution passed by the new Working Committee relates to the Boycott of Councils, in which the Committee "*appeals to the voters to refrain from participating in elections to the legislature.*" (Italics ours.) Nothing could be more explicit, nor, we may add, more disastrous. The objection raised by such stunch non-co-operators as Messrs. Konda Venkatappayya and K. Nageswara Rao, though untenable, proves however to demonstration that the Congress party is disintegrating, so far at any rate as the prominent members of it are concerned!

Hysterics or Politics.

IN striking contrast to the obstruction offered to the holding of a public meeting by the Liberals in Bombay, were the huge and almost unprecedented demonstrations in Bombay and in other towns in India on the so-called "Independence Day." The significance of these cannot be ignored or underestimated. It is clear that young and immature students and Communists are rushing politics. But neither the vociferous cries nor the mass demonstrations are a true indication of the cool and collected opinion of the people on the merits of co-operation and non-co-operation. The voting at the bye-elections and at the next general elections will afford a truer index. Every conscientious Congressman, who believes in Congress mandates, has no option but to boycott the polling booth. It remains to be seen how many voters will refrain from voting in the elections in view of the Congress mandate. A comparison of the number of voters who register their votes at the ensuing elections and of the number that voted at the last elections will indicate to what extent the voters are with the Congress, and its policy of non-co-operation. But it is well for the electorate to remember that every vote cast is a vote registered in favour of co-operation and against non-co-operation. When the Swarajists first entered the councils, they professed to be non-co-operators: their avowed policy was to non-co-operate from within the councils, to offer continuous obstruction and to bring the Governmental machinery to a standstill. But none who now seeks election or re-election to the Councils is a non-co-operator; rather, the very reverse of it. He wishes to go there to continue the good work that membership of the Council enabled him to do. For instance, Mr. Jamnadas Mehta, in his election manifesto, claims the suffrage of his constituency on the ground of the non-co-operator's achievements in *co-operation* and not in non-co-operation! Remission of provincial contributions, protection to national industries, abolition of excise duties on cotton manufactures, etc., are not items of non-co-operation; they are indistinguishable from the reforms that the co-operators strove for. It is for the voter to decide if he will vote for such people as

Mr. Jamnadas Mehta, who professed one thing and did another, who exploited the Congress prestige for all it was worth when it suited them and now defied its mandates at will, and who, in fact, are mere opportunists, or to such people as Sir Cowasji Jahangir (Junior), who have been always true to their principles, who never betrayed their constituents by false and impossible promises and who do not play ducks and drakes with solemn oaths of allegiance.

Well Done, Madras!

DR. P. SUBBARAYAN the Chief Minister in Madras and the Madras Legislative Council deserve to be heartily congratulated on their bold and courageous action in opposing communal electorates in municipalities and substituting instead the system of joint electorates with reservation of seats for minorities. It is a thousand pities that an amendment in favour of separate electorates was fathered by Mr. C. E. Wood, a Britisher, who claims to belong to an advanced and highly cultured community long used to the democratic form of government. And it is equally surprising that Mr. F. E. James, another Britisher, should have supported the retrograde step, confessing the while that he would consider it a good day when it could be abolished. Mr. Robert Foulkes explained that the Europeans did not seek communal representation for themselves. He had no fear that the European community would suffer by contesting in the general electorates, because he was confident that the time would come when the differences and misunderstandings between Europeans and Indians would disappear. If he asked for separate electorates, it was for the sake of the Depressed classes. Surely Mr. Foulkes can realise that communal electorates will not help to dispel differences and misunderstandings even between the Depressed classes and others. It is gratifying that several members of the minority groups spoke in favour of joint electorate in the interests of the minorities themselves, and Mrs. Muthulakshmi Reddi warmly supported it. Dr. Subbarayan, the Chief Minister, made an eloquent and convincing appeal for the abolishing of separate electorates. He would go further and do away with communal representation altogether in the local bodies. But, in view of the feeling and sentiments of the minorities, he would accept the system of reservation of seats and joint electorates. "If Christians, Muhammadans, depressed classes and Europeans, wanted to live in India as citizens and not as members of particular communities, they would admit that the question of communal electorate was not one that ought to be raised in the case of local boards and municipal administration." But why limit this excellent principle to local bodies only? The most significant feature of the debate was that the Justice Party, an avowedly communal body, voted with the Chief Minister and against communal electorate. It is a healthy sign that in the sphere of local self-government at least the communalists in Madras have resisted the temptation to introduce communal electorates. We hope the good example will cast its influence over wider spheres and help to bring about a truly national solution of the larger communal problems.

Misdirected Zeal.

WE must deplore the habit of some Hindu members of the Assembly of bringing up occasionally resolutions asking Government to prohibit the slaughter of cows in India. They serve no purpose except to exacerbate the none too cordial relations between the Hindus and Muslims. As often as a Hindu supports a resolution of the kind a Muslim gets up to oppose it, and much unnecessary and even dangerous

heat is generated. Resolutions of the kind have degenerated into communal challenges. The debate on the resolution moved by Raja Raghunandan Prasad is most unedifying. The Raja recommended that suitable and effective measures should be taken to prevent throughout India the slaughter of all milch cows and prime calves except for strictly religious purposes. The exception was meant to meet Muslim susceptibilities. But it deceived no one. Economic arguments were used as a decoy for purely sentimental objections of the Hindus. The milk supply of India is derived as much from cows as from she-buffaloes, but there is no anxiety to save the buffaloes also from slaughter. Secondly, Hindus as well as Muslims consume milk and use cattle for draught purposes, both for tilling land and for transport. Muslims are, therefore, as much interested in maintaining adequate supply of cattle as the Hindus. And yet, there has hardly been a case of a Muslim moving a resolution of the kind. Thirdly, the economic consideration justify, not the prohibition of the slaughter of cows, but of making it economically possible to save them from slaughter. Few Hindus, or even Muslims for the matter of that, will part with their milch cattle in favour of the butcher if it were at all possible for them to keep them and maintain them. The Hindu, with his sentiment of veneration for the cow, would be the last person to sell it to a butcher, if he can help it. There is at the present moment a regular drain of milch cattle from the villages to the towns, where it is economically possible to maintain them only as long as they yield milk. But the moment they go dry, it is beyond the means of most people to maintain them in the towns. The town-dweller does not know where to send his cow during its dry period for grazing, and reluctantly he sells it to the butcher. Thus while cows come to the city from the village, they do not return to the village when they go dry, but end in the slaughter house. The remedy for this is not to prohibit slaughter of cows but make provision for the economic upkeep of dry cows. The Raja would have done better, and would have received the unanimous support of the Assembly, if he had urged that adequate grazing grounds should be created and cheap railway facilities for transport of cattle afforded. Voluntary organisations can play a very useful part in this matter. Companies or individuals owning tracts of land good for fodder-growing might for a fixed charge undertake to take care of dry milch cattle, and when they begin to yield milk again, send them back to their owners in the towns. Such a system will facilitate improvement in the breed of cattle. Again, from an economic point of view, it is unsound to prevent the slaughter of old and useless cows. India is carrying a large load of useless cattle, which stands in the way of improving the stock of useful cattle. The need is for grazing grounds, not *pinjrapoles*.

