

The Servant of India

EDITOR : P. KODANDA RAO. OFFICIATING EDITOR : S. G. VAZE.

OFFICE : SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY'S HOME, POONA 4.

VOL. XIV No. 28. }

POONA—THURSDAY, JULY 16, 1931.

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

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK.	333
ARTICLES :—	
Financial Obligations.	335
"India in 1929-30". By S. P. Andrews-Dube.	337
REVIEWS :—	
A Novel Economic Theory. By G. B. J.	338
Russian Economics. By D. G. Karve.	338
A Defence of Bolshevism. By C. V. Hanumantha Rao.	339
A Seventeenth Century English Statesman. By M. V. Subrahmanyam.	339
SHORT NOTICES.	340
MISCELLANEA :—	
Solution of the Indian Problem—Mr. Sastri's Speech.	341
Equality of Trading Rights.—Mr. Sastri's Views.	343
BOOKS RECEIVED.	344

Topics of the Week.

Communal Settlement.

THE scheme which has been sponsored by the Congress Working Committee for the adjustment of communal claims in the new constitution is, as has been observed by the Committee, a compromise scheme which, just because it is a compromise, will not be accepted wholeheartedly by any of the parties concerned, but which on its merits ought to meet with a large measure of support. The essential features of the scheme are: joint electorates, no weightage, and no reservation of seats for any community numbering more than 25 p. c. of the population. These are all very sound and, on the footing that every community shall be represented in the electorate precisely as it is represented in the population, they ought to give satisfaction to all. For this proviso gives the best possible guarantee to a backward community nervous of being swamped by advanced communities and at the same time minority communities which are able to hold their own in open competition have the added incentive of winning more seats than they would be entitled to on a numerical basis. We say that the scheme should receive a large measure of support, but will it? That is the crucial question, an answer to which will depend upon the estimate one forms of the strength of Nationalist Muslim opinion represented by Dr. Ansari and others. For the scheme does nothing else but adopt wholesale the solutions proposed, e. g., by the All-Bengal Nationalist Muslim Conference held in Faridpur recently and presided over by Dr. Ansari. It also follows to a large extent the Nehru Report. The most striking difference between the scheme of the Working Committee and that of the Nehru Report consists in this: the former vests the

residual powers in the provinces and the latter in the Central Government. Not only was the Nehru Report uncompromising in insisting that the Central Government must hold the residue of unspecified powers, but Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, one of the signatories to it, appeared to stake everything on securing that point. He declared at the All-Party Conference held in Calcutta that he might yield to every other demand of the Moslems, but he could not possibly yield to a demand which, he was convinced, would destroy the unity of India. It is fortunate that the Working Committee, in deference to this expert opinion, have still left the matter open to further consideration. The Liberal party at any rate must loyally stand by the declaration made by its leader in such absolute fashion. It leaves the Liberals no choice but to reject out of hand any scheme of government which proposes to lodge the residuary powers either in the provinces or in the States.

* * *

India in the Commons.

THE recent Indian debate in the House of Commons was useful only from one point of view. It gave an opportunity to the Conservative party to declare that its attitude towards the work of the Round-Table Conference had undergone no change. This declaration may appear to some as quite superfluous; but when it is remembered that the recent activities of some of the Conservative die-hardes had created much confusion in the public mind as regards the attitude the Conservatives might adopt in regard to the problem of Indian reform when the Conference resumed its work early in September, the value of this declaration will become apparent. The declaration was thus quite opportune and should go some way in putting the public mind at ease. Sir Samuel Hoare's insistence, however, on the retention intact of the safeguards suggested last winter strikes one as unreasonable and inconsistent with the non-committal attitude which all parties present at the Conference, especially the Conservatives, chose to take up. He cannot have forgotten the wish he then expressed to see the "completed picture" before he finally committed himself or his party to anything in the Sankey Scheme. The picture is yet far from being completed. Why should he then be sticking so pathetically only to the safeguards and not to the other parts of the scheme? But frankly this cry for safeguards appears to us to be rather over-done in recent weeks. Is it really supposed in any quarter that these safeguards are going to ensure the permanence of British rule in India or to place British interests beyond the possibility of harm? "As a matter of fact," as the *Guardian* of Calcutta so truthfully remarks, "the best safeguard for Britain in regard to her interests in India is not any legislative enactment, but the maintenance of good will and co-operation between Britain and India. This cannot be created on the basis of a demand such as the Conser-

