

The Servant of India

EDITOR : P. KODANDA RAO—OFFICE : SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY'S HOME, POONA 4.

VOL. XIII No. 22. }

POONA—THURSDAY, MAY 29, 1930.

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

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK.	253
ARTICLES :—	
Mr. Benn's Bankruptcy.	256
Autonomy by Convention.	256
Ireland's Travail. By M. D. S.	257
REVIEWS :—	
International Law. By Dr. Nares C. Sen-Gupta. ...	259
Sociology. By A. N. W.	260
Soviet Rule. By I. H. Qureshi.	261
Culture and Politics. By Dr. D. S. Ramachandra Rao.	263
Indian States. By P. L. O.	264
SHORT NOTICE	250

Topics of the Week.

Canada on India.

THE distrust of the intentions of the British Government with reference to the political evolution of India is not confined to Indians alone but is shared by others in the Commonwealth. The *Toronto Daily Star*, which claims the largest circulation in Canada, in its leading columns on the 7th April last, refers to the situation in India with sympathy and understanding. "A review of history teaches that wherever a small and privileged governing class has monopolised political power it has never willingly shared that power with the common people. *** Here in Canada a long struggle took place before the home authorities would give any real power to the men who were building a nation in the wilderness. *** It would be a matter for surprise, therefore, if the British in India gave self-government to India as rapidly as the circumstances warrant." The Journal envisages the future as follows: "The events of the next few months in India may determine whether the people of that country will receive dominion status gratefully at the hands of British or, disappointed and impatient with the slow increase of their self-governing powers, seek the severance of the ties uniting them with the Empire" and suggests that "the task imposed by the present crisis is to perfect the best that is in the record of Britain's handling of affairs by speeding up the policy of establishing the machinery of democracy."

No Truckling to Zoolum.

THOUGH none of the leading Congress organs, least of all *Young India*, has taken seriously the edict of the Congress Working Committee that all nationalist newspapers should close down as a protest against the Press Ordinance, and the Journa-

list Conference in Bombay asked for a two-days hartal only, the Punjab Satyagraha Committee has made up its mind to enforce the Working Committee's ukase in Lahore and has asked all the nationalist papers in Lahore to close down. If they failed to obey orders, the decision was to be enforced by means of picketing the offices of the recalcitrant papers and the houses of their editorial staffs! The *Tribune* of Lahore has declined to be dragooned into obedience of this uncalled-for *Zoolum* of the Punjab Satyagraha Committee. Our valiant contemporary rightly remarks that "nationalist papers will continue to resist with all their might any encroachment on their liberty, whether that encroachment proceeds from Simla or from Allahabad. We claim the right to criticise the policy and measures of the Congress, just as we claim the right to criticise the policy and measures of the Government; and neither the Government nor the Congress can demand that we should surrender our right to decide for ourselves how best we can serve the country."

* * *

Vindictive Meanness.

APPARENTLY in pursuance of the Congress Working Committee's ukase, the *Bande Mataram*, a nationalist vernacular daily of Lahore, ceased publication. But the Government of the Punjab do not seem to get much store by the over-zealous loyalty of that paper to the Congress. For, some time after the paper had voluntarily closed down, the Government demanded from the printer of the journal security of Rs. 3,000. Did the Government fear a resurrection of the paper and therefore, take precaution to prevent it? If the Government wished to demand security, they could in decency have waited for it to reappear. It is an exhibition of petty meanness on the part of the Punjab Government to have acted the way they have. The traditions of Dyer and O'dwyer are still as strong as ever in that unhappy Province.

* * *

The Right Way.

IT is with sincere pleasure and gratification that we learn of the steps that are reported to be under contemplation by businessmen in Bombay to promote swadeshi in industry and finance. The "Indian Daily Mail" understands that a movement is afoot to organise a swadeshi Exchange Bank with adequate capital. We hope that not only the existing swadeshi enterprises will profit and develop by the present boom, but that new organisations and new industries will spring up, adequately financed and well-managed, and that whatever be the motives that brought them into existence, they will remain permanent assets to the country. It is gratifying to be told that nearly 70 per cent of the insurance business is already in Indian hands, and we hope that soon the whole of it will pass on to Indian concerns. The latest papers

from South Africa report that an Indian Insurance company has opened a branch in Durban. Indians in East Africa have resolved to encourage the use of Indian-made goods. It is a legitimate ambition that India should have the loyal support of Indians abroad in business as in politics. All this is to the good.

Disconcerting Features.

BUT there are certain features in the situation which are rather disconcerting. A European business man is reported to have said that "business relations with the Indian States are just the same." We hope that the subjects and Rulers of the States will not look askance at swadeshi on the ground that it is unfortunately associated with a political movement directed against Great Britain, with which, therefore, they have no concern, but that they will do everything in their power to promote swadeshi which is a genuine economic programme. Both Indian and European businessmen complain of the frequent *hartals*, which retard even swadeshi business. The Bombay Mill-owners do not seem to have felt the benefit of the swadeshi campaign to any marked extent as yet, but they are in hopes. They maintain that they have not exploited the campaign to raise their prices. But it is more than they can say whether the retail vendors have done likewise, if we are to believe that the scarcity of *khadi* has already raised its price "rediculously high."

The Only Way.

NOTWITHSTANDING the fillip that Indian enterprise has received from the present campaign, it is well to ask if it can be expected to be the main support of swadeshi permanently or if other bases should be discovered. In spite of past history and the deliberate wrongs done to India, why do Indians of today still go in for foreign articles and for foreign business concerns in insurance, banking, etc? It is not because they have a perverse antipathy for Indians and Indian-made goods. Can it be because foreign goods are on the whole cheaper and the services of the foreign houses on the whole more efficient and evoke greater confidence? The true and permanent hope of swadeshi lies in making our goods cheaper than foreign goods and our services more efficient than of foreigners. As we said before, Japanese goods captured the Indian markets, not because Indians preferred Japan to India, but because Japanese goods were cheaper than Indian goods.

The Premier on the Empire.

SOME indulgence must be allowed to a British Premier when he makes an imperial speech on Empire Day. There is much in the origin and growth of the British Empire of which any Britisher may legitimately be proud, even boastful, and which a non-Britisher may admire. The planting of colonies in the far corners of the earth, and their gradual development through different stages to the status of Dominions, which combine unity with independence, is a great and unique record, which must wring admiration even from the detractors of the Empire. Mr. Ramsay MacDonald is entitled to claim that great qualities of personal courage in naval, military and administrative fields have gone to the making of this vast and varied Empire.

But when he claims that the Empire builders have a definite and benevolent purpose, that the British had taken care of people who could not take care of themselves, that their trusteeship was upright and honest, exercised in the genuine interest of the back-

ward peoples and that it was designed to fit them for ultimate partnership on free and equal terms, we must take leave to demur. If some peoples were in need of protection, it was against the rapacity of the British themselves, and if there was any design at all, it was the exploitation of the weaker peoples of the earth. The history of the Empire is strewn thick with episodes which, judged by personal, municipal or civic standards of conduct, will not pass muster. The non-European citizens of the British Empire may view the Empire with awe, or with admiration but will never view it with pride, for on their humiliation rests the glory of the Empire

The Empire is dead: Long live the Commonwealth.

Dr. Suhrawardy Again.

