

The Servant of India

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

VOL. XIII No. 9. }

POONA—THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1930.

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

CONTENTS.

	Page.
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	97
ARTICLES :—	
Put Him on His Trial	100
Shouldn't They be Elected? By P. Kodanda Rao ...	101
"Woe, I have Won!" By Dr. H. C. E. Zacharias ...	102
G. K. Gokhale. By V. N. Naik	103
REVIEWS :—	
Labour Welfare. By K. E. Mathew	105
Misleading History of Mangalore. By M. S. Madhava Rao	106
A Warning to Indologists. By S. C. Sarkar ...	107
Control of Credit. By V. N. G.	107
BOOKS RECEIVED	108

Topics of the Week.

The Sapru Conference.

THANKS to the single-minded devotion of Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, there met in Delhi yesterday another all parties conference, excluding, of course, the Congressmen. The task before the Conference is perhaps the most difficult that constructive Indian statemanship has ever had to face. It is a task before which even the Congress, with all its established prestige and the added prestige that the personality of Mahatma Gandhi gave it, quailed and retreated. Under the best of circumstances to evolve unity in a conference of communities with an unparalleled variety of race, religion, creed, language, civilisation and interests, is difficult enough in all conscience. Persistent memories of an unhappy past do not make for cordiality and confidence. Pride and fear alike deepen suspicion: pride of their superior status in the past and fear of their backwardness in the present. Add to this the fact that the foreign Government has allowed the claim of certain minority communities not only to special protection, but to special privileges, the task of unifying them all in common citizenship is wellnigh impossible. And yet, if India is to achieve the constitutional progress that she desires, the difficult task must be essayed and essayed successfully. Unless Indian representatives go to the Round Table Conference with an agreed plan, which it will be practically impossible for the Imperial Parliament to resist, there is little chance of our securing what we want. It will be an eternal disgrace to India if, because of our failure to agree, we should let Great Britain impose a constitution on us, which, besides being unsatisfactory, will be humiliating to us.

Opinion at the Sapru Conference is bound to be unanimous regarding the attainment of Dominion Status by India, subject to reservations for the transitional period. It should not be difficult to agree on the nature and duration of the reservations. The conflict, if any, in this matter will be with the Bri-

tish Government and Parliament, aided and abetted perhaps by some short-sighted representatives of the Princes. Our decisions may suffer modifications in London. But in the matter of communal relations the conflict is between Indians in India; and their agreement on the question is likely to be accepted by the British Government without serious challenge. It is open to the Conference at Delhi here and now to decide the question and decide it finally. In seeking a solution it is necessary to have clearly in view the goal, even as we have Dominion Status as the political goal of India. The goal of India is common citizenship, not communal preferences. Reservations for the transition period are permissible, but their nature and duration must also be fixed. They should be of such a nature that they shall not unduly delay or thwart the goal of national unity. Another question that the Conference may well consider is the invitation of the Viceroy for suggestions regarding the selection of the members of the Round Table Conference.

* * *

Liberals Score.

IN the Bombay bye election to the Legislative Assembly Sir Cowasji Jahangir (Jr.), who stood on behalf of the Liberal Party, was returned by 4,701 votes whilst his opponent, Mr. Jamnadas Mehta secured only 1,693 votes. The result of the election has been variously interpreted. The "Indian Daily Mail" opines that it is primarily a telling victory for the Congress, in a lesser degree a personal triumph for Sir Cowasji and only in a remote degree a credit to the Liberal Party. The defeated candidate considers that it is no victory to the Congress at all. He analyses the figures of voting at the bye election and at the last general election. At the general election, in spite of the prestige of the Congress which was then thrown in favour of going to the polls and several months of campaigning, only 8,700 out of a total of 22,000 voters turned up at the polls: less than 40 percent. At the bye election—and by elections never draw the same number of voters as general elections—6,400 out of 18,000 voters went to the polls: or over 35 per cent. Mr. Jamnadas Mehta argues, and rightly we think, that the Congress mandate, that the polls should be boycotted, is an utter failure reinforced on the day of the election by the presence and oratory of the President and leaders of the Congress; the electorate have been indifferent to the suicidal mandate of the Congress. But when Mr. Jamnadas argues that the election of Sir Cowasji has no political significance, he is on uncertain ground. Granting that the Parsee voters polled solidely for Sir Cowasji from communal considerations, Mr. Jamnadas has yet to explain why the non-Parsees who are over 12,000 compared to the 5,400 Parsee voters, did not go to polls in larger numbers and vote for him. Was it due to the Congress mandate, then? He cannot have

it both ways. There is no use denying that the election of Sir Cowasji is a victory for the Liberal Party.

The Salt Tax.

DURING the course of his militant address to the U. P. Legislative Council, His Excellency Sir Malcolm Hailey sought to enlist the support of the Legislative Council for his policy of fighting the civil disobedience-wallahs. Among the arguments he used was that the latter proposed to disobey the laws which the Legislative Council approved. It was a defiance not merely to the Executive Government but of the Council itself! It is an ingenious argument worthy of Sir Malcolm's subtlety. His Excellency might well enlighten the public and the Council as to the laws made by the Legislative Council for which the elected members, as distinguished from Government members and their nominees, were responsible, and if the civil resisters proposed to defy any of these laws. Shifting the scene to the Legislative Assembly, His Excellency will not pretend that the Assembly was responsible for the salt tax: it was once certified over the head of the Assembly. If the civil resisters proposed to defeat the salt tax, it cannot be pretended that the Assembly was being flouted, and that, therefore, the elected members of the Assembly should take the field in support of the salt tax. We trust that they will, on the other hand, press once again for the abolition of that hated tax, undeterred by the feeling that the credit for the repeal may be claimed by the civil resisters and that it might give a fillip to their campaign. Rather, let their campaign give a fillip to the long-standing desire for the repeal of the tax. And let the Government by acceding to the demand put out of action a weapon of civil resisters which makes a wide appeal to the masses. Government may well pay heed to the advice of Sir Malcolm when he said, "We appeal at the same time to all land owners to see that there is nothing in their relations with their tenants which would afford an excuse to those who are seeking grounds for setting the tenant in agitation against the landowners". The removal of legitimate grievances is the best way to defeat the civil resisters.

Mr. Patel.

IT was said of Mr. Parnell that whenever he got into trouble with his own party, he diverted attention from it by starting a hare: a quarrel in an altogether different quarter. If President Patel wished to resist the Congress demand for his resignation, he could not have done better than to have embarked on a quarrel with the Government over the police arrangements in the Assembly. This adventure in diplomacy does not seem, however, to have been the success that he would have desired. For, the question of the constitutional rights of the President and the Government should not have been raised at all. But having been raised, it is a pity it was not finally solved, but simply shelved. While we are relieved that the *impasse* has been ended and the galleries have been opened to the public, we are not sure that President Patel comes out best in the compromise promoted by the Viceroy. President Patel is to have the services of a high Police Officer who will ordinarily be responsible to him. But if the Officer differs from the President, he is free to appeal to higher Police Officers, and the President is to have an appeal over that to the Government of India—not the Viceroy—who will tender "advice" to the President. It has not been made clear whether the President is free to reject the advice of the Government of India, and what would happen if he did. Since that contingency has not been expressly provided for, it can only mean that the

President will always find it convenient to accept the "advice." It does not look as if President Patel succeeded in bringing the Presidentship of the Assembly into line with the Speakership of the House of Commons. We are not aware that the exercise of the Speaker's authority in the House of Commons is subject to "advice" by the Executive Government at any stage.

The New Jail Rules.