vatives have made, but only on the basis of a give-and-take policy." How we wish this point of view were properly appreciated by all concerned in England. In that case the Conservatives would not shy so much as they do now at the mention of the test of 'Indian interests' for the maintenance of safeguards. As expected, Mr. Churchill used the Cawnpore stick for beating the Labour Government and Lord Irwin with. He attributed the disorders there of March last to the Gandhi-Irwin pact and to the R. T. C. By what process of reasoning Mr. Churchill was able to establish a connection between the two, the cabled summary of his speech does not make clear. But perhaps it requires a Churchillian bent of mind to appreciate Churchillian logic. Most people in this country are not obviously endowed with this quality and may not be able to see eye to eye with him. But even the House of Commons itself contains some members like Mr. Isaac Foot who found great difficulty in following Mr. Churchill in his wonderful diagnosis of the trouble in India.

* * *

Agitation in Bhor State.

THE Government of the Bhor State (under the Poona Collectorate) seems to be an adept in acquiring a notoriety as a repressive Government. Unknown to the world outside Poona, it first leaped into this kind of unenviable fame by prohibiting a public meeting to be addressed among others by Mr. N. C. Kelkar, when the latter was agreeable to have all kinds of restrictions imposed upon himself and other speakers with regard to the conduct of the meeting. The prohibitory order was defied, and the Durbar had to make an abject surrender, so much so that it proceeded to set up a sort of legislative council and nominate to it the very men who had taken a prominent part in the agitation. It appeared for a time as if the moral to be drawn from this incident had sunk deep into the mind of the Durbar, for it followed during this period a generally conciliatory policy. The people too on their part, though groaning under manifold grievances, of which a corrupt officialdom was the chief one, exercised admirable self-restraint, looking up to the legislative council gradually to give them relief and refraining from any agitation of an extreme character. The council however proved a broken reed to lean upon, the Durbar never giving effect to the popular wishes expressed therein. Soon a sense of desperation came over the public, and the popular leaders, always confirmed believers in civil disobedience and such-like methods, at last gave rein to their followers who launched upon direct action on an extensive scale to seek redress for their numerous complaints. The police force of the State is much too small and inefficient to cope with a determined opposition of the people, and the officials became rightly nervous. The Chief too is a man of peace, who therefore opened negotiations with popular leaders, but, being infirm of purpose, again allowed things to drift. Before the negotiations had been broken off, repressive action was taken against a leader who by his singular devotion to the public cause had endeared himself to the people as few popular leaders have done. This repression is not however the act of a Government which is determined ruthlessly to put down all agitation, but is the act of a Government which wants to pursue a policy of pacification but lacks the strength to do so. The Bhor Durbar is too weak either to take strong repressive measures or to follow a consistently conciliatory policy. Knowing, however, that the Chief's instincts are for peace, Mr. Kelkar has persuaded the people, notwithstanding the repression that is going on, to call a halt to the no-tax campaign and other agitations which savour of direct action, in order to give the State another chance of bringing about an honourable settlement with its subjects. We

hope the Chief will summon all the strength he can to be firm in conciliation, since firm in repression he cannot be.

* * *

Railway Retrenchment.