IT is strange that, while everybody is most anxiously discussing the agenda of the Round Table Conference, Dr. Suhrawardy should, in a press interview, suggest with a *sang froid* that the offer of the Conference should be withdrawn if boycotters do not wish to avail themselves of it and that the question of constitutional reform should be referred at once to the Joint Select Committee. Such a procedure can hardly be expected to be more acceptable. He is evidently not serious when he made this remark. For in the next breath he suggests that a preliminary meeting of the Indian members selected for the Conference should be held for reaching an agreement as to the safeguards which would satisfy the various interests and make the Dominion Status constitution acceptable to Muslims and other minorities. This, of course, is very desirable and it was solely to facilitate this consummation that Dr. Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru organised the Patro Conference. We wish the leaders of the Muslim as well as the Hindu communities would set themselves earnestly to the task of devising proper safeguards for the interests of the minorities. But it is absurd to comment adversely on the suggestion of the Liberals that the Viceroy should issue another statement which would put the minds of the people at ease by promising a Dominion constitution, whatever may be the safeguards necessary for the transitional period. Incidentally, he has shown himself completely reactionary by describing a beneficial measure like the Sarda Act as mischievous and pernicious. While we agree with him that the present campaign of civil disobedience is bound to end in disaster, we do not think that the assurances given by the Viceroy and the Secretary of State so far can, without further clearing up of doubtful points, lead to the successful issue of the Round Table Conference on present lines.

The Boomerang.

A meeting of Muslims in Calcutta attended by most of the Muslim members of the Calcutta Corporation was held the other day at which resolutions were passed complaining that the Congressmen who were in a majority in the Calcutta Corporation had ignored and neglected systematically the interests of the Muslims in the civic administration of the city, and that, therefore, the Muslims should be prepared, when so desired, to refuse to pay municipal taxes. If the Muslims really mean business, the Congressmen in the Corporation will find their enthusiastic espousal and zealous propagation of no-tax campaign rather inconvenient in resisting the Muslim campaign.

The complaint of the Muslims, however, loses much force and gives the impression of having been got up when it is considered with the request made to the Government that in amending the Muni-

icipal Act of 1923 Muslim representation should be increased to a third of the strength of the Corporation. Muslims have now 15 seats out of 90, and on a separate register, and the Act provides that within ten years the separate electorate should give place to a joint electorate. Muslims are evidently anticipating the change and are inaugurating a campaign from now on against the lapse of separate electorate in the Municipal Corporation.

But if, as the meeting protested, the majority of Congressmen in the Corporation were neglecting Muslim interests and riding roughshod over them, is the attitude of the majority likely to change by the mere increase of the Muslim representation from 15 to 30 members out of 90? If the Congressmen had to seek the suffrage of the Muslims, they would certainly have paid more attention to Muslim interests. The remedy is, therefore, joint electorates and not increase in the number of Muslims as long as that does not convert them into majority.

Nasik Satyagraha.

AFTER a prolonged and, on the whole, fruitless campaign of satyagraha to secure admittance into the Kalaram Temple at Nasik, the untouchables have decided to suspend their operations in order to give time to the Hindu leaders to persuade the orthodox sections of their community to yield gracefully to the demands of the untouchables. It will be remembered that a few ago when their efforts failed, the untouchables, in despair and resentment, resolved on embracing Mohammanism, and some of them actually did. When Dr. Moonje of the Hindu Maha Sabha came out with appeal to the untouchables to drop the proposal and to the touchables to realise the disastrous consequences to the Hindus if the untouchables were driven to the Muslim fold. Dr. Ambadekar, the leader of the untouchables, has a touching attachment to the Hindu faith and is loath that they should go over to a different faith. He would rather wait for the reformist element in the Hindu fold to assert itself. If it fails, satyagraha will be restarted. We hope that the Hindu reformers will see to it that the Temple is thrown open to the untouchables, and that there will be no occasion to re-start satyagraha. Would that the ladies of Nasik will follow the example of the ladies of Dacca who are reported last week to have cut down with axes, saws and hammers, the barricades at a local temple and allowed the untouchables to enter it, no man daring to offer resistance. Such a gracious surrender of exclusive rights by the privileged classes, will bring about a really peaceful revolution and obviate suffering and bitterness.

The incidents are not without a moral in reference to the present political situation. We wish the Government will by a gracious act on their part render satyagraha unnecessary; do the right thing in time and save themselves and others needless and costly trouble.

The Path of Peace.

IT appears from the interviews published by our contemporary, the *Indian Daily Mail*, that the Bombay leaders have formed a favourable opinion of the terms of peaceful settlement offered by the Mahatma in the interview he gave to Mr. Sloccombe. Sir P. Sethna thinks that the Government must meet the popular demand since repression will only intensify the civil disobedience movement; and the popular demand is, in his opinion, clearly for Dominion Status with certain safeguards. He rightly says that Mr. Sloccombe deserves high praise for having accomplished a very successful result in the matter of eliciting the terms on which the Mahatma will be

prepared to negotiate. Sir P. Sethna believes that the Simon Report will be ignored in the present temper of the country unless it recommends immediate Dominion Status and he advises the Government to take the public into their confidence if they have any knowledge of the Simon recommendations. He has emphasized the fact that to enable the Government to carry on they must have the goodwill of the people behind them and he pertinently asks what would be the good of the recommendations of the R. T. Conference if they are constantly opposed by an important section of the public. As for Gandhiji's eleven points he thinks it is quite easy to give an assurance that they will be minded to, leaving the details to be settled at the R. T. Conference. Finally he appeals to Lord Irwin to leave aside his officialdom for a while and open the door to negotiations. Mr. H. P. Mody in his interview said that it should not be difficult for some channel of negotiations to be opened for the purpose of finding a way to peace and declared his conviction that India can be saved from the horrors of continual strife and disorder only by a great stroke of statesmanship. Sir C. Setalvad said that not only Mr. Gandhi but almost all the political parties require to be convinced of the sincerity of the intentions of the British Government and from this point of view he attaches great importance to Mr. Sloccombe's interview and expressed his conviction that considerations of prestige should not stand in the way of securing the co-operation of M. Gandhi and his followers.

Indian Agriculture.

IN a paper read before the Indian section of the Royal Society of Arts, Dr. Clouston, late Director of the Pusa Institute, has appreciatively described the main outlines of the Report of the Royal Commission on Agriculture and suggested lines for future action. He has pointed out that a committee to advise on the steps to be taken to assist the sugar industry has been constituted as also a sub-committee to investigate the problems relating to the conservation of indigenous manurial resources and the use of indigenous fertilizers. Dr. Clouston builds great hopes on hybridization as a method of crop improvement and points to the excellent results produced in the Coimbatore Sugar Cane Breeding Station by this method, leading to increased production per acre, ranging from 50 to 100 per cent. He has great faith in the possibilities of private seed farms for the propagation of improved varieties of crops by adopting measures for keeping the seed pure. Dr. Clouston thinks that very good progress have been made by the Departments of Agriculture in introducing improved types of agricultural implements and machinery. In his opinion, the principles to be embodied in legislation designed to promote consolidation of holdings, which have been laid down by the Royal Commission, are eminently sound. With respect to the breeding of cattle the Commission recommended the breeding of pure and improved types of cattle; but they warned against encouraging milking qualities to the detriment of features essential for draught purposes. Dr. Clouston thinks that if the inertia of centuries is to be overcome it is essential that all the resources at the disposal of the State should be brought to bear on the problem of rural uplift. For organised and sustained effort by the several departments in this matter great responsibility devolves, in his opinion, on the provincial Governors and Ministers, and he recommends them to follow the fine example set by H. E. the Viceroy, who had by his personal interest in agricultural matters forwarded the cause of India's premier industry.

Articles.

MR. BENN'S BANKRUPTCY.