THE new Jail Rules published by the Government of India classify prisoners into three classes. To Class 'A' are assigned those who, by reason of their "social status, education, and habit of life", are accustomed to a higher standard of life but who are non-habitual prisoners with good character and are not guilty of violence to person and property; to Class 'B' are assigned those who, by reason of their "social status, education and habit of life", are accustomed to a higher standard of life but may be guilty of violence to person and property and may be habitual prisoners; while to Class 'C' are assigned the rest. The privileges of the first two classes of prisoners have much in common and are distinguished from those of Class 'C'. It is a matter for satisfaction that racial discriminations have been abolished, though it is possible, and even probable, that European and Anglo-Indian prisoners, who but for their race would have been assigned to Class 'C', will be promoted to Class 'B' automatically. The basic principle adopted for the classification of prisoners is, however, very objectionable. It is utterly wrong to adopt social status, education and habit of life as the basis. The only justifiable basis is the nature of the crime: whether the prisoner was guilty of moral turpitude or not. Those who are not guilty of it should be given ameliorative treatment, whatever their social status, education and habit of life. If these considerations are irrelevant to the severity of the sentence, they are equally irrelevant to the jail conditions. If they are to influence the latter, why, we may have to go back to Manu's Code and devise sentences in accordance with the social status, etc., of the prisoner! It is sometimes argued that the same sentence inflicts greater punishment on a prisoner of a higher social status than on one of a lower. In which case, it is equally arguable that the same crime committed by the former is more heinous than by the latter.

The Bombay Budget Debate.

WITH the revised estimates for the current year and the budgeted estimates for the next year conspiring to bring down the balances of the Province from Rs. 290 lakhs to Rs. 166 lakhs, it is not surprising that very few members were found to have a good word to say about the budget presented during the last week in the Bombay Council. The general complaint was that the advice of the elected members with regard to ways of retrenchment was not followed. Owing to the decision of the Secretary of State that interest charges of the Development Department cannot be met from borrowed capital and will have to be debited to ordinary revenue, the Development schemes became a general point of attack at the hands of non-official members; on this account alone the net burden on the revenues during the next year will be Rs. 53 lakhs odd. The budget for the next year is balanced on the assumption that the motor taxation proposals of the Government will be accepted by the Council; most of the members however have strongly opposed the increase in registration fees and license fees on the ground that it will be a tax upon what has developed into a necessity even for the poor. Another patent defect

of the budget was the failure to make increased provision for primary education. The reply of the Finance Member was not very reassuring on most of the points raised by the members and consisted of vague promises. With regard to reduction of the salaries of higher posts he could only say that opinions of the heads of departments were divided and that the question was receiving consideration and would be expedited by an officer of the finance department specially entrusted with matters of general organization and economy. He pleaded for the extension of the life of the Court Fees and Stamp Acts on the sole ground that without the revenue supplied by this source the balances of the province would go below the minimum regarded as the safety margin and thus involve the Government in grave financial difficulties. Practically therefore we may regard these Acts as permanent fixtures which are to be automatically repeated year after year in a purely formal way since the Leader of the House was not prepared to give an assurance that these measures would not be brought in again next year. In justice to the Finance Member however it must be said that he has made serious efforts to curtail expenditure in various ways; there will be a saving in tools and plants of Rs. 2 lakhs, of nearly Re. 1 lakh by the abolition of the special survey staff in the irrigation department and a large saving by the abolition of the Development Department and a saving of Rs. 3 lakhs by reduction in contingencies and stationery; in addition, establishment costs have been brought down by Rs 6 lakhs since 1926-27. But this is merely touching the surface, the main thing being the improvement of the debt position and the further reduction of the cost of general administration.

* * *

The Bihar and Orissa Budget.

WHAT strikes one after a careful perusal of the Bihar Budget is the remarkable, almost bewildering modesty of its expenditure items, other than those for nation-building services, and the careful way in which the resources of the Province are husbanded. The year 1930-31 will in all likelihood close with a balance of Rs. 1,22,41,000, out of which nearly 41 lakhs will be in the Famine Fund; a truly handsome balance for a province with a total ordinary revenue of about $\frac{1}{2}$ that of the Bombay Presidency. Some other comparisons also are unfavourable to Bomay. For instance, Bihar spends on education Rs. 93,47,000; that is nearly half of the sum spent in Bombay: on Industries Bihar spends Rs. 11,41,000, as against the Bombay; figure of Rs. 1,39,000; on public health Bihar spends Rs. 19 lakhs, that is nearly 65 per cent of the corresponding item in Bombay. An amount of justification is offered to the criticism of non-official members of the Bombay Council about the extravagance of general administration in this province when it is remembered that Bihar puts down for the next year Rs. 99.33 lakhs for this item as against Rs. 223.61 lakhs for Bombay. The following sentence with regard to the income from Excise in the revised estimates for the current year is disconcerting:—"Under Excise we hope to realize $2\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs more than the current estimate the reason being the excellent agricultural situation." With regard to the charge that Transferred Departments are invariably starved the Finance Member tries to meet it by showing that between the years 1926-27 and 1930-31 these departments have secured $71\frac{1}{2}$ % of the total funds available for increasing recurring expenditure in successive budgets. We must congratulate the Province of Bihar on having seriously inaugurated the process of substituting for the present All-India services new provincial services solely under the control of the Local Government in the Department of Education.

With regard to a bold development policy the Finance Member refused to mortgage the resources of the province up to the hilt and leave the future to take care of itself and he wisely said "we have already reached the point at which we will be unable to trench further on our balances for non-recurring expenditure." Is it too much to expect that the Bombay Government will take a leaf out of the book of a Province which has decided that "nothing shall be done to impose burdens which may be beyond its strength in the next few years".

* * *

Bombay Government and the textile industry.

EVERY one will welcome the note issued by the Bombay Government on the textile industry and labour position in the city of Bombay as giving a concrete proof that they realize the seriousness of the situation. Recognizing that the well-being of the city as an industrial centre is linked up with that of the textile industry the note goes on to examine the causes of the last few years' depression which was partly a cause and partly the effect of industrial antagonism which is the dominant issue of to-day; between 1921 and 1929 the working days lost owing to disputes amounted to 49 millions. The Bombay Government say that they have been closely studying the position with a view to arriving at a correct assessment of the factors which have to be taken into account but it appears that they have taken an unconscionably long time to do this. Referring to the part played by Millowners the Government are right in saying that they relied too much on protection by means of import duties without sufficiently realising the importance of rehabilitating the industry by better organisation; it is a good sign that they are now trying to rationalise the industry by amalgamation and centralized buying and selling and to reduce the cost otherwise than by wage-cutting devices. With regard to labour the note sums up the situation by saying "that it is drifting unorganized and suspicious alike of trade unions and of its employers"; while it must be granted that labour is not properly organized we doubt whether it is quite true to say that it is suspicious of trade-unions, there being clear signs that the value of unions is appreciated almost universally. It is reassuring however to be told explicitly that the object of Government is to assist labour to organize itself for its own protection as well as for enabling the employers to deal with the reforms suggested by the Tariff Board and the other Committees. It is good also that the Millowners' Association have notified to the management of the mills to give prompt hearing to grievances and expedite the most important welfare schemes, including free medical treatment and the provision of crèches. Coming to possible remedies it is suggested in the note that by a modification of the Trade Union Act the Registrar might be vested with greater powers of supervision and intervention even to the point of cancelling a Union for infringement of its rules. In the light of the opposition on behalf of the non-official members in the Assembly to the Trade Disputes Act last year the Government would be well advised not to arrogate to themselves powers which are certain to rouse suspicions of labour and retard goodwill between employers and employees. The other suggestion about the deputation of one or two workers from India to study the organization of trade-Unions in England by concerted action of organized Labour in India and the British Federation of Trade Unions, who after their return would organize Unions in India systematically and with a full knowledge of the technique is worthy of serious consideration.