IT is a great pity that the Railway Board and the representatives of the All-India Railwaymen's Federation who had a final Conference on the 7th inst. could not come to a settlement. The Board accepted the Federation's demand for the immediate suspension of retrenchment measures, pending inquiry into the possibilities of alternative suggestions for cutting down expenditure. Accordingly any further retrenchment with regard to the permanent employees will be held over till the end of October. The position will then be reviewed again in consultation with the agents of different railways when the Federation will be allowed an opportunity of presenting its views to the Railway Board. The main point of difference now relates to the terms of reference to the Board of Conciliation, for applying for the appointment of which the Federation wanted the Board to join it. While the Federation is rightly unable to allow the cases of those who are retrenched so far—their number is 35,000—to be regarded as closed, the Railway Board is unwilling to have them reopened. There are other points as well into which the Federation would doubtless welcome an inquiry by the proposed Conciliation Board as e.g. whether the refusal of the Railway Board to discuss retrenchment proposals and suggestions with the Federation's representatives as early as February last, as suggested by the Federation, has not led to the discharge of more men than was necessary. We are not quite sure that such an inquiry will serve any practical purpose. If the Board had then accepted the Federation's proposal all this subsequent trouble would have been avoided. But our present objective should be to concert measure so as to avoid unnecessary hardship to the low-paid railway employees, with which the Federation is principally concerned. From this point of view the Federation can legitimately stand out for the cases of those already discharged being reopened with a view to secure the reinstatement of as many of them as possible. But we do not think it is any use going beyond it. With the Railway Board and the Railwaymen's Federation thus disagreeing as to the terms of reference of the proposed Conciliation Board, the situation seems ominous with the threat of a general strike hanging over the country as a Damocles' sword. The crisis may even yet be averted by the Government of India showing the wisdom to appoint a Conciliation Board with wider terms of reference than is contemplated by the Railway Board.

* * *

Education in Bihar in 1929-30.

EVEN a cursory look at the literacy statistics given in the Bihar and Orissa education report for 1929-30 is sufficient to convince any dispassionate observer of the educational backwardness of the province and specially of the hopelessly backward condition in which female education stands. The all-India literacy percentage was very nearly 5 for 1929; that for Bihar and Orissa was slightly over $3\frac{1}{4}$. If we take female education separately, not even $\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. of the total female population is found to be at school! It is a matter for satisfaction however that this state of things has at last attracted the attention of Government so that female education will before long come into its own. The decision of the Government hereafter to give preference to the claims of female education which was come to during the year under report will be heartily welcomed by all those having the real educational interests of the province at heart. In pursuance of that decision it was also decided that

every district should have at least one middle school for girls and every division at least one high school. This is good so far as it goes; but unless steps are urgently taken to bring a larger number of girls into primary schools, it would be like devoting all one's attention to the superstructure while neglecting the foundations. One cause of the very slow progress of female education seems to have been the Government's restriction of local boards' expenditure on girls' schools to 15 per cent. of the funds available for primary education. The restriction, being quite arbitrary, was removed during the year, leaving full discretion to local boards to spend on female education as much as their funds might permit. It is to be hoped that the disappearance of this limit will go far to accelerate the rate of progress of female education. The year 1929-30 saw a diminution in the number both of primary schools and the pupils studying in them. The number of boy pupils went down from 876,000 in 1928-29 to 840,000 in 1929-30, and the number of primary schools from 27,046 to 26,159. In this connection we find that the figures relating to the number of primary schools and pupils studying in them as given in the table on p. 2 of the report differ to some extent from similar statistics given on p. 19 in the chapter dealing with primary education. It is to be hoped that the Bihar Government will throw some light on the discrepancy. The report deals with the measures designed to tackle the problem of wastage in primary education, which is such an unsatisfactory feature of educational systems in the different provinces. Some time must elapse before the results of the enforcement of these measures become available. These will be awaited with interest even in other provinces.

Indian States and the Federation.