"IT is really useless to employ mere words as if they could find a solution. A solution, a real solution, we do most earnestly desire". So said Mr. Wedgwood Benn, the Secretary of State for India in his eagerly-awaited but grievously disappointing statement in the House of Commons on the 26th inst. These words, addressed to Indians seeking communal settlement, apply with greater force to himself. We have had plenty of words, very high sounding and noble words. Some of them were best unsaid. We are prepared to give full credit to Mr. Benn's idealism when he forswears the archaic maxim "divide and rule", but when he claims that the Commonwealth was built up free from the exploitation of that maxim, he speaks without the book. When, again, he claims that the Commonwealth was built up by teaching persons of various interests and various races that in the bond of union exists the liberty to develop in their own way their own capacity, and that the main basis of the Commonwealth was voluntary co-operation, he is expressing pious hopes of what should have been and what should be than what has been. Again, when he seeks shelter under the plea that the difficulties in the way of Indian swaraj are largely from the Indian side, he minimises or forgets that, far from helping to remove them, the British Government have deliberately exploited them for their own purposes.

But all this raking of the past, this retrospection, is neither here nor there. We are concerned with the present situation. Not a day passes but tells its tale of raids, lathi charges, and police firings, of casualties and deaths, of arrests and riots, of propaganda and counter propaganada, of revolts and repressions. A sickening record of daily events associated with sanguinary war. Discontent, resentment and bitterness are daily growing in volume and gathering momentum. For all the repression, law and order have not been restored; there is no peace. The ranks of the cooperators with the Government are daily growing thinner: Government are getting more and more isolated. Will imaginary panygerics on Empire building in the past and pious mouthing of sonorous platitudes regarding the future solve the the present unhappy situation?

Thanks to the enterprise and public spirit of Mr. George Slocombe of the *Daily Herald*, Mahatma Gandhi has made an offer, which is, on the whole, accommodating. How has Mr. Benn met this gesture? By ignoring it altogether. And on the top of it, he professes to seek a solution from Indian opinion. The Liberals have made offers of solution. But they have been ignored too. It was Mr. Benn himself who said in the course of his statement that "Clearly, the cruelest, the wickedest thing that could be done on either side would be to foster bitterness and hatred and to add fuel to the flames of

racial animosities." Does he himself attach any value to this piece of sane advice?

Mr. Benn seems to take comfort in that the rural population, except in Gujerat, is unaffected by the Gandhi movement. But that is an illusion. Nay, it is an incitement to the civil resisters to stir up trouble in the rural areas also. It is true that in the rural areas generally there have so far been no outbreaks of non-violence or violence. But it is hugging an illusion to believe that discontent, dissatisfaction, and disaffection towards the present system of Government have not spread to these parts, and that the people there are content and happy. Mr. Benn's statement may unwittingly be taken by the Congressmen as a challenge, and they may be tempted to prove to the melancholy satisfaction of the Government and Mr. Benn that the rural population in the various provinces of India can give trouble. It is unwise to provoke more trouble.

Mr. Benn is anxious to avoid handing over to a self-governing India a legacy of anarchy and chaos, and it is to prevent such a contingency that he reluctantly allowed the Government of India to resort to repressive measures in order to restore peace. If the peace of India is the main or sole concern, it is not by following a rigorous policy of repression that peace can be restored and a legacy of anarchy and chaos avoided. There is but one way, and no other, and that is conciliation. After all, Mr. Benn freely admits that "it is true to say that Indians of all races and classes are looking for progress in the satisfaction of their desires. They are looking for the disappearance of the manifestations of race superiority and for recognition, which is indeed vital to the stability of our Commonwealth, that within it there is complete equality of citizenship." He recognises that "any policy which sets before an Indian any ideal save the Indian ideal,—by which I mean the welfare of those, of whatever race or colour, whose interest is in India,—is foredoomed to failure."

What then stands in the way of the British Government acting on these principles? Mr. Benn knows, or ought to know, that repression is not the way to meet "an insurgence of national and racial aspirations." While repression can at best produce a semblance of peace though at a terrific cost, conciliation will produce real and lasting peace, and contentment and goodwill. We would still fain believe that Mr. Benn is not lacking in the courage of his convictions, that he will not be false to his Labour principles and programmes, and that he would ere this have done the right thing if the Simon Commission had been out of the way. That initial blunder has cost so much. The persistence in the blunder, the holding up of wise, sensible and timely action until that "historic state document" is released, in a tragedy too deep for words. We can understand that the traditions of British public life require Mr. Benn to refrain from doing anything that may seem to anticipate the Simon Report. But we wish he had for once risen above that impediment. We still cherish the hope that, once the Simon obstacle is out of the way, Mr. Benn will retrieve the situation and do the right thing by India.

AUTONOMY BY CONVENTION.

IN the course of his statement in the House of Commons on the 26th inst., Mr. Wedgwood Benn reverted to the fiscal autonomy convention and descanted on the growth of political autonomy by convention in India. He quoted with approval the recommendation of the Joint Select Committee of 1919 that in matters touching purely Indian interests, if and when the Government of India was in agreement with the Indian Legislature, the Secretary of State should refrain from interference. And he claimed that, in consequence of this convention and its faithful observance, "the Government of India is looking more and more for approval and support to its Legislature and to Indian opinion, and, though it may be embodied in no clauses and no schedules, that in itself is a real, effective and, I believe, lasting growth in the measure of self-government which India, even under the present constitution, possess." Mr. Benn gives no concrete instance to justify his optimistic view of the attitude of the Government of India. The only instance that has drawn public attention is the cotton duties episode. It is true, technically speaking, that, in the final event, the Legislature approved of the proposals of the Government of India, which inextricably linked up protection for Bombay with protection for Lancashire. But it was made perfectly clear that Indian opinion, even in the Legislature, not to speak of it outside, did not approve, of rather vehemently opposed, British preference. The Government of India looked for support neither to its Legislature and Indian public opinion nor to the Secretary of State, became supremely autocratic, ignored the Secretary of State and dragooned the Legislative Assembly into consenting to British preference. If that is "looking more and more for approval and support to its Legislature and to Indian public opinion" it is no wonder that Mr. Benn's optimism is not shared in India.

Mr. Benn claims credit for having observed both in the letter and in the spirit the fiscal autonomy convention by refraining from interference with the proposals of the Government of India. He said that the Government of India proposed the increase of cotton duties from 11 to 15 per cent. In spite of the adverse consequences to Britain, he felt estopped on account of the Convention from interference. But the British Cabinet approached the Government of India and the Indian Legislature in exactly the same way as they would approach any Dominion Government and put their difficulties before them. The Indian Government and Legislature considered the representations but, as Indian interests were to come first, they were unable to accede to the request of the British Cabinet. Now on Mr. Benn's own showing, he declined to interfere with the proposals of the Government of India to increase the duties from 11 to 15 per cent. But he did it before the occasion could arise to see if the Indian Legislature was or was not in agreement with the Indian Government. The Government had not then put their proposals before the Legislature. The

Convention, even the most loyal adherence to it, inhibits the Secretary of State's interference only after the Executive and Legislature in India had agreed, not before. If, therefore, Mr. Benn did not choose to interfere when the proposals of the Government of India first came to his notice, long before they were revealed to the Legislature, it was not because the Convention required it.

It can be contended that Mr. Benn knew that Indian opinion would be in agreement with the Government of India in raising the cotton duties and that he respected Indian public opinion. But the Convention makes no reference to the state of public opinion outside the Legislature. If Mr. Benn was willing to respect Indian public opinion, as distinguished from its expression in the Legislature, he might as well have paid equal deference to it in the matter of British preference. Public opinion both in the Legislature and outside was unanimously opposed to preference, and in consequence, there was really no agreement between the Government, the Legislature and Indian public opinion; and the Secretary of State was free to interpose his authority. But he did not.