* * *

Articles.

PUT HIM ON HIS TRIAL.

SOMETHING exceedingly rare in the annals of Indian States happened a few months ago when ten live men addressed a memorial to the Viceroy bringing to his notice the most appalling cruelties said to have been practised by the ruler of the State in which they lived, moved and had their being, offering further to substantiate every statement they had made. Copies of this memorial were sent to the press. When we received one, frankly we could give it no credence, so blood-curdling were the allegations made therein against the Maharaja of Patiala, who occupies the exalted position of Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes. But, on the other hand, the memorialists are members of the executive board of the Punjab States' Subjects' Association, and the (All-India) Indian States' People's Conference lent the weight of their name to the publication of the memorial. These two facts would compel one to support the demand for an open inquiry made in the memorial, however incredible the allegations in themselves appeared to be. A journalist, however, often prefers to err on the safe side; we for our part did not merely play for safety, but, being still incredulous, we felt unable to take cognisance of such a document. As we were debating within ourselves whether, by declining to give countenance to the memorial, we were not indirectly helping in the denial of justice to thousands of oppressed people, a Punjab newspaper published the facsimile of a letter by a Political Agent of the Punjab States which seemed to implicate the British Government itself in the misdeeds of the Maharaja. We could no longer withhold our sympathy and support from the memorialists and the States' People's Conference. We, therefore, took the liberty of suggesting that the Viceroy institute an inquiry into the whole matter—not so much for the purpose of giving the Maharaja of Patiala an opportunity of clearing his own character, but for the purpose of the British Government itself dissipating the grave doubts to which the publication of the letter must give rise in the public mind about the manner in which it discharges the duties of paramountcy. Unless such an inquiry was set up the public would be entitled, we said, to draw the conclusion that the British Government was buttressing misrule in Indian States.

The Government, however, does not seem to be too careful of its reputation. The Viceroy has, to all outward appearances, ignored the memorial, and, it need hardly be said, the warnings issued by ourselves and other newspapers. The memorial was a challenge no less to the States' People's Conference than to the British Government, and if the latter has chosen to turn its blind eye to it, be it said to the credit of the former, that, taking its responsibilities seriously, it has made a public inquiry into the matter through a committee of its own members, with Mr. Amritlal V. Thakkar as chairman, which

fact alone, we are sure, would be to most people a complete guarantee of its meticulous integrity. "None of the members of the Committee has any interests, friends or relations in the Patiala State. None of them ever knew any citizen or the ruler of Patiala. Theirs has been a perfectly disinterested task." And the task has been accomplished, as one can see by reading their report and the mass of evidence on which it is based, in a thoroughly judicial spirit. The cold and unimpassioned manner in which they sift the evidence and record their conclusions extorts our warmest admiration. The Committee itself does not claim for its report anything more than that a *prima facie* case has been made out for putting the Maharaja of Patiala on his defence for the numerous charges brought against him. In this preliminary trial, if we may so call it, it was open to the Maharaja to rebut the evidence being tendered against him. He chose however to put in no defence. That should in fact in no way derogate from the strength of the evidence collected, but the Committee, recognising that it is after all *ex parte* evidence, has, with a view not to cause the slightest injustice to the Maharaja, elected to present its report to the public on the lower footing of a mere police investigation. "In the case of offences alleged against ordinary people, the police hold an investigation behind the back of the accused, and when there is sufficient material for a *prima facie* case, they send up the case for enquiry before a magistrate; and then the magistrate has to hold a regular enquiry. This is just our position. We have had in our possession a complaint against the Maharaja of Patiala. We held an investigation behind the back of the Maharaja; and as a result we proceed to state our opinion as to the substance in the allegations," which is, that "the allegations made in the memorial are not made lightly or irresponsibly, but have the backing of very solid and in many cases startling and shocking facts."

The States' People's Conference has done its duty; will the Government now do its? The police having satisfied themselves by a preliminary investigation that a *prima facie* case exists, the magistrate has to bring the suspected persons to trial. But does the British Government lie under a similar obligation where the person to be put on his trial for alleged crimes of abetment of murder, extortion, abduction, and so forth is so distinguished a member of the order of ruling princes as the Maharaja of Patiala, who only the other day pledged the whole force of his State in putting down troublesome agitators hailing from British India? We shall soon see. The Viceroy, in opening the Chamber of Princes the other day, reminded Their Highnesses, small and big, who have assembled there, that the internal autonomy they were aspiring to must ever remain subject to the power of intervention that vests in the paramount power. The power that we would invoke in the present instance is not the power of punishing a proved criminal, but that of bringing to justice a Prince against whom there is strong evidence of guilt. This we think is a simpler task; but it is an indispensable preliminary to the harder one. There can be no punishment of a

proved criminal unless opportunities are provided of proving (and conversely disproving) a crime. The Maharaja of Patiala himself, we guess, would be glad of an opportunity of establishing his innocence. But whether he welcomes it or not, the British Government is under a solemn pledge to protect the States' people from gross misrule. No one can deny that if the allegations are proved the Maharaja's rule would fully answer to the description of gross misrule. We do not maintain, nor does the States' People's Conference, that the guilt should be taken for granted. No punitive action could justly be taken till misrule is proved to the hilt. The demand only is for affording opportunities to the people to prove, and to the Maharaja to disprove, the continued existence for a long time of a serious state of misgovernment. We shall, therefore, be the first to oppose the move, if it be resorted to, of persuading the Maharaja of Patiala to abdicate as the ex-Maharaja of Indore was persuaded. We do not want some kind of punishment to descend on the Maharaja but scrupulous justice to be done to him, and therefore nothing less than a trial, full and open, will satisfy us. If the Viceroy, who has a personal responsibility in the matter, the Government of India being required by the Princes' pretensions to keep out, takes no step to inquire into and lay bare the truth of the allegations, we shall be compelled for our own part to score out the mark of interrogation from the headline of our earlier article (of September 12, 1929 on this subject—"Under-writing Abuse?"—) and to assert that the Government is a party to it. In fact, to our thinking the moral basis of the British Government in India will largely disappear if it considers, as it must be inferred to do in face of the indictment so powerfully drawn by influential leaders of the States' people it remains inactive, that the protection, instead of the prevention, of misrule in States is its ordained task.

SHOULDN'T THEY BE ELECTED ?

IN his opening speech to the Legislative Assembly His Excellency Lord Irwin invited suggestions as to the personnel of the Round Table Conference and the method of selecting them. There are those who believe in sending up names privately to the Viceroy, leaving it to him to pool the suggestions and make his own selection. In the meanwhile, new organisations, new interests and new leaders are springing up who claim representation at the Round Table Conference. Some of these have stressed the amount of representation then desire *vis à vis* the other organisations and interests. But it will be a hopeless task for any body to assess the strength and representative character of the numerous organisations and assign adequate representations to each. Even the political parties in India do not easily lend themselves to such assessment. The Congress is perhaps the only political party in India which runs through all the provinces of India, and measured by the crowds that its annual sessions draw, the most influential organisation. The Liberals are also an all-India Party,

but measured by mass demonstrations, they are quite a small minority. The Responsivists are more or less limited to the Maharashtra areas in Bombay and C. P., and it is difficult to measure their strength. Then there are the Independents in the Assembly, who are independent both of parties and following in the country. The provincial parties are again divided along different lines. Though for the purposes of the Round Table Conference, where political sense is of greater value than voting strength, the numerical strength of the representatives of each party and interest is immaterial, still a truer perspective will be possible only when it approximates to the strength of the party in the country. But it is so difficult to ascertain that it is wellnigh impossible to attempt it without causing bitter disappointment, controversy and even opposition.