Away with It.

THERE can be no doubt that the Hindus who supported Raja Raghunandan Prasad's resolution did so purely on the sentimental ground of veneration of the Hindu for the cow. It is time that the Hindus shook off this ridiculous superstition; it is time some enlightened Hindus organised themselves to eliminate this degrading worship. The cow is no more sacred than any other domesticated animal. We can understand the love of a man for his pet animal: he then looks after its comforts with tender care. But when the sentiment is not accompanied by the tender care, it is a different matter. Some years ago the columns of "Young India" were full of the iniquitous and harrowing treatment of

cows by Hindu *Gowallas* and the abominations they practice on the poor animals. There is no veneration in it, but the worst and the most cruel exploitation of the animal for economic ends. Few, far too few are the cows which in old age are tended with care. The great bulk of them are progressively starved and left to die a lingering death, more cruel than slaughter. It were a mercy to kill them outright, even as Mahatma Gandhi approved of the killing of the diseased calf. Besides being absurd and unreal, the sentiment is positively dangerous in India. It has been the cause of great misunderstandings and quarrels, occasionally leading to bloodshed, between Hindus and Muslims. If it is a folly to venerate the cow, it is criminal to expect others to share that veneration.

Women in Conference.

UNDER the auspices of the All-India Women's Conference, Mr. Jayakar delivered a lecture in which he pleaded vigorously for the Hindu woman's right of inheritance and urged the need of fresh legislation amending the present law. Referring to the vow of marriage he said it clearly indicated the acquisition of property by the bride. He pointed out the unfairness of a widow being denied all share in the joint family property, except a bare maintenance, on the ground that her requirements under a system of ascetic life enjoined on her needed no more. Even in the case of separation the widow without a son had to preserve the property to be handed on to a distant heir, may be, of the fourteenth remove. This is certainly out of joint with our modern conceptions based on the equality of the sexes. He therefore called on the women to agitate for an amendment of the law so as to enable a widow, without a son, to claim the entire share of her husband, and in the case of separation, to get the whole of his property absolutely, as also to enable her to acquire property independently from other sources. A suggestion was made by one of his questioners that there should be identical legislation for all women in India, irrespective of their religious creeds. As long as Hindus and Muslims insist, and that too vociferously, on having their own personal law in this and other spheres, such a piece of legislation is almost an utopian wish. In the meantime, however, it is necessary to train women to such a conception, so that when the time is ripe for such legislation, there should be no opposition from them at least. The various other anomalies of a woman's position have been laid bare by many a social reformer and some early and comprehensive legislation about women's property rights is certainly indicated. The Resolution moved at the Conference recommending to the All-India Women's Education Fund Association to form a committee for the establishment of an All-India Training College was carried by a large majority; this shows the keenness of the women in removing the defects of a shortage of teachers. The objections to such a college on the ground of its English medium of instruction were effectively answered by Mrs. Fardoonji, who explained how the teachers, after receiving training in English in the latest methods of education in a central place, could easily teach in their own vernaculars when they get back to their places of work. We heartily welcome the Resolution declaring the Conference to be in favour of compulsory primary education for girls and requesting local bodies to take immediate steps to introduce it in urban and rural areas in such a way as to make it universal in twenty years.

Articles.

THE VICEROY'S SPEECH.

THERE is a ring of sincerity in the Viceroy's Speech that is unmistakable. In his address to the Legislative Assembly on the 25th inst, His Excellency spoke as a friend of India, and not as the head of a foreign bureaucracy of exploiters. "I have striven hard", he said "not, I think without result, to secure the recognition of what I felt to be the just claims of India at the hand of Great Britain." The result was the offer of the Round Table Conference. The time and the terms of the offer were obviously meant to placate and reconcile the Congress, which, however failed to seize the opportunity. Notwithstanding the petulant provocation of the Congress, the Round Table Conference, he announced, will be proceeded with. The success of the Conference will, he said, "depend far more profoundly upon what her (India's) public men can achieve in welding together into a true unity the different elements that compose her being and represent the sum of her political thought than upon anything that His Majesty's Government or anybody outside India may be able to do." And for this unity and political wisdom he appealed with a passionate eloquence that will do credit to Mr. Gandhi himself. "I would accordingly hope most earnestly that the leaders of all those who will be represented at the Conference may realise that no duty to which the love of their Motherland may impel them can transcend in dignity or worth this call to unity and that they may utilise wisely the interval before the Conference in training the ears of their countrymen to hear it."

With regard to the purpose, scope and procedure of the Round Table Conference, His Excellency said that the assertion that the goal of India is Dominion Status, though useful in itself, was not the same as the attainment of it, and that the Conference was not intended to draft and pass a constitution for India by a majority of votes, which will thereafter be binding on His Majesty's Government, but merely to afford guidance to His Majesty's Government, who would subsequently submit draft proposals to Parliament. There is no need to cavail at these statements. Nobody, not even the most fanatic exponent of Dominion Status for India or of Independence will pretend that here and now it will be possible for India to attain full Dominion Status. A period of transition is inevitable. All that we need to secure is that the progress to full Dominion Status will depend on ourselves and not on periodical examinations by British Commissions. The Viceroy was constitutionally correct when he said that it was for His Majesty's Government in the last instance to frame proposals to be submitted to Parliament. But he himself made it clear that the destiny of India was in the hands of Indians themselves. If we have confidence in ourselves, we have nothing to fear from the mere reiteration of the constitutional position of His Majesty's Government.

There has been some adverse comment and the expression of disappointment at the Viceroy's statement that the clear definition of the destination was not the same thing as the completion of the journey. It has been interpreted to mean that India has to wait long before she attains Dominion Status. Another passage in the Viceroy's speech negatives this interpretation. "The whole object of the conference now proposed is to afford the opportunity to His Majesty's Government of examining in free consultation with Indian leaders how they (the difficulties) may best, most rapidly and most surely be surmounted." Whether the destination is far or near will depend on us, and the type of representatives that are invited to the Conference. And in this matter of the selection of representatives, the Viceroy invited suggestions from the public. The public will be better employed in accepting the invitation and sending up names of people, the wisest and the best that India has, rather than in looking for apparent inconsistencies in the speeches of Viceroys and Secretaries of State. It is even more important that the All-Parties Conference that Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru is organising should be made an unqualified success. Those who ask for Dominion States to be dropped into their laps and to be promised in advance show little confidence in themselves and have not shaken off their mendicant mentality.