Far from indicating the growth of autonomy, the cotton duties episode proves to the hilt how helpless the Indian Assembly is when it differs from the Executive.

IRELAND'S TRAVAIL.

I.

THE following is a brief summary of events leading to the settlement of the Irish problem.

It is based on certain chapters from Mr. Winston Churchill's "The World Crisis: The Aftermath." The reader will find that history seems to be repeating itself—in India. Is Ireland a warning or an example? Is there predestination in history? For, neither example nor warning seems to save the present from the mistakes and tragedies of the past.

By the Act of Union Ireland was entitled to send 103 members to the British Parliament. The astonishing changes in the relative population during the nineteenth century had not affected this quota. Thus, excluding those from Ulster, a solid block of 80 members was created in Parliament which, by throwing its weight upon the side of every subversive movement at home and of every foreign antagonism, could embarrass the government at every stage. This fact, and the power derived therefrom, maintained the ascendancy of the Parnell group over the forces of actual rebellion and assassination in Ireland.

The deluge of August 4, 1914, stirred the vast majority of the Irish people to its depths. All antagonisms were forgotten and all factions were merged together in the generous sentiments evoked by the common peril. The heart of Ireland did not beat with the same rhythm as that of Britain, but the moral and intellectual decision was the same in both islands. Now was the time to strike while the iron was hot, and to forge the bond of a lasting unity. But the opportunity was let gone. The Home Rule Bill.

which was placed on the Statute Book, was postponed by a suspensory clause.

In the building up of the Irish Army also other important opportunities were forgotten. "Irish Nationalism sought—and surely it was natural—to emphasise in every way the distinctive Irish characteristics. . . Banners, badges, uniforms, watchwords of national significance were everywhere objects of keen desire but Lord Kitchner saw these manifestations from a different angle. The history of 1798 stared him in the face, and, an Irishman himself, he could feel no assurance that Irish armies raised for one purpose may not be used for another."

The handling of the Irish conscription problem entirely alienated Irish sympathies, and at the end of the war Ireland returned, in place of the Nationalist Party, Sinn Fein Members *en bloc* and the atmosphere of amity and level-headedness, so precious for negotiations, was destroyed.

If this block of 'implacable haters' had meant it, they could have easily wrecked every Government. But, mercifully for England, "they did not for a moment weigh the immense influence and leverage they could exert, for ill or for good," from within Parliament, and withdrew from the House of Commons.

On January 15, 1919 Sinn Fein Ireland declared itself independent. On the 22nd they met and elected a Cabinet. On the 4th of February, when the House of Commons assembled, not a single member from Ireland, except from Ulster, was present. This was overlooked in the rush of afterwar problems. But as the tumult of the whole world gradually subsided, "Southern Ireland was perceived to be crying aloud in a strange voice, and the words she cried were: Independence or Murder."

As days went on occasional but nationally conceived murders began to be perpetrated upon the agents of the British Crown in Ireland. They gradually grew in boldness and culminated in an attempt to murder the Viceroy, Lord French, in Dec. 19, 1919. The Sinn Fein Parliament did not directly countenance this: the actual work was done by secret organisations called the 'Irish Republican Army' and the 'Irish Republican Brotherhood.' Such events led to the arrest of leading Sinn Feiners, suppression of the Sinn Fein Parliament and the muzzling of their press. These counter measures, instead of checking, increased the disorder ten-fold. The troops and the police, naturally, were the most to suffer. At last they took the law into their own hands. Soldiers wrecked the shops and dwellings of people and police began unauthorised reprisals upon suspected persons.

In such an atmosphere of hatred the Home Rule Bill was introduced and passed. It received the Royal Assent in December 1920. But nobody in Ireland would touch it even with a pair of tongs. No doubt, there had been many occasions since 1886 when such a measure would have been accepted with goodwill. But the time was gone. In 1920 it was simply ignored by the Sinn Fein. They refused to put it into operation, and the campaign of disorder and systematic murder grew.

The famous Black and Tans, an organisation of retired army officials and war-veterans turned into police to counteract the Irish terrorists, added patrol to fuel by their primitive method of dealing with 'suspects' and 'malignants'. This 'police force' by their repressive actions shocked even many Englishmen who demanded that suspects should be tried before the ordinary courts of law. On the other hand the Military demanded "universal martial law throughout Southern Ireland." They thought that that "would show the Irish rebels that the Government were in earnest."

"The grass soon grows over a battlefield, but never over a scaffold." Things worsened to such a pitch by 1921 that it was clear that Britain was at the parting of the ways. The choice was now clearly between: "Crush them with iron and unstinted force, or try to give them what they want." "These were the only alternatives, and though each had its advocates, most people were unprepared for either."

By April 1921 the Irish problem had become the main preoccupation of the Government. The Cabinet was one with the Prime Minister in fighting the matter out at all costs. But there was almost a balanced division regarding the method. One section was all for force in spite of the enormous cost in men and money involved; the other section was ready for 'drastic measures' but held that they should be accompanied by the "offer of the widest possible measure of self-government." They wanted "to couple a tremendous onslaught with the fairest offer." In fact there were only two courses open: "war with the utmost violence or peace with the utmost patience. When the sword is bared and the pistol pointed, and blood flows and homes are laid waste, it ought to be one thing or the other."

It was asked by the diehards "whether Dublin Parliament would be suffered to levy tariff against British goods?" It was 'fiercely' put aside with the answer: how can this petty matter be weighed against the grievous action we are preparing?

In May 1921 there was an interview between Sir J. Craig and Mr. de Valera. The conversations were abortive but a rope had been flung across the chasm, and from that moment British Government agents were, upon occasions, in touch with the Sinn Fein Headquarters.

Yet things went from bad to worse, eventually ending in the despairing note submitted by the Commander-in-Chief in Ireland in which he said *inter alia* that if the state of affairs continued, the whole of the British forces stood in grave danger of losing what little morale they still retained.

But the King's speech in Ulster on June 22, 1921, changed the whole aspect suddenly. The King appealed "to all Irishmen to pause, stretch out the hand of forbearance and conciliation, to forgive and to forget, and to join in making for the land which they love a new era of peace, contentment and good will".

The response of public opinion in both Islands was instant, deep, and wide-spread. It led to the historic invitation of Mr. Lloyd George to the rebel leader, Mr. de Valera, to a conference in London.

This action aroused violently conflicting emotions. For such a vast and variously composed system of human government as the British Empire to compact with open rebellion was an event of enormous magnitude. Servants of the Crown were daily being systematically murdered as a deliberate method of warfare. "The extenuating factor was that those responsible for these acts were not selfishly and sordidly actuated; that they were ready to lay down their own lives; and that in the main they were supported by the sentiment of their fellow countrymen."

M. D. S.

Reviews.

INTERNATIONAL LAW.

CHAPTERS ON CURRENT INTERNATIONAL LAW AND THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

BY SIR JOHN FISHER WILLIAMS. (Longmans, London.) 1929. 23 cm. 513p. 25/-.

NATIONALITY. RESPONSIBILITY OF STATES TERRITORIAL WATERS. (RESEARCH IN INTERNATIONAL LAW, HARVARD LAW SCHOOL.) (Harvard Law School, Cambridge.) 1929. 27cm. 399p.