Further, it is a vital matter of principle whether the Indian people should have a voice in the selection of their representatives to the Round Table Conference or go without it. The element of self-determination will disappear altogether if the selection is made entirely by the Viceroy: it will not be the duly elected representatives of the people of India, but the nominees of the Viceroy, that will help to shape the Indian constitution. The election of Indian representatives will greatly add to the constitutional and popular appeal of the conclusions of the Conference.

It is therefore suggested that the representatives of India, not excluding those of European interests, should be elected. All the un-official members of the Central and Provincial legislatures in India should, after the next general elections, form the electorate to elect representatives to the Round Table Conference. They should be free to elect them either from among themselves or from others who are not in the legislatures. As for minorities and special interests, only such of them as have already been recognised under the existing constitution should be allowed representation and in proportion to the strength of each of them when the strength of all the legislatures is added together. To illustrate: if the total strength of all the Muslim representatives in all the legislatures, both Central and Provincial, is, say, 30 per cent of the total strength of all the legislatures, then they should be given 30 per cent representation in the Round Table Conference. Similarly for European, Anglo-Indian, Indian Christian, Sikh and other communities and the interests of commerce and industry and labour etc. In other words, the Indian representation at the Round Table Conference should be a replica, on a reduced scale, of the variety and proportion of the un-official legislators in India.

The question still remains whether the quotas of the various minorities and special interests should be secured by a system of reservation of seats in the general electorate or by splitting the latter into special electorates. Under the former system, all the unofficial members of all the legislatures will participate in the election of all the representatives; whereas under the latter system, all the Muslim members of all the legislatures put together will form a special electorate and elect from among themselves or others

the Muslim quota of representatives; and so will the other communities and special interests.

As to the merits of the two, there can be no doubt that the former will yield better results, though in the existing communal atmosphere it may not give full satisfaction to the minorities. If the vital consideration is that the representatives should be disposed to reach agreements and conclusions, and not merely stage a cock fight in London, the former method has distinct advantages.

P. KODANDA RAO.

"WOE, I HAVE WON!"

IN the "good, old days", when every Continental Prince had still a "Court Jew" on its roll of henchmen, the tale goes that a humorously inclined Prince once bet his Court Jew a hundred ducats that he could skilfully trim the Jew's thumbnail with one stroke of his sword. The Jew accepted the bet and put his thumb on the table; the Prince smote it with his sword—and hacked off the thumb. Whereupon the Jew, maddened with the pain, yelled and yelled: "Woe to me, I've won—woe to me, I've won!"

I have been reminded of this tale over the "Independence" stunt at Lahore and its repercussions in England. The Indian comments I have seen on this Congress performance, have been many and of all kinds and from all sorts of points of view: but apparently, nobody has yet taken the possibility into consideration, that after all England might take India at its word and let it have "Independence"—when, I think, India will, like the Jew of the tale, be left to shout in pain: "Woe is me, I have won!"

A recent leader in the *Manchester Guardian* certainly is proof that the contingency of such a development must not be ruled out altogether. The Congress is now launched on its new policy of being of set purpose simply and without frills revolutionary and none will gainsay the great power for mischief that this body, as at present constituted and ruled, can exert. But what, if England came to the conclusion that it would be cheaper to write off certain Indian accounts, rather than throw further good money after bad? That there is such a realist drift of opinion in England at the present moment, is undeniable: I would not have to assess its strength relative to that of the traditional sentimental opinion, but it certainly exists and will grow in strength, were India to prove more and more intractable.

Then what about India—if it was "independent"? I think the contingency certainly ought to be seriously scrutinized.

Independence can come in two ways—by a more or less friendly understanding, or after a real and definite break. In the former case there will be a Declaration of Indian Independence—and a Treaty of Alliance between India and England. Egypt has shown the way to that sort of "independence"; Iraq is next on the list. Cuba is another illustration of such "independence"—of the United States, in this case. The fact is that the freedom of Cuba towards the United States is infinitely more restricted really, though not nominally, than that of Canada

towards the British Empire; and that "independent" Egypt will always depend far more on the British Empire than will South Africa. In the relationship of a Dominion there enters a great deal of sentiment—"goodwill" in the commercial sense of that word—all of which has to be paid for in one kind or another by the "Mother Country": in an Alliance all this is expressly ruled out and every material *tit* on the one side is nicely balanced by a material *tat* on the other. In such a bargain England is bound to be the gainer, whilst, as a Dominion it would be the other side which would score more heavily. Which is exactly the reason why hard-headed Englishmen are beginning to ask, whether the empire-sentiment is worth the price; and exactly the reason, why India ought to ask herself, whether she stands to gain anything at all by having her "Independence" acknowledged.

I am unfortunately aware that at present the Congress, if not India, is still swayed by sentiment alone and wishes nothing so ardently, as to be able to indulge without let or hindrance in the luxury of burning Union Jacks and in similar feats of pent up resentment. It is an understandable position to take, especially by "Youth Movements". Alas, it is not a strong position nor one advantageous to India. Should India be willing to barter away its birth-right for such a mess of pottage, let us be sure, that England will not be found an unwilling purchaser? An Indian Dominion, having the right to call upon England's help and backing, when the occasion demands it, is a very serious imperial liability, no less than its loyalty to the common Empire would be an asset. There are such things as are not worth it at the price. But left with such "independence," would not "independent" India soon have to shout: "Woe to me, I have won?"

But, it will be said, of course no such proper independence is intended; but the real thing, which will make India as independent of the British Empire as, for instance, the United States are already. "We will never make a Treaty with England—perish the thought!"—one hears already the Congress spokesmen disdainfully exclaim. But steady on, my fiery friends: granted that Subhas Babu and Pandit Nehru junior, never, never, will make Egyptian treaties with that unclean thing, England—there are other people in India who will. His Exalted Highness of Hyderabad, for instance. The Maharajahs of Patiala and Alwar and Bikaner and all the rest of the Princes for another. In fact, not one single Prince, I think, would forego the chance there offered; sure to be offered and as sure to be accepted. Pandit Jawaharlal might then lord it at Allahabad as Komissar-President of a Socialist Soviet Republic of the Workers and Peasants of Hindustan; or King Subhas Chandra I of Bengal be the most independent sovereign of all he surveys: the tragic fact will remain, that, if there are potential Indian rulers who want complete independence from, there are actual ones who with equal eagerness will insist on further complete dependence upon, the British Empire—and thus the unity of India will vanish, as sure as two and two make four. As long as India is a Dominion, England's interest demands that India's

unity be safeguarded; once India is a hostile country, every interest of England demands that India should cease to be one: and the difference between one attitude and the other will settle the fate of India for a long time to come.

India in that case would have independence—in parts; and, like the curate's egg, this independence would be good—in parts. It comes then to this: that the whole of India could only have a sham-independence *à la* Cuba; or that real independence could, at best, only come to fragments of India. This is what "Independence" means, with the mask of verbiage torn off its lying face.