STATES' SUBJECTS AND THE SAPRU CONFERENCE.

THE "Sansthani Swarajya" in its last issue puts in a plea that the representatives of the subjects of the Indian States should be invited to the preliminary All-Parties Conference which the Committee under Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru appointed by the Liberal Federation in Madras last Xmas is organising. As a precedent, it quotes that Pandit Motilal Nehru had invited such representatives to the All-Parties Conference that he had convened some time ago. The "Servant of India" has consistently held the view, and rightly, that the representatives of the subjects of the Indian States have a place at the Round Table Conference. It follows from it that they have a place at the preliminary All-Parties Conference as well. It is unfortunate, however, that neither the Princes nor the Government of India have allowed the claim. The Princes had declined the invitation of Pandit Motilal Nehru on behalf of the Congress on the ground that they would not meet their subjects at an All-Parties Conference convened to discuss the external relations of the Princes with the Government of India. The Government's decision to exclude the subjects of the States from the Round Table Conference has only strengthened the reluctance of the Princes. If the Government, with its prestige, power and authority, could not or did not prevail on the Princes to permit their subjects to be represented at the Round Table Conference, there is very little chance of the Sapru Committee prevailing on them to take a different course. If the Sapru Committee invited both the Princes and their subjects

to the All-Parties Conference, the latter might attend, but not the former.

Under the circumstances, the Sapru Committee has two alternatives open: either to exclude both or invite only the Princes and leave out the subjects of the States. The latter alternative seems to be the wiser of the two, notwithstanding the risk that the subjects of the States will be disappointed. It is here contended that the exclusion will do the States' subjects no real harm and that they may well acquiesce in it. The presence of the representatives of the Princes, however, is vital and must be secured.

The subjects of the States have often repeated that they do not wish to bring up before the Round Table Conference the question of the internal administration in the various States. Their interest in the Round Table Conference is to see that the constitutional relations between the Princes and the future Dominion Government of India should be the same as they are between them and the Government of India today. Secondly, they desire to secure economic justice to the States in the matter of customs revenue, etc. As regards the latter, Mr. G. R. Abhyankar, in his Presidential Address to the recent Bhor State's Subjects' Conference, stated that "So far as this is concerned there is no conflict between the rulers and ruled." It is true he added that "if however any relief is to be given to the Indian Princes in this respect, it is absolutely necessary to see that this relief goes towards the benefit of those who have been indirectly paying this taxation." But the disposal of the relief is a matter of internal administration, outside the purview of the Round Table Conference. It follows, therefore, that the representation of the States' subjects is not essential for the purpose of safeguarding their economic interests that will come up for discussion at the Conference. But the representation of the Princes is essential.

The only other matter that will come up at the Round Table Conference in which the subjects of the States have a vital interest is the constitutional one. The subjects of the States are profoundly dissatisfied, and rightly, with the administration that now prevails in them. They want it to be reformed and modernised. In their attempts to secure reform they come up against not only the Princes but the suzerain Power, the Government of India. They are disappointed with the way the Government has discharged its responsibilities. They have great faith and confidence that the Dominion Government of India will press to the full its moral and constitutional influence for the purpose of modernising the administration of the States. They are, therefore, anxious that the Dominion Government of India should inherit, without diminution or abatement, the powers and obligations that the Government of India today possesses over the States. They resist the attempt made by the Princes to take themselves out of the control of the Dominion Government of India.

Though the reasons may not be identical, the British Indian politician is at one with the subject of the Indian State in upholding this view regarding the relations between the Princes and the Dominion

Government of India. There is hardly a single British Indian leader, of whatever school of thought, who has not repudiated the constitutional theory advanced on behalf of the Princes that their relations are with the Crown direct and not with the Government of India. To allow the contention of the Princes is to deny Dominion Status to India. The British Indian is bound to oppose most strenuously the claim of the Princes as it is incompatible with Dominion Status for India. It will thus be seen that, though for different reasons, the views of the subjects of the States and the British Indian politicians are identical with regard to the relations between the Princes and the Dominion Government of India. The subjects of the States have no separate interest apart from that of the British Indians to safeguard and the latter cannot surrender the former's interest without surrendering their own claim.

If there is any conflict of interest at all, it is between the Princes and the British Indians. The latter have made up their minds to secure Dominion Status. The Princes seem to hesitate to come under the control of the Dominion Government of India. Notwithstanding the constitutional interpretation of the relations of the Princes with the Government of India, it is certainly desirable that their cordial consent should be secured if only to facilitate the attainment of Dominion Status and to give India a good chance to assimilate the new status. The co-operation of the Princes is useful from an other point of view. It will take a long time before the Indian Army can be completely Indianised, and in the meanwhile, it is difficult to say if and how long British officers will be available for service in India. The Indian Princes have their own armies, and they may have to take a real share in the defence of the country against external aggression. It may become necessary to make some concessions to the Princes in order to secure their hearty co-operation. It will be to the eternal credit of India if the Princes attended the Sapru Conference and came to an agreement here, on Indian soil. They may well remember the patriotic action of the Samarai in Japan on the threshold of the modern era in Japan. As for the subjects of the States, their economic interests are safe, on their own showing, in the hands of the Princes; and their constitutional interests are equally safe in the hands of the British Indian politicians.

"PRACTICAL POLITICS."

A ONE-DAY STRIKE!

A one-day strike that is threatened on the G. I. P. Railway on the 4th of February and which, if it comes about even partially, is bound to cause dislocation and inconvenience to the public, gives some food for thought to those who are connected with the Trade Union Movement in India. Apart from the merits of the present dispute to which I shall refer in a moment, it cannot be forgotten that a strike on a railway is a strike with which the general public are deeply concerned, and that the creation, and not the alienation, of their sympathy is an additional factor of importance in such a strike. Have the

railway men on the G. I. P. satisfied themselves and the public about the significance of a strike *for a day only* and the result that it is likely to yield? An answer to this question will largely determine their *bona fides* as trade unionists and their own position with the public.

On the merits of the dispute, it is impossible to withhold one's sympathy with the G. I. P. railwaymen. They have grievances the genuineness and seriousness of which cannot be doubted; they affect their conditions of life and service very materially. That they had placed them before the authorities and waited long enough for some satisfaction is a fact. The attitude of the authorities has been found to be one not only of indifference but of callousness. They have shown a tendency to defer consideration of even minor grievances till such time that their redress almost invariably synchronises with the presentation of other grievances, thereby removing the grace of their action and allowing the list of unredressed grievances to swell. Their organisation and continuation of advisory committees on a wrong, one might almost say mischievous, basis, is one of their methods of "divide and rule" and has been a sore point with the railway men. The latter have thus a clear case and are justified in drawing out the last weapon in their armoury, the declaration of an *industrial* strike, upon the failure of other weapons to yield the desired result.