SINOR DE MADARIAGA in his lecture at the fifth meeting of the Geneva Institute of International Relations makes the sad confession that in spite of the various pacts and protocols the main purpose of the League of Nations for establishing peace on earth has on the whole been a failure. But though the main avenue for the march of world society still lies barricaded by almost insuperable obstacles born of the age-old obsessions of society and governments, the League of Nations has made advances by bye-ways towards the establishment of a world society which are by no means altogether negligible. Its contribution towards the economic reconstruction of the world, for instance, although stigmatised by a new school of economists as founded on obsolete ideas of capitalistic finance, has for the time being stabilised currencies and given more or less substantial stability to world economics. But perhaps the most promising and most tangible of its achievements has lain in the domain of international law which it has helped largely to reclaim from a morass of confusion and inefficiency. The amount and value of its work in this sphere can be gauged by a close study of *Chapters on Current International Law and the League of Nations* by Sir John Fischer Williams.

The learned author brings out prominently throughout his work the outstanding fact that since the War, through the operation of the Peace Treaty and the League of Nations, a *new* International Law has grown up in the place of the old. The outstanding features which distinguish new International law from the old are, according to the author, three:

(1) In the old international law the law of War filled at least an equal space with the law of Peace, while in the new international law, while the necessity of some law of war still exists, the law of war has become far less effective and far less important than the law of Peace.

(2) The old international law made no distinction between just and unjust means. Articles 12 to 17 of the League of Nations, on the contrary, not only

make the distinction but lay down definite and automatic tests for just wars and differentiate between the legal consequences of just and unjust wars.

(3) Old international law provided no machinery for the adjustment of international relations which are dangerous for the maintenance of peace, while Art. 19 of the League Covenant provides for such a machinery which, though wanting in complete authority, is not without an overwhelming moral power. Besides, in the Permanent Court of International Justice an efficient instrument has already been created which will lead to development in the same direction.

The extent of the change worked in international law can be appreciated by a study of the various chapters of the book in which old problems of international law are treated with a new orientation. And no one can fail to observe how profoundly international law since the war has been affected by a true legal spirit brought about by the establishment of legislative and judicial authorities in the League of Nations and the Permanent Court of International Justice.

Modern International law has long ceased to be substantially founded on *a priori* rules of natural justice. The history of that law has been a long story of conventional law replacing more and more the natural law. But this process has received a sharp acceleration since the war and it is remarkable to note what a vast area has been covered in recent times by the creation of the League of Nations and by precedents established by the Permanent Court of International Justice. It is only a question of time for this habit of international society to grow and, unless some great convulsion upsets the life of the world again, the spirit will grow till the habit of judicial settlement of disputes will totally displace war in international relations in the same way that judicial decision has displaced private feuds in municipal law.

The effect of this development has been the growth of international law largely beyond its original limits and the creation of new concepts of law which were foreign to older international law. In this volume the author has given an extremely lucid and informing exposition of these new developments of international law. The book cannot but be read with interest and profit by every student of international law.

Another important contribution of the League of Nations has been the work of progressive codification of international law, the first instalment of which is apparently still under consideration. It is possible to attach exaggerated importance to codification and Sir John Fischer Williams in his work under review frankly gives expression to a characteristic Anglo-Saxon dread of codification. "In this matter", says he, "let us be content not to force the pace, and, while helping forward codification by which is apparently meant both the statement and the improvement of existing law—as and when opportunity offers, let us not suppose that codification is a necessary condition of progress." He would place greater reliance upon the development and determination of the law by judicial decisions of the Permanent Court.

The Fifth Assembly of the League in 1924, however, decided to help in the progressive codification of international law and recommended to the Council to convene a committee of experts to prepare a provisional list of subjects of international law suitable for codification and to report on questions which were sufficiently ripe and on the procedure to be followed in the matter.

The committee of experts having reported in the meantime, the Eighth Assembly of the League in 1927 decided to submit to a codification conference the subjects of (1) Nationality, (2) Territorial Waters and (3) Responsibility of States for damage done in their territory to the person or property of foreigners. And recently the first codification conference met to discuss these matters at the Hague on March 13th last.

The second book under review is the contribution of the Harvard Law School to the solution of the problem. It consists of draft articles of the suggested code on these subjects, with elaborate commentaries dealing with the existing state of the law on the subjects in different countries and in the different states of America and an exhaustive bibliography of the subject. In the appendices have been set out in detail the drafts prepared or resolutions passed on these subjects by various law associations and international bodies including the committee of experts and other functionaries of the League of Nations.

America gave to the world the League of Nations. but when, through the patience, zeal and tactfulness of President Wilson it became a reality, the American Senate backed out and left the institution stranded on the shoals of comparative inefficiency for the prime purpose for which it was brought into existence. Yet, as observed by Señor Madariaga, "there is nothing in the history of mankind equal to the service that was done by President Wilson. . . . America could still afford to carry on fifty years of blatant Imperialism and still remain our moral creditor on the strength of President Wilson's achievement"

Though America thus declined to share the burden of responsibility for the League, she has found herself forced by circumstances to realise that complete non-co-operation is impossible. And, in point of fact, she has since then agreed to join in almost every conference of importance convened by the League and has lent her support to the Permanent Court. This co-operation which started in 1925 has grown and in 1927 America was represented in not less than four conferences, and now Secretary Kellogg finds it possible to say on behalf of his Government, "The Government of the United States has continued its policy of friendly and helpful co-operation with the League of Nations on subjects of humanitarian concern". It is possible that opinion in Government circles in America is veering round, slowly but certainly, to a realisation of the wisdom and inevitableness of the policy of President Wilson which the Senate of those days was in such a wild hurry to repudiate.

But if the Government of U. S. A. has held back, scholarship in America has never been lacking in helpfulness to the League in more than one branch of its worth and this is not the first time that the Harvard Law School has organised research on an elaborate scale for the solution of problems which the League of Nations had set out to tackle. In the volume under review they have dealt with some of the most difficult problems for codification with an energy and all-embracing organisation of research that is almost astounding. Reading the volume it is possible to have difference of opinion with regard to the actual draft of this or that article. But one cannot help feeling that in the book there has been brought together in a handy and well organised form all the knowledge, scholarship and research bearing on the subject.

Some of the subjects under review are matters on which wide diversities of opinion exist and with regard to Territorial Waters and the Liability for Damage to Property of Foreigners there is no lack

of strong feelings either. The American view with regard to the former is notoriously at variance with some other views and with regard to the latter subject, the controversies on the exact law on the subject, dealt with by Sir John Fischer in p. 149 *et seq* of his book under review are sufficient to show the difficulties of the subject.

The same matter is dealt with in the Harvard Draft under Art. 9 at p. 173 where we find not only a clear statement of the rule in the article itself but a most comprehensive and critical estimate of the entire learning and authority on the subject. Another interesting and controversial topic is discussed under Art. 20 which is drafted as follows :

"The navigation of the high sea is free to all states. On the high sea adjacent to the marginal sea however, a state may take such measures as may be necessary for the enforcement within its territory or territorial waters of its customs, navigation, sanitary or police laws and regulations, or for its immediate protection". Subject to this article, the limit of the territorial waters is placed at three miles from the low water-mark. One can see at once that the view represented in this article is the American view which was recently enforced against English smugglers and this is supported in the commentaries by elaborate quotations from a large number of diplomatic documents, laws, and decisions which are set out at some length,

There is no doubt that there will be and have already been wide divergencies of opinion on the questions dealt with in the articles at the Hague. But there can be no doubt that the representatives of the nations assembled there in the conference will feel themselves greatly indebted to the Harvard Law School for organising the collaboration of practically all the scholarship on the subject in America and producing a work which not only furnishes a draft to consider, alongside many other drafts, but provides in a handy form complete information on the subject dealt with.

NARES C. SEN-GUPTA.

SOCIOLOGY.

SYSTEMATIC SOCIOLOGY IN GERMANY.

By THEODORE ABEL. (Columbia University Press). 1929. 23cm. 186p. \$3.00.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF SOCIETY.