The most distressing feature of the position today seems to me to consist in the general tacit assumption that Independence must necessarily be thought better in itself than Dominion Status, and that the latter is merely a *pis aller*, is one half of a loaf, which as a whole one cannot get at once. Against this, I submit, at least the Liberal Party of India should make it clear to its adherents and to its opponents alike, that its policy of today is not merely the Extremists' policy of yesterday; that it does not desire Independence, because for the time being Dominion Status would be cheaper to come by: but that it refuses Independence on principle, because it is a negative, unfruitful policy, which is opposed to India's interests and, especially, to her unity. Let us not take India's unity too much for granted. We have already in the past only too successfully worked for Provincial Autonomy, though we merely meant freedom from alien rule: forgetting, perhaps, that, once control from a central government is slipped, it is not easily recovered; and that, once the centrifugal forces are allowed full play, the parts fly off and cannot be recovered.

To balkanize a country is easy enough: to federate the fragments afterwards is a tough job and often impossible. Look at the fate of the "Succession States" in Europe today: become "independent", their existence has become economically, politically, culturally, a nightmare—and yet, who is there today skilful enough to unscramble these eggs, which were smashed with such light heart a decade ago to the strains of "Long live Independence", and "Our Nation first"? Belgium celebrates this year the centenary of its "independence" from Holland, a country which together with Belgium forms as much a natural entity, as any geographical, cultural and political necessity can ever make one: yet, separated today, how to bring the severed parts together again? The task seems hopeless and the only remedy actually proposed is to subdivide the country still further and to declare the "independence" of Flanders! Thus does the *damnosa hereditas* of fissiparity, of "independence", work itself out. Even Ireland, as an English Kingdom, was at least one: today, Ireland is not a Free State; there is merely a Free State in Ireland. Separation and fragmentation is the twin fate staring also India in the face: and because we do not want the one, we do not want the other either. Besides, we, as Indian Liberals, do not want India as a Hermit Nation, even if we would get it; our ideal for India is not Tibet nor what China used to be,

when it lived segregated behind its Great Wall. We do not aim at non-cooperation, whether at home or abroad; we mean to let India keep and improve its place in the sun of the world. We know that real independence is impossible nowadays for any country, big or small; we know that we shall pull more than our individual weight, if we enter international life as member of a team, the British Empire team, rather than if we tried to play a little hand of our own, divorced from and suspected by the rest of the field.

That is, I should say, why we Indian Liberals refuse *on principle* the negative shibboleth of Independence and *on principle* want to work positively, constructively, for that Dominion Status, which will safeguard India's Unity no less than her freedom, and which will render most effective her co-operation in the world's work, not only for herself, but also for Humanity as a whole.

H. C. E. ZACHARIAS.

G. K. GOKHALE.

IN "Young India", dated July 13, 1921, Mr. Gandhi, making what he calls his "confession of faith", wrote about the late Mr. Gokhale as follows:— "He seemed to me all I wanted as a political worker—pure as crystal, gentle as a lamb, brave as a lion and generous to a fault. It does not matter to me that he may not have been any of these things. It was enough for me that I could discover no fault in him to cavil at. He was and remains for me the most perfect man on the political field. He frankly differed from me in my extreme views on non-violence. Nothing could put us asunder. *If he were alive today, I know I would have been working under him.* I thought I must declare my faithfulness to him, especially when I seemed to be living in a camp which the Indian world calls opposite".

It will not be inappropriate to meditate for a brief while on the message and lesson of a noble life like that of Gokhale during the week following the fifteenth anniversary of his death, and especially at a time when the air is full of the swelling cry of independence and the severance of the British connexion. Mr. Gokhale was, indeed, "the most perfect man in the political field" of his times. In the last years of his extremely crowded and intensive political career he had developed into an all-India leader enjoying an international reputation for sanity and moderation joined to fearless, independence of view and opinion. An educationist and student to the core, he felt the burden of his responsibilities even more heavily than any other publicist of his day. On every question of public importance, be it of finance, economics, currency, statistics, or of the intricacies of constitutional procedure and settlement, Mr. Gokhale was rarely found tripping. He did not believe in politics without the severest intellectual and moral discipline and preparation at the back of it. He never indulged in mere vapourings of the imagination, exuberance of language or pyrotechnics that dazzle the mind and bewilder it. It is a point worthy of note that his longest speeches, and on hard, matter

of fact problems, hardly exceeded an hour's limit. Hard facts, stern realities, a full knowledge of conditions and history—these were the golden keys he used to solve every problem of the hour that happened to monopolise his attention. And to this study and to the steady and evergrowing discipline of grappling with facts, he added a suavity of tone and an accommodating spirit that are of the essence of a statesman's temperament. With him there was no temporising. He would never burke the real issue. But his mind was not like a water-tight compartment and he was far from being either pugnacious or self-opinionative. And, least of all, was he what has been so aptly described as "an embodied theory".

Mr. Gandhi has told us that the late Mr. Gokhale frankly differed from him in his extreme views on non-violence. Mr. Gokhale's difference with Mr. Gandhi on this point saved the former from advising his countrymen from taking a single step that was rash and disastrous and that was calculated to set back the clock of progress by being pushed to extremes, the apparently best lends itself, in this imperfect world, to easy perversion and, in the result, brings on consequences that the author never imagined to flow from it. Mr. Gokhale feared that it was the lot of him and those like him "to serve the country by their failures". But in the actual result, because of their patient, toilsome and self-effacing work, the country had taken big strides forward in political advance and accomplishment. Mr. Gandhi always talks in a strident tone, though in the language of meekness and non-violence. He promises instantaneous success, of course, subject to conditions. But the good that lures him from afar "often as he follows flies." Gokhale believed in negotiation and conciliation. Mr. Gandhi believes in nothing else but direct action, whatever the form and colour that action may take at a particular time. Mr. Gokhale went to South Africa and discussed things with General Smuts. And the Gandhi-Smuts agreement was the fruit thereof. Mr. Gokhale was punctilious not to utter a word too much. Mr. Gandhi wrote and spoke as furiously in South Africa as he now does in India. And on his confession, it took him eight years to convert General Smuts to sanity by satyagraha backed by support from the Indian Government and the Indian people. Mr. Gandhi condemns western civilization, ridicules the parliamentary system of government, attributes all our weaknesses to education and regards literacy as a shibboleth. He does not know how to discriminate, or rather would not discriminate, between the use and abuse of a thing. He traces all our drawbacks to British rule and finds his best type of self-government in the village! It is his ideal type of life and civilisation. In the result Mr. Gandhi has made himself the dictator, swears by independence and the proletariat, offers khaddar and hand spinning as the panacea for all our economic ills, and if he had his way, would abolish all schools and colleges or turn them into nurseries for turning out workers for his hand spinning association and civil disobedience propaganda. We had one year's experience of that programme about ten years ago and we shall

soon have a taste of it, once again, within a few months from now. It is time, in these circumstances, to hark back to Gokhale from Mr. Gandhi.

One of the conditions of self-government which the late Mr. Gokhale imposed was the power in us to co-operate with all. "They must seek", said he to his countrymen, "steadily to increase what little powers of administration and control they possessed and they would be injuring, and not advancing, the interests they had at heart", by the policy of universal boycott. "They must all resist", he added, "as much as they could, the attempt to shift the foundations of their public life". And again, "The loose talk in which some people indulged, that constitutional agitation had failed in their country, was unjustified, as they had not yet exhausted even a thousandth part of the possibilities of real constitutional agitation". No doubt, Mr. Gokhale had defined the furthest limit of that agitation to be "passive resistance, including even its extreme form of non-payment of taxes". But it ought not to be forgotten that Mr. Gokhale had not failed to add that "everything that was constitutional was not necessarily wise or expedient," and, further, that "the question of what was wise and expedient and what was unwise and inexpedient was of the utmost importance". Mr. Gokhale ruled out unhesitatingly the method of boycott and passive resistance as both unwise and inexpedient. Those who would understand fully what he meant have to turn for that purpose to his famous speech at Allahabad on "The Work before Us", delivered under the presidentship of Pandit Motilal Nehru.