THOUGH the Princes have agreed to join the Indian federation, they are claiming complete internal autonomy and unfettered discretion to introduce representative institutions when and how they like. How the claim, if it came to be conceded, would prejudice the working of the federation is admirably set out in the following comments by the *The Weekly Observer*, surely no enemy of the Princes:

If most of the States be governed, as at present, according to the will of the ruler, and if the provinces have a democratic constitution with elected legislatures, then Federal India will be composed of parts dissimilar and opposite in structure. A notable feature of some of the important existing federal constitutions is a declaration laying down in general terms the form of government to be adopted by the states forming part of the federation. For example, the constitution of the United States of America contains provision guaranteeing to every State of the Union a republican form of government. Similarly, according to the terms of the Swiss Federal Constitution, the Cantons are required to demand from the Federated State its guarantee of their constitution. This guarantee must be given provided, among other things, they ensure the exercise of political rights according to republican forms, representative or democratic. Likewise, the new German constitution provides that each state constituting the republic must have a republican constitution. These facts cannot be buried in any useful discussions regarding the future of the Indian States. Further, the lesson to be derived from these facts is that the Indian States, if the contemplated federal system is to work smoothly and efficiently, must progress on parallel lines with the Provinces—although the same rapidity might not be desirable from the point of safety. In no other way is it possible to conceive of a Federated India, otherwise its constituent parts will necessarily possess menacingly discordant elements, with mutually antagonistic political ideals.

Articles.

FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS.

THE Committee on Financial Obligations between Great Britain and India set up by the Congress has submitted its report which was released for publication last Tuesday. The Committee, though small, was undoubtedly a strong one containing as it did two eminent lawyers and two eminent economists. What has been published is Vol. I of the report containing the main report of the Committee; Vol. II containing an elaborated annexure by Prof. K. T. Shah is yet to be published. It may, however, be taken for granted that all the more important reasons in support of the Committee's recommendations have already found a place in the report itself. The Committee divides its subject matter in three parts considering separately in single parts the question of "debts" under the East India Company's rule, the "unproductive" debts under the British Crown and the "productive" debts under the British Crown. As a result of their examination of the whole question the Committee have put forward a claim against Great Britain of a total sum of Rs. 729.5 crores.

This claim is made up of a large variety of items and if the report is examined analytically there appears to be an equal variety of grounds on which the different claims are based. The following classification makes clear how the total claim is chiefly made up, (i) External Wars of the E. I. Co. and the Crown, Rs. 82 Crores; (ii) Transactions in connection with the capital stock of the E. I. Co., Rs. 37 crores; (iii) Cost of "Mutiny," Rs. 40 crores; (iv) Charges in respect of Burma, Rs. 102 crores; (v) European War cost and gift, Rs. 359 crores; (vi) Reverse Councils losses, Rs. 35 crores; and (vii) Claims in respect of railway transactions, Rs. 114 crores. It is our intention here briefly to examine the various claims thus put forward. The most obvious and the most indisputable claims are certainly those with regard to the external war expenditure. India has in the past been made to pay for wars undertaken and conducted by the British Imperial Government in such distant parts of the globe as China, Abyssinia or Soudan. There has never been even any plausible reason put forward why India should be saddled with any part of this expenditure and Indian publicists have protested most strongly against this unnecessary charge on Indian revenues. A detailed examination of these charges was made by Mr. Gokhale in his evidence before the Welby Commission and unless it be for the reason that these monies were expended in the distant past there seems no reason whatever why Great Britain should not be asked to take over this part of our national debt. The only point to be specially noticed about the Committee's report in this behalf is the claim it advances for the inclusion of the Afghan wars also as being amongst the wars external to India. This, though unusual, is supported by the reason that these Afghan wars were under-

taken purely in pursuance of what were strictly imperial aims.