By FRANK HAMILTON HANKINS. (Macmillan, London.) 1929. 22cm. 760p. 17/-

THE PRACTICAL APPLICATION OF SOCIOLOGY.

By HERBERT NEWHARD SHENTON. (Columbia University Press.) 1927. 21cm. 259p. \$3.00.

SOCIOLOGY, though young in age, holds out endless possibilities for the benefit of humanity. But its very extensiveness and the enormous complexity of its subject matter retard an early fulfilment of the great hopes it creates in the human heart. The three books under review, while constituting most valuable additions to sociological literature, unconsciously bring out the extreme difficulties which waylay the student of human society. There is no difference of opinion as to the need for a science of Sociology. But there is endless difference as to what its real nature is. Dr. Abel's book in an able way brings out the attempts of four eminent German sociologists—George Simmel, Alfred Vierkant, Leopold von Wiese and Max Weber—to establish Sociology as an independent science by itself. Their main endeavour lies in showing that Sociology is not a mere replica or a mere

repetition of other social sciences, but has its own peculiar subject matter which makes it independent of, though related to, the other social sciences. Their endeavour to discover the pure concepts of society, to bring out the dynamic character of society, makes their question considerably methodological. They share the general German idea that a pure science should be free of all empirical elements, and so they try to discover sociological concepts which have no empirical admixture. If they succeed at all, they can create a formal science like geometry or logic. This aspect is emphasised most in Simmel and Vierkandt, while Wiese aims at placing Sociology on the level of natural sciences, but in doing so he would rigidly exclude man's connection with nature, and concern himself only with behaviour "as directed towards, and influenced by, human beings". Weber emphasises the importance of interpreting and understanding social behaviour so as to give a causal explanation of its course and effects. Hence "we explain nature, but we comprehend culture and the psychic experiences upon which it is based". That is, Sociology has to rise above mere correlations and averages, for these fail to bring out the qualitative significance of social phenomena. Dr. Abel feels that on the whole these German sociologists, in spite of vital and characteristic differences, have made good the claim of Sociology to be an independent science.

Prof. Hankins' book leaves a totally different impression on the readers' mind. While anxious to free sociology from any theological or metaphysical assumptions, he is conscious that at every turn the sociologist knocks against Biology and Psychology, Anthropology and Ethnology, Economics and Ethics. In fact it is the great merit of Prof. Hankins' work that it seeks to give a student of sociology "the broad background" which is so indispensable to one who aspires to comprehend social phenomena. That is also why this book will constitute an excellent text-book from an examination standpoint, but to say this does not in the least detract from its value for the general reader as well. On its merits, it is a most useful corrective to the German Sociologists, who in their desire to make Sociology an independent science, hovered perilously near vacuity. This raises of course the very difficult question as to the exact relationship between Sociology and the several social sciences, apart from Biology. If Sociology is a mere repetition of the social sciences, it has no claim to being considered an independent science; it is merely a convenient term to designate a *pari passu* study of the social sciences. If it is not such a mere repetition, what is its peculiar subject matter and how is it differentiated from social sciences like Ethics and Economics, Politics and Anthropology? Sociology as primarily concerned with social relationships is bound to be concerned with every type of social relationships, and many of these have been necessarily appropriated by the different social sciences, some of which came into existence centuries before the very possibility of Sociology was dreamt of. It is inevitable that Sociology should deal with concepts which have been already current coin elsewhere. But it would be a mistake to imagine that such use is mere repetition. Each social science is apt to look at its own subject matter in an intensive, but a narrow blinkered way. Its excessive concentration on certain aspects of social life necessarily leads to a loss of broad perspective. It is this which necessitates a social science *par excellence*, which could coordinate the results of the various social sciences and bring a synthetic vision to bear on the social problems in all their mutual ramifications. Such a master social science is Sociology. If any justification were needed for this

view, it is amply furnished by the history of the so-called "classical economics". In the interests of an "independent" economics the phantom of an "economic man" was evolved, and its ghost was not finally laid to rest, till it had done untold damage by creating the greatest unhappiness of the greatest number. Man in himself is exceedingly complex, and a society of men is infinitely more complex. This complexity makes it impossible for any social science to be really independent except as a matter of degree. If a sociologist is to do justice to his subject, he will require to master the latest pronouncements of Biology and all the social sciences. If he is to succeed in this, he will have to be a man of endless industry and a man of synthetic vision, in short a man of genius, which comprehends both industry and imagination. Or, in the alternative, a number of sociologists, following a similar methodology and similar ideals may cooperate in the production of a work like the important book of Davis and Barnes—which would combine the advantages of firsthand work in a limited field and a general co-ordination of the results of the specialised social sciences.

If the sociologist's main task is to bring out the correct theory of social life in all its manifold aspects, it is his hope to see that his conclusions, based on an exhaustive study, should ultimately lead to some practical end so as to be used to control social forces. At the present stage it is but a hope, for Sociology has not as yet been placed in a position to master all the mysteries of the biological or psychological nature of men. Nor as yet has sufficient time elapsed to make sure that the *a priori* expectations of the ardent sociologist receive a *posteriori* confirmation. Bearing these considerations in mind one can whole-heartedly welcome Dr. Shenton's thoughtful work on Applied Sociology, whose function is "to formulate the principles, laws and data of human relations and associations for use in effecting social change (or maintaining social status)". He is fully conscious of the limitations of our sociological knowledge at present, but he believes, and rightly perhaps, that "the development of an applied sociology may be the most certain and direct route to the development of general sociology". Applied Sociology is not to be confounded with social work, which is only one of the social arts. It is "a selected and specially organized part of sociology". Its main function is to make sociology available for practical use. It cannot be said that Dr. Shenton's present work goes a long way in solving any practical problems which confront society, but he brings out in an able fashion the directions in which Sociology can be made to contribute to the betterment of human society. The day may indeed be far enough when governments will be constrained to make use of expert sociologists in their committees and offices, just as expert economists are now made use of. But that such a day will come is the hope, which not merely the sociologist, but also the man in the street, should cherish, for it is only then that governments will cease to blunder and utopias be brought within the reach of mankind.

A. N. W.

SOVIET RULE.

SOVIET RULE IN RUSSIA. By WALTER RUSSELL BATSELL. (Macmillan, New York.) 1929. 22cm. 857p. 25/—

RUSSIA, under its present rulers, has attracted much notice. The capitalist relates almost blood-curdling tales of atrocities and anarchy, while the Communists, all the world over, would make us believe that, at least on one-fifth of the habitable

globe the Golden Age has dawned. The student of civics and sociology is bewildered by these contradictory views expressed with so much vehemence, and longs for a scientific and impartial thesis on the subject. He knows that no violent revolution can be free from a certain amount of persecution and even terrorism, and that the greater the impediments for the revolutionaries to overcome, the more serious dislocation in the normal course of justice and order there is bound to happen. He also knows that no high sounding theories, however sincerely they may be proclaimed, can withstand the pressure of prosaic but irresistible political necessity. He fully understands that no dynamic force can bring the feeling of complete realization of all objects in a nation's mind; this kind of satisfaction is the sure symptom of stagnation. Therefore he is prepared to hear and even believe all that the hostile critics of the revolution have to say; yet he is not averse to believing that the revolution has achieved something tangible for the people. It is with the exact amount of the good and the harm done by the revolution that he is concerned, and in the mass of literature produced on Russia this is difficult to find.