The faith in Mr. Gokhale was the faith born of the practical experience of affairs. Mr. Gokhale was an idealist, no doubt; but his idealism was fully under the control of his practical genius as a statesman and a tried man of affairs. And, therefore, again and again, he insisted, in his long and strenuous efforts to bring both his own people and the rulers to view the political situation from a correct standpoint, that "the question was not one of what was theoretically perfect but of what was practically attainable. It was a question not merely of dreams, but also of muscle and character, of capacity, organisation and sacrifice." He warned his countrymen, "not to behave like persons who sought to fly from evils they knew of to those that they knew nothing about." This was a piece of advice he gave in 1907 when the air was full, as it is now, of the talk of independence and of the means to attain it.

He then maintained, in most unequivocal terms, that "the goal of self-government within the Empire involved a minimum disturbance of existing ideas, and it meant proceeding along lines which they understood. Such a goal, moreover, enlisted on their side all that was high-minded, freedom-loving and honourable in England. It would be madness, it would be folly, on their part to throw away in the struggle that lay before them these enormous advantages." "The cases of the French in Canada and the Boers in South Africa," he added, "showed that there was room enough in the Empire for a self-respecting India." He significantly observed that

those who thought that this goal was unattainable, curiously enough, talked of "another goal that was even more impossible of attainment," namely, independence. If these words were true in 1907, they are truer still today when we have advanced still further and when "self-government within the Empire" has come to mean much more than what it meant even to Canada and South Africa in the days preceding the Great War. The Viceroy and the Labour Government of the day in England have made our position in this respect exceedingly clearer than it was visualised by Gokhale in 1907. And conditions have materially altered in our favour since the time that Gokhale first spoke of it in 1907. On the other hand, if independence was difficult to achieve in 1907, it is still more difficult of accomplishment now, whether by violence or by non-violent passive resistance. Visualising the problem as a whole, Mr. Gokhale addressed the following words to the advocates of independence and universal boycott, which deserve to be particularly recalled at the present moment. "Some of the leaders of the new thought have gone so far", he said "as to talk of independence as an object of practical pursuit. Now, if any one sits at home and gives himself up to dreaming dreams and, among them, dreams of independence for his country, and every manner of perfection for his people, I would have no quarrel with him. But the moment he preaches it as a practical policy to be pursued by his countrymen, it becomes another matter, and we, then, owe it to the best interests of the country to resist the propaganda with all our energy and all our resources. One has only to look around to realise where a movement for independence is bound to land us. Meanwhile, it means sure destruction or, at any rate, indefinite postponement, of all those opportunities for peaceful progress which are within our reach. We hear it asserted that their plan is to use only peaceful means for the attainment of their end. They may intend to use only peaceful means, but the Government which certainly does not want to see its rule overthrown, will not long permit them to retain their peaceful character."

These words of Mr. Gokhale have to be remembered at least by Mr. Gandhi, if by no one else. For he calls Mr. Gokhale his political master. The movement for independence in those days went by the name of self-reliance and universal boycott. It was sponsored by Aurobindo Ghose and Bipin Chandra Pal. One has turned a Yogi and gone into seclusion. The other has become a convert to Dominion Status. The movement today is an old friend with a new face. It is that for Purna Swarajya by the method of Satyagraha and civil disobedience. In the light of all that happened during the year and half when it had its first trial in 1921-22, will not Mr. Gandhi, encircled as he is, according to his own latest admission, by the fire of violence, desist from his own hobby that may mean untold evil to the country which he undoubtedly loves so passionately and truly? Will he not take it from "the most perfect man in the political field" that independence was "a goal even more impossible

of attainment" and that it inevitably meant "flying from the evils they knew of to those they knew nothing about"? It is a leap in the dark which neither our outward circumstances nor our inner strength would justify.

V. N. NAIK.

Reviews.

LABOUR WELFARE.

INDUSTRIAL WELFARE IN INDIA. By P. S. LOKANATHAN. (University of Madras.) 1929. 24cm. 222p.

MR. LOKANATHAN'S volume, "Industrial Welfare in India", is the third of the series of economic studies which the University of Madras is publishing under the general editorship of Professor P. J. Thomas. The rigid isolation of our universities from the currents of every day life and their narrow academic outlook have long been matters of comment and adverse criticism; the book under review, however, marks a desirable departure from the policy of keeping the noses of university research workers to the grindstone of academical studies that have little or no bearing to the storms and stresses of the work-a-day world. The present volume is particularly welcome as dearth of suitable books dealing with Indian labour conditions is to some extent remedied by this contribution to the scanty literature on the subject. The author's avowed purpose is to make "a critical study of the industrial welfare work carried on in India by the State, the employer and organised labour", but the book is more than a mere register of welfare activities. The first part of the book is devoted to a study of the principles underlying the labour legislation of the country, and the occasion is utilised by the author to pass in brief review the main landmarks of Indian labour legislation—the Factory Acts of 1881, 1891, 1911, 1922 and 1926. The second part is more objective in character as an attempt is there made to describe in some detail, the recent efforts made by sympathetic employers in the direction of active, constructive welfare work. The third and last part which deals with trade unionism and welfare is rather sketchy in treatment, which is no doubt due to the author's lack of actual contact with this aspect of the subject.

Notwithstanding this deficiency, the book can be confidently recommended as a suitable introductory study for those who desire to obtain a bird's eye-view of the labour situation in the country. Remarkably sympathetic in his treatment, Mr. Lokanathan brings out sequentially the economic causes underlying the present industrial unrest, the psychological factors at work behind the revolt of labour, and the agencies that are at work in the country to bring about peace in industry. The recurring industrial crises of the last fifteen years certainly furnish sufficient cause for alarm and deep searchings of heart on the part of the Government, the employers and the workers. During the period 1924-1927 the number of industrial disputes in India averaged about 131 annually. The

years 1928 and 1929 were even more disastrous. In Bombay, the fate of the textile industry is literally hanging in the balance; in Calcutta, a series of sympathetic strikes almost paralysed the jute industry; Jamshedpur is even now under the ominous shadow of potential strikes and lockouts. Mr. Lokanathan has made it as his thesis that the state, the employers and the workers are, all the three, responsible, though in varying degrees, for these conditions. The vicious circle of low wages, low efficiency and low standards of living is admittedly at the bottom of the unrest; the difficulties of the situation are, however, augmented by the tendency of labour legislation to lag behind labour requirements, by the attitude of unconcern and apathy of a certain type of employer, and by the fatal facility with which a gullible section of our workers would act up to the promptings of Moscow.

It is not, however, an entirely unrelieved picture of gloom that Mr. Lokanathan paints. To the hot-gospellers of direct action in labour circles the author points out that the steady and evolutionary, if slow, progress of Indian labour legislation furnishes the surest guarantee of further uninterrupted advancement. What is more, in the International Labour Organisation and in India's continued participation in the Geneva Conferences, the author finds valuable safeguards against stagnation in labour legislation. Thus, there is no occasion for unrelieved pessimism, even though the immediate prospects may not be heartening. The author's plea that in envisaging industrial problems "both employers and workers should dwell more upon their mutual interests and less upon their differences" is particularly apposite at this critical stage when the Indian labour movement is at the cross-roads and have to choose between evolutionary and revolutionary methods.

K. E. MATTHEW.

MISLEADING HISTORY OF MANGALORE.

MANGALORE. A HISTORICAL SKETCH. By GEORGE M. MORALS. (Codialbail Press, Mangalore.) 1927. 19cm. 94p. As. 12.