The next class of claims is in respect of transactions regarding the stock of the E. I. Co. When the Crown took over the Government of India it had to redeem, according to the terms of the Company's Charter, the stock of the E. I. Co. and pay interest on it while it was unredeemed. The whole of this amount has been paid out of the revenues of India and the Committee, we believe, rightly hold that this transaction was neither just nor equitable. It could only be justified if it were pleaded by the British Government that they bought over India as a "going concern" and naturally expected themselves to be reimbursed for the original capital expenditure from out of the revenues of the new business. Though it is unlikely that this explanation will now be put forward it is only on the analogy of the dealings of a business concern that a number of the financial transactions of Great Britain with India can adequately be understood.

When we come to the "Mutiny" expenditure we are on a somewhat different ground. The Congress Committee hold that as in 1858 Britain may be said to have reconquered India the expenditure in connection with this "War" must be borne by the conquering nation and they point, in this connection, to the analogy of the Boer War. It is obvious that this depends entirely on what view you take of the "Mutiny". The British may conveniently class it as a revolt or an internal disturbance on a very large scale and thus plead that this expenditure was merely in connection with the maintenance of peace and order. The Burmese charges except those in connection with the eastern Burmese wars cannot, as one member of the Committee points out, be pressed except in the event of Burma being separated. So long as Burma remains an integral part of India it could hardly be said that such expenditure as the charges due to deficits in the Burmese budgets have no financial connection with India.

We then arrive at a consideration of the largest single item of the claims—the expenditure incurred by India on account of the European War. This certainly is a question surrounded with difficulties. For example, the moment we question the validity of the gift we may be confronted with the fact that at the time of the gift no leader of public opinion in India actively opposed it and that on the other hand a number of leaders very actively supported the idea. And the same reasoning may well apply to the military expenditure incurred by India. Lastly, there are the two claims which rest on the general ground of British financial mismanagement costing India dear. The losses sustained in connection with the Reverse Councils transactions and the premia paid to Railway Companies on acquisition by the State are particular instances of this. The first is an instance of gross miscalculation, the second an instance of misplaced and unnecessary generosity in the offer of terms of a financial transaction. On the same ground a number of other claims as for example in connection with Bombay Development Schemes

could well be made out. This amounts to holding Great Britain responsible for all the financial mistakes and misdeeds of its representatives in India. In so far as the responsibility of the Secretary of State for the finances of India has been emphasized this does not seem to be an entirely unreasonable procedure. It is necessary, however, to bear in mind that this type of claim rests on grounds entirely different from claims in the first two categories we have examined above. The item of the strategic railways has hardly been sufficiently explained in the report. We are unable to understand how the cost of railways built, for whatever purpose, in the Punjab or the frontier provinces could be put forward as a claim against Great Britain.

We have summarily attempted to explain above the grounds on which the various claims have been based. In doing this we may unconsciously have done an injustice to the report. For it contains a great deal of most interesting material conveniently brought together. The general case of the Committee is based on grounds of a wider nature than those which support particular claims. They maintain that politically and economically the dominion over India has immensely profited Great Britain; India on the other hand has become politically subject and economically impoverished. "These facts by themselves should be sufficient reasons for the transference of all existing liabilities by way of public debts from the shoulders of India to that of Great Britain from every moral and equitable point of view." It is hardly likely, however, that in this heavily indebted world such a plea would be considered sufficient for the transference of any considerable financial liabilities from one country to another. On specific claims we have already indicated above what we think to be comparatively stronger claims in the total put up by the Committee. We may frankly confess, however, that in these matters we do not take a very optimistic view. We do not think it probable that Great Britain at this juncture will evince any readiness to shoulder fresh burdens and for us the chief value of the report lies in the clear picture it presents of a series of unjust exactions and financial blunders. Beginning from the time of the E. I. Co. when the territorial and commercial accounts were hopelessly mixed up we have a series of charges for external expeditions, the transactions with regard to the stock of the Co., such charges as the China Consular Establishment and the Zanzibar and Mauritius Cable, the extravagance with regard to railway construction, the enormous losses of a variety of types connected with the Government management of currency and exchange and the permanent and crushing burden of inflated military expenditure, all of which constitute a sufficiently heavy indictment of any Government. With such a record, to which we may add the particularly dismal performance during the last decade, neither the Anglo-Indian bureaucracy nor the Secretary of State could rightly claim to be the sort of people to whom special financial powers may be safely entrusted. Even if the Congress Committee's report does not

succeed in obtaining for India any substantial relief in respect of debts we feel sure that it can be used with great effect at the R. T. C. as proving conclusively the case against all types of financial safeguards.