The G. I. P. Ry. Staff Union, therefore, offered some three months ago, under the advice of its able and level-headed Secretary, Mr. S. C. Joshi, its hand of cooperation to the G. I. P. Railwaymen's Union and pleaded for joint preparation and joint action. Joint preparation, such as further organisation, intensive propaganda and collection of funds, is, it will be recognised, a condition precedent to and essential for joint action in the case of a lac and twenty thousand men, of whom only twenty thousand have come under the organisation of the two Unions, if such joint action is to have a fair chance of success. That offer of co-operation was unceremoniously rejected by the G. I. P. Railwaymen's Union, of which Messrs. R. S. Ruikar and F. J. Ginwala are, for the moment, the guiding (?) spirits; and the latter started the stunt of a one-day strike. Thus with their own hands they have killed the chance of unity which, is a vital factor in any industrial action but which, in their arrogance, they seem to consider of little importance as compared with their latest stunt. With their alleged strength of 40,000 members they seem to be so sure of coercing the Railway Administration into submission by flourishing the wand of one day's strike that they do not attach any importance to Mr. Joshi's well-knit organisation of 7,000 members, and to the very large mass of unorganised workers. This is indeed a kind of self-confidence from which even Mussolini may draw fresh inspiration.

What is this stunt of a one-day strike? How is it to be interpreted? Is it an industrial action or a political one? If the former, has it a chance of success in the twinkling of an eye and against the combined forces of capitalism and reaction and without the required unity between at least the two

Unions behind it? Will it, at any rate, result in bringing the unorganised mass of the G. I. P. Railwaymen together so as to prepare them for a future combined action? Cannot this object be achieved, without a show of a one-day strike of doubtful utility by intensive propaganda amongst the rank and file? Has the ballot of the members of the Union, prescribed under its own rules, been taken, and, if so, what is its result? Why has this industrial action been confined to one day only? If the workers are ready for sacrifice, is it not necessary in the interest of honesty and purity of the movement that the fight should have the semblance of a fight so that the men themselves should get some idea of their strength as against that of their employers so as to enable them to make up their deficiency before the next struggle comes up? If, on the other hand, the interpretation of the stunt is to be a political one, I must raise my voice of protest against that move. In the present condition of the Indian workers it is dangerous to make them the scapegoat in a political fight. For the moment I leave out of account every consideration other than this: that if they fare badly in a political strike, the reaction, that the failure brings in, is such that they are likely to decline to take any action, however mild it may be, on industrial issues of the most vital importance. Such a result is a death blow to the trade union movement and every honest trade unionist must set his face in a most determined manner against such a move. The public have before them the Presidential speech of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru at the Lahore Congress in which he has advocated the organisation of strikes as one of the methods in the ensuing political struggle and also the amendment, though defeated, of Mr. Subhas Chandra Bose to the Independence resolution of the Congress in which he had also advocated political strikes of workers; they have also before them the Communist philosophy of general strikes and Mr. Ruikar's faith in their efficacy. The G. I. P. Railwaymen's Union owes it to the other trade unionists and the public to give satisfactory replies to these questions so as to remove the suspicion lurking in the public mind about its object in launching this one day's Strike. Till those replies are forthcoming, one can only support the decision of Mr. S. C. Joshi's Union that the railway workers should not join the strike, but at the same time they should give no help of any kind to the Railway Administration in their dealing with the strike, if it takes place, and to the G. I. P. Railwaymen's Union.

R. R. BAKHALE.

INDIA AND U. S.

IN a paper read before the East India Association Mr. S. K. Ratcliffe, formerly Editor of the *Statesman*, explained the peculiar importance of the subject of India to a large section of the American public and dwelt on the need of understanding public opinion in North America on the part of the British in England as well as in India and the Indian people. Mr. Ratcliffe claims as a discovery of his own

the sociological observation that India and U. S. are more alike than any two countries in the world and the array of resemblances that he gives is almost irresistible. The Philippines offers a parallel to British India in the matter of a demand for self-government made by a people deeply divided by race, religion and social habits, but the methods of government followed latterly in Philippines offer little, in his opinion, by way of a parallel for India. Although the Indians are not excluded from U. S. like the Japanese they suffer from the disability of being denied American citizenship by the decree of the Supreme Court; and Mr. Ratcliffe expresses a surprise that this is done on the basis of the unscientific label of the Caucasian in spite of the great advance of anthropology in U. S. Although he bewails the lot of those Indians who were deprived of their holdings and other property as a result of the loss of citizenship he is content that those who were not proceeded against are left in peaceful possession of their property and are allowed to bring up families which will be recognized as Americans. He notes the curious fact that a number of Indians in U. S. have been identified with the political opinions of the Indian left wing and have carried on activities directly related to the subversive movements in India.

Speaking of "Mother India," Mr. Ratcliffe said that by people accustomed to free debate upon social questions Miss Mayo was condemned as a strongly prejudiced observer; in women's clubs and among churchgoers however her picture of Indian social life was regarded as substantially accurate, showing the superiority of American civilization to the strange systems of the East. With regard to opium he is cynical enough to believe that Americans can speak and act with emphasis on the extinction of the opium traffic because opium is not a cause of embarrassment to any department of Government in Washington; in spite of this he admits we ought to feel indebted to the Foreign Policy Association of New York and to other bodies for the serious study of the opium question and for informed criticism and constructive suggestion. It is quite correct to say that modern India with its multifarious awakening could not have come into existence without the Christian missionary and the schoolmaster. Although the part played by American missions in India has been small, Mr. Ratcliffe believes that in the coming years there will be a great expansion of educational and medical work done by them, especially the latter owing to the marvellous agency, as he calls it, of the great Rockefeller Foundation created in 1913 "to promote the well-being of mankind throughout the world".

The interest of U. S. in India is what strikes the English traveller as something actual and widespread, and Mr. Ratcliffe opines that the direct relationship of commerce and culture between America and Asia is certain to be augmented in future; he equally anticipates that America will influence the India of coming years to an increasingly larger extent. In the matter of public health India provides some of the great tasks for sanitary science and preventive medicine; similarly it is possible he says that the

zeal of American social reformers would be stimulated to meet the challenge offered by India's untouchables. In reality the task of liberating India from disease belongs, as he says, to the British research workers and administrators co-operating with Indians in order to secure the financial backing for the necessary schemes. In politics the American press, he tells us, will furnish more Indian news than British papers will think fit to supply; the result is the Indian events are followed with critical interest by the American public. There is a sardonic humour about his confession that in the civilized world, there are not many groups of people that are given to speaking well of the British in India; in particular America is certain to be lavish in her criticism, considering that she has taken upon herself the rôle of giving active sympathy to every people struggling to be free from an alien rule. At the same time he is certain that a large part of the American public will be ready to show sympathy with a friendly power in an unexampled difficulty, when the British Government address themselves in the coming year to the construction of a scheme of self-government for India.