THIS is the second volume of the Studies in Indian History, and the first product by a research student of the Indian Historical Research Institute of the Bombay St. Xavier's College inspired and fostered by the Rev. H. Heras. It is obviously meant for the lay reader, the man in the street, and the impression which it makes upon him has its own value in estimating the success of the labour spent upon it. The bibliography and the copious references, etc. make it abundantly clear that a vast amount of original sources has been studied on the subject. Though it is said that the importance of Mangalore "is of very recent origin," to wit, from the arrival of the Portuguese in the 16th century, the sources of information availed of are almost exclusively of European authorship. No doubt only these are so far published and intelligible to the student who knows only the European languages. But this must necessarily impose a serious limitation upon him in dealing exhaustively, and with correct perspective, with the story of an Indian place which has been in existence and connected with the outside world in various

ways long anterior to the touch established with it by the Europeans. Speaking of Mangalore and Kanara, a critical study of the local legends, ballads, religious and social institutions of the Tulavas, in addition to the palmscripts and other records in Mudabidri and Dharmastala ought to prove very useful, if not essential, for a full, informing and impartial history.

The book under review is, therefore, too scrappy. While it arouses the reader's interest it does not fully satisfy it, but leaves it in awkward suspense. To state the fact that Mangalore and the area around formed once a part of the Vijayanagar Kingdom, without mentioning what reactions that had on the lives and culture of the people does not take one far. Within 30 miles from Mangalore is Mudabidri—and two leagues further Karkala—which from the remains now extant must have been great Jain centres. But there is no mention of Jainism and its vicissitudes anywhere in the book. Udupi is 36 miles to the north and was, and has been, the centre of Madhwaism, whose importance is felt and seen to this day. Not a word about this by the author. This would have been understandable if as many as three chapters were not devoted to the vicissitudes of the Christians (Roman Catholic) of Kanara. Take again the Italian traveller Pietro Della Valle's description of the beautiful hill at Kadri. Beyond the mere English translation of it no critical explanation of the temple and of the monastery on the top is offered. That the Jogi, the chief of the monks, and his followers belong to an all-India order of sanyasis, distinguished by the glass lobes they wear, and therefore denote a factor of religious and cultural unity in the country has sadly escaped notice. To read of the queen of Karnat (who withstood to the last the aggression and duplicity of a neighbouring king) and of the queens of Ullal and Bednur who bravely defended their territories against the Portuguese and Mysore invaders arouses more than ordinary interest. But a brief description, of, or even a hint at, their methods of administration how far the social and economic conditions, and especially the system of matriarchal inheritance, fostered such bravery and initiative is deplorably absent. In fact no description of the people of Mangalore, barring the Roman Catholic Christians, is given in these pages. Even the effects, permanent or temporary, of the Portuguese and Dutch connections are not described, except in so far as during the former Christianity made considerable progress. In contrast to these omissions and snatches of history, the periods of Hyder Ali and Tippu Sultan, though briefly given, are vivid in effect. It seems as if the appreciation of the commercial importance of Mangalore was better made and served by these two much maligned monarchs than either by their preceding and contemporary European powers or even by their successors, the present British administrators. The various schemes which they conceived and put into operation in the 18th century during the brief period of their overlordship of the place, throw into glaring light and contrast the comparative sluggishness of the British in the same direction in the 19th and 20th centuries. It took nearly quarter of a century to connect it with the south by a railway, barely 150 miles long. The connection with Mysore was long under contemplation, conference and other dilatory processes till it has practically been abandoned. The back-water in Mangalore was neglected long enough to make it hard for big vessels to approach the town and the sand-bar dangerous for the boats to cross into the open sea.

The book is written from one angle of vision and that one of the place whence the writer offers the reader his first view of the beautiful panorama of Mangalore, viz. the tower of the St. Aloysius.

College. As already pointed out, the omission of references to Hinduism and Jainism is a serious one, specially so when Christianity is dealt with at fair length. This may be due to the tyranny of the sparse materials which the writer had access to or could understand. But a research student cannot become an advocate without damage to his avowed vocation and also to the point he seeks to make out by turning a partisan. Certainly the expression "even now cackled out by some no less bigoted pseudo-historians" with reference to the opinion held by some writers who happen to agree with Tippu Sultan that the Portuguese had resorted to questionable methods of conversions to Christianity, is unhappy in a student doing historical research and in this case on slender and incomplete materials, and therefore without the proper perspective. Perhaps to abuse Tippu Sultan for his 'unaccountable fanaticism' and so on may pass muster as the mere repetition of conventional or fashionable terms which British historians have coined and given currency to. Even then it is well to recognise that recent research, as in the case of Sivaji Maharaj, has thrown new light on the temper and policy of that intrepid ruler. From the extracts in the book itself the writer's defence of the Portuguese can be rebutted. The instructions of King John III of Portugal to his Viceroy in Goa (1546) mention the usual means by which the heathen people ought to be "brought over to our religion not only by the hopes of external salvation, but also by temporal interests and preferments", which are described in detail as bestowal of offices, favours, presents and otherwise. "The heathenish sports shall be abolished and the Brahmans not in the least encouraged". Who can say that the Hindu temples with their worship did not come under this head, at least in the eyes of the Portuguese officers in Goa, and more than one ancient church in old Goa bearing ineffacable traces of the Hindu temple architectural arrangements, are not the practical results of these instructions? The legend connected with the location of Hindu temples in remote places, not easily accessible, of Goan suburbs suggest the intolerance of the Portuguese Inquisition and so, to some extent, do the emigrations of the several sects of Saraswats from Goa to the south along the coast in Kanara, Malabar, Cochin and Travancore. Tippu Sultan's tone and description of all these methods are only characteristic of the zealous soldier that he was and of the times in which he lived. And with regard to the captivity and persecution of the Kanara Christians, James Scourry, an European victim and prisoner for ten years in Seringapatam, says that it "was at least partially due to the pecuniary help rendered by them to the English" who were the enemies of Tippu Sultan.

A small book has had to be criticised at such length as this lest the title of the series and the presentation of accompanying bibliographies, foot-notes etc. should create mistaken impressions on the lay reader on the subject and mislead the ordinary writers of class histories.

M. S. MADHAVA RAU.

A WARNING TO INDOLOGISTS.

THE MAKERS OF CIVILIZATION IN RACE AND HISTORY. By L. A. WADDELL. (Luzac.) 1929. 24cm. 646p. 28/-

THIS book, like some of the other recent books by the same author, is written in a manner which disarms detailed and scientific criticism; an equally big volume would have to be written for this, and unnecessarily, for much of the book is unsound. It is nevertheless entertaining reading, particularly

owing to the excellent get-up, the illustrations, and the quaint naivete with which the author announces his first, truest and most astounding discoveries in every known or unknown branch and epoch of human history; and with which he calculates the inevitable pitiable discomfiture of the entire race of mistaken scholars and historians that have misled the world right up to 1929. One is tempted to describe the work as an overstuffed scholar's nightmare, a delirium of a rebellious brain that refuses to digest any more indiscriminate information. In fact every section, almost every page, presents a hopeless jumble of true, half-true and quarter-true facts with fancies of various degrees. It is perhaps not in the best of taste in academic circles to extol in every page one's own theories and so-called discoveries in superlative and provocative language; and it is also not usually regarded as the right method of scientific research in history to first spin out a pleasing fabric of interpretations with one's own bold fancy, and then select, exclude, magnify, main or distort sundry disconnected facts and fictions in order to prove the pet preconception.