"INDIA IN 1929-30."

THIS is a useful publication as giving in a simple style a succinct account of India's problems and progress during the year with which it deals. But we must lodge our protest against the inordinate delay in presenting the book to the public. The publication covers the official year ending March 31, 1930; and its appearance fifteen months later in July 1931 deprives it of most of its interest and usefulness. The members of Parliament for whose benefit primarily the work is undertaken and the general public would have appreciated the report far more, had it been issued twelve months earlier. We hope future years will see some improvement in this respect.

Turning to the contents of the book, we are glad to say that practically all aspects of India's national life—domestic and international; political, social and economic; defence, external and internal; communications, commerce, trade and industry; finance, central and provincial; education, health and scientific research—have been intelligently touched upon. The detailed analysis of the ten chapters of the book by paragraphs at the beginning makes reference to the subjects reviewed easy and convenient.

The publication being an official one, such views as are expressed necessarily display a tendency to magnify the achievements of the Government, to justify its attitude on all matters, and correspondingly to undervalue unofficial opinions and viewpoints. For instance, there is a studied attempt on the part of the writer to belittle the strength of the Indian opposition to the Simon Commission. As a further illustration of the same point, we may refer to the manner in which the public demand for the Indianisation of the army is dealt with. The report after dwelling on the obstacles due to "multiplicity of social, religious and linguistic differences in India" harps on the "extraordinary variations, unparalleled in any other comparable area on the surface of the globe, which exist in the natural military aptitudes possessed by the country's different inhabitants". "Give the dog a bad name and hang him" comes appropriately to our minds when an argument like this is trotted out.

Now we cull a few extracts and figures from the report to show its interesting character and incidentally to indicate the magnitude of the task which is shouldered by the Government. The total establishment of the British and Indian armies in regular service amounts to about 194,000 men which represents a proportion of one soldier for approximately 1650 members of the population. There is one British soldier for every 6000 inhabitants "profoundly divided by social and religious differences."

The actual number of Indians at present settled abroad is about 2,610,000, of whom 359,000 are in

Ceylon. This amounts to less than one per cent. of the total home population. Not more than 100,000 Indians are permanent residents in lands not subject to the British Crown.

The standard estimate of the minimum average annual income for all India during Lord Curzon's time worked out to about Rs. 30 per head. But more recently, according to this publication, in Madras the average annual income earned per head by agriculturists amounted to a little over Rs. 100; in Bombay the net per capita annual income was found to be about Rs. 100 for urban and Rs. 85 for rural areas. In 1927-28, out of about 670 million acres of land in the nine major provinces of British India, 22 per cent. was unavailable for cultivation, 13 p. c. was occupied by forests, and 31 p. c. was fallow land or consisted of culturable waste. Thus only about 34 p. c. of the total area was actually sown with crops. According to the census of the livestock in 1924-25, the total number of livestock in British India was about 217 millions, the bovine population alone, i. e. oxen and buffaloes, totalling over 151 millions. During the year 1928-29, the total area irrigated by Government works came to 830.7 millions or 12 p. c. of the entire cropped area of the country. The total length of main and branch canals and distributaries in use came to about 75,000 miles, and the estimated value of the crops supplied with water from Government works was Rs. 141 crores.