From 1922 Gandhi became for the American people one of the outstanding personalities of the world and the American imagination, he says, has been struck by the spectacle of a man renouncing the whole of modernity and defying the mightiest imperial authority of the present time. In Mr. Ratcliffe's opinion Gandhi embodies a complete negation of the American idea, history, habit and ambition. During the discussion on the paper Sir Albion Banerji and Mr. Rushbrook Williams stressed the necessity for a bridge of understanding between India and U. S. and the latter suggested the continuation of the system of the exchange of professors formerly arranged by the Government of India. Mr. Rushbrook Williams further said that there was a strong body of public opinion in U. S. which desired to force on every Asiatic people the American prescription for happiness and warned the Americans against tactlessness and discourtesy in their efforts in the direction of sanitation and medical relief in India in view of the fact that India had attained a considerable degree of self-respect.

V. N. G.

Our European Letter.

THE LONDON NAVAL CONFERENCE

THE two major aims of the League, as defined by the Preamble to the Covenant are: (1) "to promote international cooperation," and (2) "to achieve international peace and security." Of these the second is by far the more important and the one by which the League must ultimately be judged, for long before the League came into existence various forms of international co-operation were practised, and natural evolution would have led these activities to where the League has led them, even in the absence of the formidable organisation at Geneva. Much of the dissatisfaction which now exists about

the League and a great deal of disillusionment regarding it are due to the slow, much too slow, progress concerning the security of international peace. It is indeed so slow that serious students do not now hesitate to say that if no better results are shown in the immediate future, the League would without doubt find itself beaten by the forces making for war. It would, at the present rate, soon be a matter of simple calculation to tell the probable time of the next war on whose certain effects even the pessimists dare not dwell. Consequently, as Mr. Delisle Burns points out in his new book on Democracy, the next decade is fateful for this decision, and there is a widespread conviction that the forthcoming Naval Conference in London will be the most important of all single events determining the future. Even if only for this general belief, this Conference is the greatest diplomatic event since the Peace Treaty.

THE PROSPECTS.

A writer in the *Christian Science Monitor*, always a well-informed journal, sums up the prospects in a nutshell when he says :—

The atmosphere is more hopeful than it has been before, and there can be no doubt about the warmth of friendship and the earnestness of intention of the two leading naval powers. Yet the practical problems are still unsolved.

What are the practical problems? On the American side there is willingness to admit that

Parity is not, in this connection, a mathematical expression. It may, on the contrary, prove to be a mystical expression. In the whole realm of nature not even two blades of grass enjoy parity—much less complex organizations like countries! It is idle, as one publicist affirms, to define parity as strict equality in the number of ships in each category; for if one can use to advantage ships of a certain category, and another country cannot, then parity is immediately disturbed. But more: even though there were on both sides the same number of identical guns, how would it be possible to obtain parity in the men behind the guns?

And yet parity is not a meaningless term, since we all know what we mean by it. We mean that at least there should be no visible and avoidable superiority on the part of the one or the other. We mean that, without inquiring too closely into the niceties of tonnage distribution, we acknowledge a theoretical equality. Even though parity be only nominal, there will, at any rate, be established a parity of prestige.

But it is precisely with regard to this "parity of prestige" that the greatest difficulties are apt to arise. Quite apart from the question of Anglo-American relations, there are the Franco-Italian affairs to be considered; and with regard to them, parity, so far from being the magic expression it is in connection with Anglo-American conversations, is a term mischievous in its effects. It will be far better to talk of ship-building programmes instead of parity—to begin with concrete figures instead of questions of prestige. Somehow or other the Franco-Italian controversy must now be closed and it cannot be closed by a solemn repudiation of war on the part of representative statesmen (on account of the Latin temperament) but only by setting up a definite machinery for "sanctions". Hence the proposal for a Mediterranean Lccarno, the essence of

which is an invitation to England to stand between France and Italy, to guarantee that the French Atlantic fleet shall not enter the Mediterranean, and to bring pressure on a belligerent nation, or at least to keep the ring. Such a proposal will only with the utmost difficulty find favour in Great Britain in the present political situation in the country, and for all practical purposes, it would amount to strengthening the sanctions involved in the League Covenant to which the United States Government is opposed and against which the Kellogg Pact is principally directed. And yet if a Three-Power accord between Great Britain, Japan, and America is not expanded into a Five-Power accord including France and Italy, not only would the impression of an Anglo-American alliance be so strong as to make the accord little effective as an instrument of peace, but also for that very reason it would hardly stand a chance of being accepted by the American Senate. It is not surprising therefore that the publication of the French Memorandum on the Conference gave rise to such a feeling of apprehension.

THE FREEDOM OF THE SEAS.

Moreover, can the question of the Freedom of the Seas be really burked any longer, and is the present political situation in England suitable for a serious consideration of this issue? Let each answer for himself. I shall content myself by citing the American correspondent to whom I have already referred. He says :—

From the American viewpoint, the British acknowledgment that the United States is not regarded as in an inferior position navally is all important. The abandonment of the doctrine that Britannia rules the waves alone is so profound in its significance that it would be unwise to quibble overmuch about precise ways and means.

Everywhere I was told that the problem of freedom of the seas had scarcely been mentioned at Washington and would not be admitted on the London programme. Doubtless this cautious attitude is justifiable on the part of the authorities; but I frankly fell to considering the implications of parity. Whenever it was asserted that freedom of the seas would not be debated, I replied that if it were not debated it would be because the problem no longer exists in the old sense; for the acknowledgment of parity by Great Britain surely implies the British abandonment of the right to enforce a blockade against the will of the United States. It is quite illogical to agree on parity and still to claim superiority.

But further: if the British can no longer logically control the seas without the consent of the United States, the United States has, in initiating and signing the Pact of Paris, renounced its right to trade with a belligerent. How far this is officially admitted is doubtful, but though prudence may dictate official silence it is obvious to the onlooker that the old rights of neutrals have been scuttled by the Kellogg Pact.