To the specialist student of Indology, however, the most regrettable feature of the book is a totally inadequate and inaccurate presentation of epic and Puranic materials: thus it will suffice to note here that the dynastic lists given as Puranic are not so, and the Puranic geographical traditions, so indissolubly bound up with its historical traditions, are simply brushed aside, perhaps as being inconvenient to the hypothesis of a Cappadocian origin of the Indians. But for sober historians, Indian or European, the book will serve the very useful purpose of illustrating the danger of relying on superficial impressions about Epic-Puranic historical traditions. Another utility of the book will be to draw the attention of balanced and scientifically trained Indologists to the urgent necessity of revising current notions about Vedic and pre-Vedic history and civilisation of India in the light both of the latest archaeological work in India, Western Asia the and Mediterranean regions and of further scrutiny into the entire body of Vedic and Epic-Puranic literatures from a new angle of vision.

S. C. SARKAR.

CONTROL OF CREDIT.

CREDIT CONTROL. THE PATH OF INDUSTRIAL REVIVAL. By FREDERICK THORESBY. (John Bale.) 1929. 20cm. 89p. 2/6.

THIS booklet is a strong plea for a larger volume of bank credit in Great Britain and pleads for the changed control of the Bank of England by a committee representative of the principal national interests, to wit, the Federation of British Industries, Chambers of Commerce, Trade Unions, Banks and Discount Houses and the British Treasury, presided over by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The crux of the problem of industrial depression is, according to Mr. Thoresby, the recovery of the export trade and not cheap imports; he rejects the development of agriculture as a solution since it would destroy the whole of

the manufacturing processes as well as the world-wide carrying trade. He has conclusively proved that the export trade is the bed-rock upon which the national prosperity must be built in Britain since the imports of food and raw materials have to be paid for. He would expect the Government therefore to follow the footsteps of the State in Germany and U. S. A. and "help to ensure that the banking and credit facilities are controlled and operated mainly towards helping and developing manufactures." The gravamen of his charge is that in Great Britain there is no sympathetic co-operation between manufacturers and the bankers owing to the short-sighted policy of the Bank of England which however is imposed upon it by existing legislation. The credit power of the nation, which is at present controlled by exigencies of international finance, should in his opinion be controlled in future in the interests of national trade. The policy of the Gold Standard, with its accessory, the deflation of the superfluous war currency, is anathema to him; in effect he renounces the Gold Standard and would continue the war-time inflation. He inveighs against the artificial requirements of the Gold Standard which restricts credit permitted to a nation of manufacturers unless there is a proportionate increase in the gold reserve. Apparently Mr. Thoresby ignores the plain truth that if Great Britain had not taken the lead in restoring the Gold Standard in the world, the disorganization of currencies and exchange would have gone on indefinitely, with a powerful reaction on the very export trade of Great Britain which he regards as the bedrock of prosperity. We think that his tirade against deflation and credit restriction in his country is overdone and he would have done well to think of the consequences of delaying the establishment of the Gold Standard. He makes too much of the large profits reaped by financial interests owing to the increasing purchasing power of the sterling consequent on a policy of deflation, but this is inevitable in every period of reconstruction, especially during the aftermath of a period of phenomenal currency inflation. His description of the Court of Governors of the Bank of England as a group of international financiers whose interests are not identical with those of British manufacturers appears to us very much exaggerated; in fact the Bank deserves the gratitude not only of British interests but those of all other countries for stabilizing the £ sterling "by raising its international value as high as possible". The setback to British exports is only temporary and much of the malaise is due to other than currency causes.

V. N. G.

SHORT NOTICE

Indian Scientists.

MESSRS NATESAN and Co., have done a very useful service by publishing the volume under review. It contains brief sketches of some of the lead-

ing Indian Scientists of recent times. These include Dr. Mahendralal Sircar, the pioneer in medical research, Sir Jagadish Chunder Bose, the plant-physiologist, Sir C. V. Raman, the physicist, and Messrs. Ramachandra and Ramanujam, the Mathematicians and Sir P. C. Ray, the Chemist. The volume is exhaustive neither of the scientists of India nor of the life of work of each of the six great scientists treated therein. There are many more workers in the field of science in modern India, but these six represent the peaks, as it were whereas the numerous others are the lesser hills. An adequate biography of any one of the "big six" would require a volume larger than the present one, but it makes no such pretensions. But enough has been said of each of these and schools he founded that the lay reader lays down the book with a sense of satisfaction and of thankfulness to the publishers.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- THE WORLD CRISIS. THE AFTERMATH. By WINSTON S. CHURCHILL. (Butterworth.) 1929. 24cm. 474p. 30/-
- STATE BANKS AND THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM By CHARLES S. TIPPETTS. (D. Van Nostrand Co., New York.) 1929. 23cm. 393p. \$4.00.
- PROVINCIAL FINANCE IN INDIA. By PRAMATHANATH BANERJEA. (Macmillan, Bombay.) 1929. 23cm. 367p. 10/6.
- LENIN, Vol. XX—The Revolution of 1917. Books I & II, By V. I. LENIN. (International Publishers, New York.) 1929. 22cm. 381, 428p. \$6.00
- LIBERTY AND DESPOTISM IN SPANISH AMERICA. By CECIL JANE. (Oxford University Press.) 1929. 32cm. 177p.
- BRITISH BUDGETS, 1913-14 to 1920-21. (Second Series.) By BERNARD MALLET AND C. C. OSWALD GEORGE. (Macmillan.) 1929. 22cm. 407p. 20/-
- SOVIET RULE IN RUSSIA. By WALTER RUSSELL BATSSELL. (Bureau of International Research, Harvard University and Radcliffe College.) (Macmillan, New York.) 1929. 22cm. 857p. 25/-
- THE PUBLIC ARCHIVES OF SOUTH AFRICA, 1652-1910 By C. GRAHAM BOTHA. (Cape Times, Cape Town.) 22cm. 108p.
- THE IMPERIAL BANKS. By A. S. J. BASTER. (King.) 1929. 22cm. 275p. 12/6.
- A HISTORY OF LATIN AMERICA, By WILLIAM WARREN SWEET. (The Abingdon Press. 1929. 21cm. 404p. \$3.00.
- ANDREW JACKSON, THE GENTLE SAVAGE. By DAVID KARRNER. (Brentano's.) 1929. 21cm. 399p. \$3.50
- THE WASTED ISLAND. By EIMAR O'DUFFY. (Macmillan) 1929. 21cm. 534p. 7/6.
- THE KNIGHT OF THE DIXIE WILDS. By WALTER E. TAYLOR. (Meador Publishing Co., Boston.) 1929. 20cm. 280p. \$2.00.
- AN AUSTRALIAN LOOKS AT AMERICA. ARE WAGES REALLY HIGHER? By HUGH GRANT ADAM. (Allen & Unwin.) 1928. 20cm. 118p.
- A CASE FOR LAISSEZ-FAIRE. By JAMES W. BISSET. (King.) 1929. 20cm. 245p. 7/6.
- JESUS OR CHRISTIANITY? By KIRBY PAGE. (Doubleday Doran & Co.) 1929. 20cm. 326p.
- THE ESSENTIALS OF DEMOCRACY. By A. D. LINDSAY (Oxford University Press.) 1929. 20cm. 82p. 3/6.
- BALADITYA. A HISTORICAL ROMANCE OF ANCIENT INDIA. By A. S. PANCHAPAKESA AYYAR. (Taraporevala.) 1930 20cm. 402p. Rs. 4.
- THE ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF NATIVE SEGREGATION IN SOUTH AFRICA. By JOHN KIRK. (King) 1929. 20cm. 149p. 6/-