It is a commonplace to say that one should approach such a subject with an absolutely free mind, and divest oneself of all prejudices and passions. Unfortunately it cannot be said about Batsell that he has done this. He makes no effort to hide his contempt for 'Asiatics' and 'Tatars'. Though every now and then he generously admits that even Western nations would not behave better under the same circumstances, yet all the mistakes committed by the Bolsheviks in Russia he considers to be typically Asiatic and Tatar. Now it is absolutely true that the genius of a particular nation is different from that of any other, but one cannot but laugh at the high-browed scorn of the man who says, 'what more could you expect from these people. Probably it is Batsell's prejudice against all Asiatics or it may be that he has a horror for Communism, which makes his book a long piece of hostile criticism unbroken by a word of praise. Now, surely, if Soviet rule were an unmixed evil, it could not have been tolerated by the Russian people for so long. A small clique of revolutionaries, however clever they may be, cannot possibly rule a huge country like Russia without some very solid support. The Russian workers and peasants may be wrong in their estimate, yet there can be little doubt that a large majority of these classes believe the government to be their government and as such, in spite of its shortcomings, superior to the Tsarist regime.

But one can forgive this shortcoming in the book, for it is well written, and is a mine of information. The author has put in a great deal of really solid research work, and, therefore, as far as the facts are concerned, he is generally on unimpeachable ground. One can differ from him in the interpretation of the facts but it will be impossible to doubt his veracity. The result is that one mostly agrees with what he says, yet one has the feeling that his picture is only partial. One reason is that Batsell very often beats the Soviet with sticks which would be good enough to beat any modern state. The divorce of practice from theories, the difference between legal and real power, and the reduction of high-sounding promises made to backward and weaker nations to mere shams are not peculiar to Soviet Russia, though it is true that the Bolsheviks have generally been more trenchant in their criticism of these evils in *bourgeois* states.

The author has succeeded in giving a clear idea of the very complex constitution of the Soviet union as well as its component parts. What makes

the Soviet constitution so complex is the fact that there are several organs which are merely ornamental. For instance, the Congress of Soviets, and even the Central Executive Committee (a body of 386 members) are, more or less, useless, as far as actual effective working of the government organs is concerned. The presence of such organs which exist simply to hide a highly centralized and oligarchic government creates an atmosphere of deceptive unreality around the claims of the Communists that they have established a democratic government. But to be fair to the Communists, they do not make a secret of the fact that their notions of democracy are different from those of the *bourgeoisie*. Indeed, Lenin was responsible for the famous dictum: 'Liberty is a *bourgeois* superstition'.

As a matter of fact, it is unfair to judge the Communist by our standards. His ideals are quite different from our ideals. He is a firm believer in class war, and he has a firm belief in the ultimate victory of the Proletariat. Therefore he moulds all his ideals to this object. He has a Machiavellian scorn for the ethics of the means. Indeed, the only criterion he has of judging the ethical value of things is: 'whether this will help the cause.' Therefore he does not believe in absolute justice. To him justice should be frankly class justice. It must help the proletariat in regaining all that it has lost due to the *bourgeois* notions of justice. Therefore he says with some truth that to the capitalist justice consists in protecting his ill-gotten wealth, to the labourer it should consist in snatching it away from him. As a matter of fact, he believes in the annihilation of the capitalist class and those who are interested in keeping it alive. Therefore, he argues, it is sheer justice to bring about this end by any means. It is this idea of justice that is enforced by Bolshevik Courts and underlies Bolshevik administration.

The treatment meted out to the different non-Russian nationalities also is interesting, as it illustrates the political truth that no nation which is incapable of holding its own against others can enjoy real independence. All the national republics which grew up like mushrooms are now little more than merely administrative areas. The union government is so highly centralized that very little power is left to these republics. The local language is encouraged and, in theory, every republic has a right to secede. But the Communists are naturally anxious to infuse their own ideals amongst the youth of the republics in the union; therefore education is not free. This hardly contributes to the much vaunted 'cultural freedom' of the nationalities. As far as the right to secede is concerned, it is simply an asset for propaganda. As a matter of fact, some Communist leaders have been very frank about the whole affair. No less a man than Zinoviev, then the head of the Third International, said, after his return from the conference of Eastern peoples held at Baku in September 1920, that Russia did not want to exploit other nations "but we cannot do without the petroleum of Azerbaijan or the cotton of Turkestan". He was, however, wise enough to add the following, which would hardly satisfy any sophisticated student of International Politics: "We take these products which are necessary for us, not as the former exploiters did, but as older brothers bearing the torch of civilisation." It seems that the Russian even now feels the weight of "the white man's burden"! It must be mentioned here that the Bolshevik is essentially international in outlook, and he detests the persecution of one nation by another, for this will retard the union of the world's proletariat; but, because he believes in a highly centralized government and the fusion of all the states of the world into one state controlled by a practically self-elected small body of men fully imbued with

and aware of the doctrines of Communism, the people of a state 'liberated' by Communists can hardly be said to have gained liberty. They simply change masters, only less tolerant of the 'bourgeois superstition' of liberty and freedom. For it must be remembered that Communism has all the faults of an intolerant religion, namely, the belief in a monopoly of truth, the enthusiasm to spread its ideal by any means, and the desire to suppress all other philosophies.

The chapter titled 'From Tsarism to Bolshevism' is particularly interesting, as it shows how a handful of revolutionaries, by sheer organization, capability and determination, were able to make themselves the rulers of the country by defeating all other competitors and driving them away out of the field. It also throws light upon the working of European diplomacy, and the means adopted by certain powers to defeat their enemies. The story of Lenin being conveyed to Russia in a sealed German railway car is both instructive and interesting.

Of particular help are the extracts of original documents given at the end of every chapter, which give the reader some chance of forming independent opinions, though, of course, these are not all the documents which one would like to read on the particular subject. The size of the book could not have possibly allowed this. The extracts from treaties and the decrees and proceedings of the different organs of government are very instructive.

In short, the author has produced a book based on solid research, containing plenty of useful information, especially on the constitutions of the union and its republics and their working. One however feels that the author might have added something on the results of the Soviet rule: as to how it has affected the general life and welfare of the people. For instance, Dr. Wilson—no friendly critic—acknowledges the immense change which the Bolshevik regime has made in the life of the whole people. Then, he might have well avoided the exhibition of innate prejudice against the people of Russia in particular, and the East in general. He might also have taken into consideration the fact that every violent revolution is followed by some reaction and the Russian Revolution could be no exception. Besides the government ultimately rests upon the capability and temperament of the people. Were the Russians qualified, after the long despotic rule of the Tsars to govern themselves in a democratic fashion at such a short notice without any previous training? This factor must count in judging and criticizing the Bolsheviks.

L. H. QURESHI.

CULTURE AND POLITICS.