Fortunately the British know how to let sleeping dogs lie and they are not likely to show any haste to deal with the implications mentioned above. But the British have been learning lately that "to sit tight" is not only uncomfortable, but also, in the rapid development in the international situation today, impossible. President Hoover is an energetic man and all who read his Armistice Day speech proposing the inclusion of food slips (with hospital ships) among vessels exempted from conditions

governing blockade would not need to be told that the last of it has not yet been heard. There is a logic of events in America's participation in the organisation for peace: first came the Kellogg Pact, and then the membership of the World Court, and now the question of an executive to sustain the decisions of the Court has become urgent. "The sanctions of the League Covenant," has been the answer so far, and Great Britain still maintains that the differences as to the operation of these sanctions arising between the members of the League only shall be referred to the World Court. Will the United States, which stands outside the League, accept this position as final? That in essence is the ultimate problem before the London Naval Conference.

Geneva, January 8.

Reviews.

THE NATURE OF LAW.

JURIDICAL ESSAYS AND STUDIES. By JOHN C. H. WU. (The Commercial Press, Shanghai. 1928. 24cm. 267p. \$3.00.

THIS collection of essays written by the author from time to time is a remarkable work in more ways than one. It is the work of an erudite Chinese scholar on an essentially Western science and is remarkable alike for its firm grasp of the principles and doctrines of law and legal philosophy of the West and for its brilliant analysis and criticisms of accepted theories from a refreshingly original standpoint.

The essays are arranged in three groups, the first consisting of "Constructive Essays", the second of "Critical Essays" and the third of "Studies in Chinese Law." The fourth group consists of discussions by others on the author's contributions. Three of the essays in the first group are in French and one in German, the remaining four being in English.

In the constructive essays the author mostly restates and develops doctrines which he had already arrived at earlier in his critical essays and the author is not wrong when he asks to be judged as a legal philosopher by his two essays on Stammler and Holmes in the critical section.

Although the essays bear evidence of a most extensive reading of the author in philosophy and jurisprudence, his juristic theories and opinions have been most profoundly influenced by the theories of Holmes and Stammler, with both of whom the author has had the privilege of personal intimacy. One would have thought that, barring the inevitable points of contact between men who are born in the same age and have imbibed the same culture, it would be hard to find two legal philosophers who were more wide apart in their viewpoints and opinions than Holmes and Stammler. Yet the author is equally enthusiastic about the opinions of both and endeavours to establish that the antithesis of these great jurists is really subsumable under a greater synthesis and that the two thinkers are only looking at law each from a different view point which is not irreconcilable with the view-point of the other.

The modern tendency in all branches of science may be summed up as, in substance, a pursuit of the concrete. Philosophy, as well as physics and mathematics, has developed on the basis of abstractions to such an extent as to generate an illusion that those abstractions are the reality. The modern pursuit of the sciences is to draw attention to and emphasise, the concreteness of reality. What Bergson has done to philosophy, Einstein has done to physics and mathematics. The same movement of thought may be traced in Holmes's view of Law, which the author has adopted and developed in his essay on "The Juristic Philosophy of Justice Holmes," in the following words:

"Law is thus a matter of prediction. It does not even consist of rules already recognised and acted on, as Salmond would define it; it consists of the rules which the Courts will probably recognise or act on. This is no definition, to be sure. It is an *aperçu* of what law actually is. It is of psychological, not of logical or mathematical, essence. Psychologically law is a science of prediction *par excellence*. It concerns primarily our future interests; people do not study cases for pleasure, but generally with a view to anticipating what courts will do when future cases arise. One constantly refers, it is true, to past cases as so many repositories of the law, but in the last analysis this is done almost always with the intention of showing that there is sufficient ground for believing that the courts will act in such and such a way in future."

This extremely pragmatic view of the law would seem to indicate an end of juridical science, except as a branch of sociology or anthropology, and one might add that, in this view, there would seem to be really no basis for anticipation or prediction either. For, what could be "*the sufficient ground*" for believing that the courts will act in such and such a way, unless there are some abiding principles on the basis of which such prediction may be founded?

Far different is the point of view of Stammler who emphasises, as against the historical school, the permanence of the norms of justice on which law is based. Stammler recognises, no less than Holmes, that the content of law consists of the "particularities of a historically conditioned will," but he insists that that is not the whole of law. Behind the changing content there is the methodically co-ordinated form of juridical notion. In other words, law has a rational as well as a historical content, as Vico would say, or both a logical or *a priori* and a psychological or empirical content, as Stammler himself puts it.

Dr. Wu recognises the truth in Stammler's philosophy and the difference between the two thoughts, according to him lies in this that one is the conceptual and the other the perceptual view of law. And, the synthesis which he offers is that the law must be looked at as a whole, and the conceptual and perceptual view-points must be combined in a synthetic one. So far nobody will be disposed to dispute his proposition. But when he proceeds to formulate the form of this synthesis as consisting in the hypothesis of law as a thing-in-itself which, according to him, is posit-

ed in both the perceptual and conceptual views of it, one would be disposed to demur. For one thing this view of law as a thing-in-itself runs wholly counter to the view that the only reality is concrete, and therefore, to the whole philosophy of Holmes. Besides this view of law as a thing-in-itself, apart from being a none too intelligible notion, is not very helpful either. For the thing-in-itself which seems to be postulated is nothing more or less than a rational or ethical concept, which is *ex hypothesi* conceptual.

Dr. Wu's solution does not, therefore, seem to take us any where nearer a solution of the conflict. The true synthesis seems to lie in looking upon law as an essentially rational and ethical, though an empirically determined, entity.

It is not possible within the limits of this review to do anything beyond barely indicating the nature of the problem and its solution. But we must not be understood to underestimate the value of Dr. Wu's contribution to the learning on the subject, because we find ourselves forced to disagree from his conclusion. On this as well as on all the other topics dealt with by the learned author, he has brought to bear an extraordinary amount of learning and erudition and an exceptionally acute and critical intellect and he has given his views an extremely thought-provoking expression. He appears to us to have succeeded much more in his critical and expository essays than in his constructive efforts.

The third part of the essays are a most interesting contribution to the knowledge of the world. In this has been given for the first time a translation of several ancient Chinese legal documents which will doubtless be read with interest by historical jurists. The contribution would perhaps have been of greater value if the renderings had been done by a scholar less deeply imbued with the notions of modern jurisprudence. For, as Holmes observed in a letter written to the author, it is difficult to avoid the suspicion that vaguer and cruder notions have been translated by terms involving a more developed conception of law.

NARES C. SEN-GUPTA.

MANDATE SYSTEM.

THE MANDATES SYSTEM IN RELATION TO AFRICA AND THE PACIFIC ISLANDS.

By ELIZABETH VAN MANEN-HELMER. (King.) 1929, 22cm. 331p. 15/-.

THIS feeble system has come into being owing to the probity of character and indefatigable efforts of the late President Wilson. After the defeat of the Germans, the victorious powers were, shamelessly and in spite of their war-time slogan of "no annexations and no indemnities," all for outright annexations! Only President Wilson was faithful to his principles. But the adroitness and cunning of the notorious opportunist, Lloyd George, tricked this simpleton Wilson into accepting a system "which (we quote the authoress's words) would be the mandates system in principle, but which would come in practice as near as possible to complete annexation" (p. 37). It is little short of annexation because the territories are "to be administered as integral portions of the mandatory state" subject only to a few restrictions to safeguard the interests of the natives of

those territories a very elastic phraseology and which "would not include the 'open door' and equality of treatment of other members of the League in regard to immigration." That this system means virtual annexation is again proved by the fact that, to quote the authoress again, "the line which divides the administration of a country as an integral part of another country, and the actual incorporation of the first country into the second is not very broad and not very easy to define. The Commission also has not attempted to define it" (p. 203). That it meant, and possibly means, actual annexation in the eyes of certain mandatories is again vividly brought to light by some school manuals which taught the students that "the mandated territories had been purely and simply annexed to the colonial dominions of the mandatory powers" (p. 156). Far more convincing proofs of this attitude can be found in the *Tanganyika Official Gazette* of Oct. 18, 1925, in the declaration made by no less a person than the British Secretary of State for Colonies at an East African banquet. There he said that he would like "to correct the idea that there was something transient in their hold upon Tanganyika. It was as essentially part to the British framework as any other Protectorate." In the *Tanganyika Exhibition Handbook* prepared for the British Empire Exhibition, there was not the least mention of Tanganyika being a mandated territory. In spite of all this, how the authoress can be so optimistic about the prospective success of this system, we fail to know. We think that the system is an eye-wash, and was intended as a salve to the tortured soul of simple Wilson.

The weakness of this system of trusteeship on behalf of the League is further enhanced by the fact that there is no adequate sanction behind it. In case a mandatory power fails to discharge its responsibilities, there is no greater punishment than publicity, and no competent agency always willing even to inflict that flea-bite-like punishment. The authoress herself admits that publicity is a "feeble weapon," but her indomitable optimism impels her to say that, though feeble, it 'is not to be scorned.' And yet she has to admit that very few members of the Assembly of the League are willing to inflict this pin-prick. She says (p. 152):

"The chief difficulty encountered in the Assembly in regard to mandates is that of finding speakers who will take enough interest to bring up the subject of mandates . . . so far Dr. Nansen of Norway has been the only person who has most regularly brought up the subject . . . There must be more members who will dare to criticise the mandatory powers."

This conclusively shows the patent weakness of this system. The mandates are practically a euphemism for annexation. Their real nature is exposed by a British Colonial Secretary. Granting however that they mean trusteeship, there is no punishment except criticism which can be inflicted on the trustees if they prove faithless. How much the powers care for criticism is known to the whole world. Allowing however that the mandatory Powers do care for public opinion, who is there even to criticise them roundly in the Assembly except the solitary figure of Dr. Nansen? Supposing that men like Dr. Nansen move the Assembly and initiate discussion on the mandates, what is the result? The discussion is postponed for want of sufficient information or some such excuse. If it is taken up again in future sessions of the Permanent Mandates Commission or of the Assembly what happens? The Commission, if at all it summons sufficient courage, makes "too modest a recommendation" (p. 142) or "sacrifices the substance for the appearance". The writer herself says,

"The Commission has let things come to a head before taking any notice of them.... It should cultivate the habit of calling black black and white white and of recommending that the black black be taken out lock, stock and barrel."

The authoress mentions elsewhere that the Commission's task (another word for submissiveness) is at times "exasperation" (p. 190), and we agree with her. This much then for control of the Commission over the mandatory powers. There comes the Assembly's influence over them. And what does the Assembly of the League usually do? We quote the authoress again:—"The assembly is usually ready to congratulate or find extenuating circumstances for the mandatory Powers." One can thus very well imagine what control these two bodies can have on the mandatory powers.

Being thus very little handicapped by the nature of the mandates, and by the machinery of control, the administration in the mandated territories goes on as merrily as if they were annexed to the regions of the mandatory powers. The worst offender in flouting the authority of the mandates in several respects is the Union Government. South-West Africa is the only country of the mandated ones which can be inhabited by the whites. It is given over to the Union Government for administration. But there the interests of 20,000 whites rule supreme and the 200,000 natives go to the wall. The authoress says:—The Union Government's policy is based upon the assumption that "the main purpose of the native's existence is to work for the white man." The result of this policy is either depopulation or discontent in the areas administered. The Tanganyika Medical Report (1924) shows how work for Europeans means disease or death for the natives. The authoress admits in one place that the policy of the mandatory Powers towards native labour is the touchstone of their faithfulness; so long they have failed in that test. Again, the breach of the mandates is evident in the increase of the liquor traffic in the mandated territories in which it was intended that it should decrease or disappear! The only exception to this is New Zealand which has enforced prohibition in Western Samoa.

It is true that the mandates system is new and yet in its infancy. But if we look facts squarely in the face, we cannot share the optimism of the authoress as to the future success of it till human nature is more purified and ennobled than now.

V. M. BHAT.

THE BURDEN OF POPULATION.

POSTERITY IN THE LIGHT OF SCIENCE,
PHILANTHROPY, AND POPULATION.

By FRANK W. WHITE. (Watts & Co., London.)

20cm. 139p. 2/6.

IN this little book of about 140 pages, the author has presented the case for a sane control of the population of the world in a most forceful way. The struggle for existence, that is constantly going on a round us results in all cases, except that of man, in the survival of the fittest. The weaker, diseased or abnormal types are automatically destroyed while the stronger, healthier and normal types survive and propagate. This has in fact been the chief factor in the evolution of life upon this world of ours. But what do we see in the case of man? The great advances in preventive medicine during the last couple of centuries have enabled even the unfit to survive and to produce progeny as degenerated as themselves. Not only that,

but our social institutions have even managed to help these unfit to live, grow and multiply. The total result of all this is that our stock is degenerating.

The total population of the earth is estimated at 2,000,000,000 and is at present increasing at the rate of 12,500,000 per year! Now even with all the discoveries of science, the maximum amount of food that can be obtained from the earth is not unlimited, on account of the simple fact that the total surface of the earth is limited. Moreover, we must take it into account that the deposits of coal, oil and other minerals, essential to a civilised life, are strictly limited. Are we then going to obey the commandment "increase and multiply" until the earth can no longer sustain the human population? Should we not as rational men and women regulate the rate of increase in population in such a way that it is just sufficient to bring about a healthy competition, conducive to progress?