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

THIS is an interesting book dealing with the cultural and political problems of India. The author is at some pains to prove that India has hitherto been a nation and the tendency of the British rule has been for disintegration. He argues that the Mohammadan rule had made for political unity since it recognised cultural unity. He decries the tendency of the Westerners and the Westernised Indians attaching inordinate importance to politics and considering it to be the main, if not the sole, bond of nationhood. "The Swaraj which India enjoyed was primarily cultural. With real village self-government, the people were more or less independent of the central government. Ever since India attained the ethical, the high stage of civilisation, her empire extended nearly all

over Asia, but it was the empire of culture with peace and altruism as its basic principle, won and maintained not by physical but by psychic force." The chapter on India's cultural Swaraj is both interesting and informative. "The Hindus made considerable advance in the chemical and metallurgical industries. Varahamihira, who flourished early in the sixth century A. D., mentions several preparations of cements, 'strong as the thunderbolt', and of dyes, cosmetics and scents. He also refers to mechanical experts. India had already made several important discoveries which for a long time secured for her the foremost place in the commercial world, such as the preparation of fast dyes, and the extraction of the principle of indigotine from indigo. The prosperity of the weaving industry of Dacca about the close of the eighteenth century may be best estimated from the fact that in 1737 fifty lacs of rupees worth of cloth was entered at the Custom House of that town for export to foreign countries. He contends that the introduction of Western culture has led to the decline of India's cultural Swaraj. "But we are perhaps more to blame for having aided and abetted an alien Government with interests and ideals different from, and often diametrically opposed to, ours." He lays at the door of the British Government the crime of the annihilation of village self-government. "The killing of the village organism is the cruellest wrong which the British Government, consciously or unconsciously has done to India." The leaders of new India are blamed for having taken an active part in the demolition of the rural "republics" which made the people to a large extent independent of the Central Government. "The judicial function was one of the most important of the functions exercised by the village panchayat. There is no doubt that the British machinery for the administration of justice is, as a machine, much more advanced. But sociological advance from simplicity to complexity is good only within limits to be determined by economic and ethical considerations.... Within half a century between 1877 and 1927, the stamp revenue has in round figures increased from three crores to thirteen. But the population of British India has within that period increased from about 191 millions to only 247 millions... The number of Neo-Indians subsisting by the legal profession increased in two decades from 251,608 in 1901 to 336,510 in 1921... The legal profession must absorb some 16 crores a year." He thinks that the legal exploitation of the Indian people would not probably fall short of 25 crores a year. In the chapter entitled the "Passing of Communal Concord" the author says: "We have seen that fundamentally the foundation of the amity which formerly prevailed among the Hindus and the Mohammadans was cultural. Its recent diminution to almost the vanishing point at places appears to us to be primarily attributable to the undermining of that foundation by the multitudinous forces of the modern culture of the West. Natural Science is the intellectual foundation of this culture, as Mental Science is that of ancient culture, whether Hindu or Mohammadan. The ancients subordinated science to philosophy. The moderns, on the other hand, elevate science above philosophy.... In short, spirit was the sovereign of ancient culture, as matter is that of modern culture.... The principle of renunciation by leading to simple living among the people minimised intensity for the struggle for animal existence and inordinate greed and thus promoted concord and amity. The propagation under Western influence in India of the gospel of sense gratification, euphemistically called, "elevation of the standard of living", has proved an almost unmitigated evil.... One of the inevitable results of this stringency has been cut-throat compe-

tition between individuals and classes, and consequent enhancement of greed, selfishness, jealousy and dissension". He deploras that under western influence political activities have for some time past overshadowed all others in India as in Europe. But attempts at communal solidarity have proved a failure owing to the overthrow of ancient culture which tended to develop the pacific traits of character. The spirit of reform in modern India has not added to the cultivation of the quality of benevolence. He lays at the door of modern education the responsibility for the decay of indigenous industry, for it fosters in the people tastes and habits which make them despise Indian products. Instead of fostering economy and self-control, it fosters self-indulgence and extravagance. "It is but natural that a British Government should do all it can to secure customers for British manufactures. True, Government dug the ditch in which we are being drowned, but we cannot absolve ourselves from the responsibility of deepening it." In the chapter "Is Imitation Swaraj Desirable?" he pertinently remarks, "To placate all the sections of our community and reconcile their conflicting interests, the Swaraj Government would have to cast to the winds all considerations of equity, merit and efficiency. The capable, the good and the wise who form a microscopic minority of the community would be swamped, if not wiped out, in the cut-throat scramble for official preferments." Then discussing the question "Is Political Swaraj Possible?" he comes to the conclusion that under the existing circumstances, political Swaraj, even if it were desirable, is not practicable whether by violent or by non-violent methods. "I would venture to suggest that it would be much wiser for us to take the existing Government as an unavoidable reality, and endeavour to minimise its evils so far as possible. He makes a strong appeal for the revival of the cultural Swaraj. "The primary bond of Indian nationhood has hitherto been cultural. India's Swaraj from remote antiquity has been cultural rather than political; this cultural Swaraj which made her, on the whole, prosperous survived down to the earlier years of British rule; its decay since then is due to the supersession of the principles of Indian by those of Western culture in New India; as a result of this supersession New India has been pursuing the path of Western Civilisation; this result has contributed to the destruction of genuine village self-government, and the decay of indigenous industry and communal concord; the striving for political Swaraj on the Western model, which is the result of this pursuit, is futile, even if desirable, because it is not possible."

But Mr. Bose does not seem to realise that cultural Swaraj is not possible without political Swaraj; the experience in India during the last decade proves that both conceptions are interdependent, that the one is not possible without the other. The book here and there seems to be somewhat out of touch with upto-date nationalist India. Still it is an informative book and should be read by those who wish to retain all that is good in the culture and civilisation of our ancient land.

D. S. RAMACHANDRA RAO.

INDIAN STATES.

THE EVOLUTION OF BRITISH POLICY TOWARDS INDIAN STATES, 1774-1858.
By K. M. PANIKKAR. (S. K. Lahiri & Co., Calcutta.) 1929. 24cm. 117p. Rs. 3/-.

THESE lectures constitute a very valuable contribution to the study of the problem of Indian States

which has been brought to the forefront at the present moment. The evolution of the policy of the British Government towards the Indian States has been traced from the Regulating Act of 1772 down to the assumption of direct government by Parliament by the Government of India Act 1858 in the course of six lectures admirably conceived. The lectures have more than a mere academic interest and Mr. Panikkar well deserves the thanks of the Indian Princes, for his labours will go a long way in strengthening and re-inforcing the case of complete internal independence which they are so strenuously trying to make out. Mr. Panikkar's first volume entitled "The Relation of Government of India and the Indian States" was hailed as a classic of first-rate importance and these lectures will similarly rank as first class literature on the subject. He has compressed volumes of political history in a neat little book readable from end to end within six hours. The reader is, however, left to wonder if there is any intelligible policy even today. "The vagueness and the lack of consistency of this policy which at one moment would interfere in minute affairs of administration and at another leave the ruler free to do anything he chose" has not come to a close with the mutiny, as Mr. Panikkar says but persists even today. It is quite true to say that "it is an epitaph written in blood of the chaotic, indefinite and contradictory policy pursued towards the States".

P. L. C.

SHORT NOTICE.

THE HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE LIGHT OF MODERN KNOWLEDGE.

(Blackie & Son, London.) 1929. 22 cm. 780p. 25/-

THE present volume is entitled to a very high place among the collective works which have appeared in recent years. The companion volume is known as 'Evolution in the Light of Modern Knowledge'. Within the compass of about 759 pages the best thought of the present time has been brought into view. The writers are well-known for their scholarship and experience. The Archbishop of York, Dr. Edwyn Bevan, Dr. Anderson Scott, Dr. T. R. Glover and Prof. Gilbert Murray are among the contributors.

The world into which Christ was born is described with all the wealth of description revealed by historical research. Judea, the scene of many of the deeds detailed in the New Testament, was part of the 'strong, well-disciplined, tolerant, and, on the whole, just Roman Empire.' In the closing chapter the social principles of Christianity are discussed. The sacredness of Personality, the Reality of Fellowship, the Duty of Service and the Power of Self-sacrifice—these are certain of the elements inherent in the Christian view of life.

A careful study of the book will convince the reader that the remarkable liberalising process within Christianity reached its zenith during the twentieth century.

H. C. BALASUNDARUM.

WANTED—Candidates desiring to serve in Government, Railway & Canal Departments. Full particulars and Railway Fare Certificate on 2 annas stamps. Apply to :-

IMPERIAL TELEGRAPH COLLEGE,
Nai Sarak, DELHI.