Moreover, at present, it is the better class of population, and therefore the more desirable part of it, that has directly or indirectly to support the undesirable population, and help it to "multiply". This ridiculous state of things causes the better elements in society to put an artificial and, according to the author, an unduly low limit to the number of children they can give birth to. In other words, increased sanitation, state hospitals, unemployment doles, orphanages and the like are all tending towards increasing the undesirable type of citizen at the cost of the desirable one. The remedies suggested by the author are sterilisation of the unfit (those who have hereditary defects, and who are mentally and physically unfit, etc.), birth-control propaganda, especially among the poor, the weak and the diseased, a regulation of the total population of the world by international agreement, passing of laws by which the right to marry will have to be established by each individual on the strength of medical and other certificates, etc. etc. Some of these methods may seem rather utopian, but there is no doubt about the urgent need for a sane population policy. Dr. White has done an eminent service to humanity in writing this book and bringing the subject before the civilised world.

D. D. KARVE.

DEMOCRAT AND DICTATOR.

LENIN. By VALERIN MARCU. Trs. by E. W. DICKS. (Gollancz, London.) 1928. 23cm. 419p. 21/-

THIS is an excellently written book. Almost the first feature that will strike the reader is the literary quality of its style. From cover to cover it is gripping and is throughout forceful and full of grace. The author is very obviously a great admirer of Lenin and of the work he did in Russia. But the treatment is thoroughly objective. In crisp phrases, with dramatic directness that is sometimes thrilling, he describes the hard but glorious life of the Russian revolutionary. As may be expected, nearly half the book deals with the Dictator of the Soviet Republic, but the other half which pictures Lenin

in exile is no less interesting. As a boy he saw his brother snatched away from him to be shot for an attempt made on the life of the Tsar. The memory sank deeply into the mind of the impressionable youth. From that day onward his one object in life came to be to put an end to Tsardom. Whether he was in Russia hiding from the authorities for the sake of dear life or whether he was in exile sending code messages for his fellow conspirators in the mother country, his vision thenceforward never wavered from his idea. Karl Marx had deeply impressed his mind and he was always planning to carry out the doctrines of the master. But thirty years of precious life had to be spent as an exile before he could gain his object of a revolution in his country. The first revolution was a bourgeois affair with which he was not satisfied. And next came the second one of which he was the head. But no sooner was it accomplished than troubles arose on all sides. The peasants divided the land among themselves according to his decree and promptly forgot all about the revolution. The workers were dissatisfied and they had to be placated. Then there was the war at the western front where millions of Russian soldiers were rotting without food and without arms. And on the top of all came green-eyed John Bull now supporting this general and now that against Moscow. Lenin found that to bring about a Revolution, difficult though it had been, was far easier than to maintain it. He had lukewarm allies and indifferent ones with whom he had to work in harness. His own life was in danger. But a dogged pertinacity carried him through. Though in the name of democracy, he was obliged to assume dictatorship. And he worked and drudged as no galley-slave ever worked and drudged. But life itself was ebbing away from him. Barely six years after he had come to power, he lay on his death-bed, an irreparable physical wreck. To admire the man is not to admit his doctrine. The able author has indeed breathed life into his lines and to read the book once is to feel tempted to read it again and yet again.

S. P. SARMA.

Correspondence.

BACKING THE WRONG HERSE.

TO THE EDITOR, THE SERVANT OF INDIA.

SIR,—Under the above headline Dr. Naresh Ch. Sen-Gupta, a Calcutta Advocate, formerly Professor of Law and Dean of the Faculty of Law at Dacca, takes Pandit Jawaharlal to task for what he considers a barren and negative pronouncement in the Congress at Lahore. Curiously enough, Dr. Sen-Gupta approves the "socialist" exuberance of the Pandit-President which for a great majority of thinking men may appear to be the President's weak point in an otherwise brilliant address.

Dr. Sen-Gupta declares himself "a socialist" and a "republican". What does Dr. Sen-Gupta mean? How does he reconcile his republicanism or his socialism with

practice or practices. How does he propose to achieve economic or social equality? What exactly does he mean by socialism? Does Dr. Sen-Gupta as an 'honest' republican criticise the Pandit for not going far enough in his doctrinaire fantasy. I pause for an answer.

I am one of those who believe that India is not fit for Independence yet, nor will be for at any rate another half a century. Holding the view that I do, I have also a quarrel with the Congress President for going too far, though with the ideal of Independence no one can quarrel. But I cannot understand Dr. Sen-Gupta when he says that there would be reason and commonsense, if we insisted on going to the London Conference if it is held, with a programme for a socialist democracy of the republican brand, I presume. Dr. Sen-Gupta must remember that the Labour Party's socialism is a peculiar travesty of socialism in more ways than one.

Dr. Sen-Gupta again argues like a child when he says that England at an early date is going to have a really socialist government. What are his reasons for this belief, the reader is bound, to inquire, and what is "a really socialist" government?

Dr. Sen-Gupta again goes on to argue that the thing worth striving for is freedom—not merely the freedom embodied in the notion of representative government, but the ampler freedom founded on social and economic equality. Would I be right in thinking that Dr. Sen-Gupta's socialism verges very much on the ideal of the philosophic anarchist? Probably if Dr. Sen-Gupta would care to give us his own constructive suggestions instead of a barren criticism of Pandit Jawaharlal's political exuberances, he would be doing a better service not only to the SERVANT OF INDIA, but to India as well.

S. V. AYYAR.

The University,

Dacca.

January 21.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- AGRICULTURAL CO-OPERATION IN THE SOVIET UNION. By G. RATNER. (Routledge, London.) 1929. 28cm.
- DOCUMENTS AND READINGS IN AMERICAN GOVERNMENT, NATIONAL, STATE, AND LOCAL. By JOHN MABBY MATHEWS AND CLARENCE ARTHUR BERDAHL. (Macmillan London.) 1928. 22cm. 1928p. 14/-
- THE WORLD, THE AIR AND THE FUTURE. By CHARLES DENNISTOUN BURNEY. (Knopf, London.) 1929. 32cm. 356p. 21/-
- THE AGRARIAN SYSTEM OF MOSLEM INDIA. By W. H. MORELAND. (Hoffer.) 1929. 22cm. 296p. 15/-
- INFORMATION ON THE WORLD COURT, 1918—1928. By J. W. WHEELER-BENNETT and MAURICE FANSHAW. (Allen & Unwin.) 1929. 22cm. 208p. 10/-
- PRODUCERS AND CONSUMERS. A Study in Co-operative Relations. By MARGARET DIGBY. (Routledge.) 1928. 22cm. 203p.
- AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF SOCIETY. By FRANK HAMILTON HANKINS. (Macmillan.) 1929. 22cm. 760p. 17/-
- WHAT THE NEGRO THINKS. By ROBERT RUSSA MOTON (S. C. M.) 22cm. 267p. 7/6.
- MEN AND MACHINES. By STUART CHASE. (Cape.) 1929. 20cm. 354p. 10/6.
- RESEARCH IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES. Ed. by WILSON GEE. (Macmillan.) 1929. 20cm. 305p. 8/6.