The chapter on Communications is very interesting. From 5300 miles in 1872, the total railway mileage in 1930 came to about 42,000. 75 p. c. of the route mileage of Indian Railways is company-owned and 47 p. c. is directly managed by the State. "The efficiency and comfort of India's long distance railway services", says the report, "is probably unsurpassed in any other part of the world." We do not think that section of the public which travels in the lowest class in Indian Railways and which constitutes an overwhelming portion of the travelling public will endorse this description.

A word about the metalled roads. There exist four great trunk roads stretching diagonally across the country—from the Khyber to Calcutta, thence to Madras, on to Bombay and linking the latter with Delhi, which together account for about 5,000 out of the 60,000 miles of metalled roads in British India. None of these roads can be considered safe 'all weather' trunk roads according to European standards.

Figures showing the remarkable growth of the cooperative movement during the last 24 years are noteworthy. In 1908-9 the total number of cooperative societies in the whole country was under 1,500; by 1927-8, however, it had increased to about 96,000; and the working capital of these bodies amounted in the aggregate to nearly Rs. 77 crores. In recent years capital has been increasing faster than membership, and now amounts to about Rs. 200 per member and the average membership per society stands at 39. The movement encourages thrift by collecting small shares, receiving deposits and persuading members to make compulsory contribution for special purposes. Of the various means used to

improve the lot of the poorer classes of the population, perhaps the most important and successful is the cooperative movement. May the number and utility of co-operative societies ever increase!

Before concluding, we wish to say that the printing of the report has not been done as carefully as we should have wished. The result is that a number of errors have crept in into the report. To mention a few: p. 3 line 13 from the bottom has "protected" for "protracted"; p. 94 line 11 from the bottom has 'January' for 'December' and p. 120 line 8 from the bottom has "beileves" for "believes". Such slips are inexcusable in a Government publication which finds a place on the shelves of all good libraries. We hope future issues of the publication will leave no ground for complaint on this account.

S. P. ANDREWS-DUBE.

Reviews.

A NOVEL ECONOMIC THEORY.

UNSOLVED PROBLEMS; NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL. By JOHN S. HECHT. (Jarrolds.) 1930. 24cm. 288p. 16/-.

THE author of this book is profoundly dissatisfied with the present organisation of production and distribution of wealth and he is very severe on the economists for entirely misunderstanding the nature of the problems they profess to deal with and for their general inaptitude in the matter of theoretical analysis and practical reform. The book is divided into two parts — one dealing with unsolved national problems and the other with unsolved international problems. Under cover of these two main divisions Mr. Hecht ranges over a very extensive field and has something arresting — if not enlightening — to say on the innumerable questions which he discusses. The keynote of the book is sounded in the preface as follows:

Of all our problems . . . the most important is that of wages. Not only do wages affect directly the mass of the workers and their dependents in every civilized country, but the possibility of abolishing poverty and reconciling the interests of labour and capital depends upon a solution of this problem. Unsolved problems, national and international, may be well approached, therefore, from the point of view of wages on which they may be said to hang and that is the method adopted in this book.

But we fear that this novel method of approach has not helped Mr. Hecht to arrive at results useful or even barely rational. His theory of wages boils down to this that (i) Before the introduction of the modern industrial regime every family of workers working independently must have been able to produce year by year the subsistence of an average family, (ii) Under the modern regime owing to the introduction of division of labour the production capacity of labour has vastly increased, (iii) Therefore the worker is entitled to at least the subsistence wage of an average family for otherwise he would be better off without division. According to the author, the acceptance of this principle leads us to the conclusion that "without division of labour a share of the product is really due from workers having less than the average number of dependents to those having more, and when labour is divided the minimum wage must vary according to the number of dependents". "The real and all sufficient reason," says the author "why

the minimum wage should vary according to the number of dependents lies in two undeniable factors in human existence, namely, *unequal fecundity* and *division of labour*." Mr. Hecht further alleges that this fundamental principle of wages according to family needs is as old as civilisation and that "right up to the eighteenth century the payment of wages, generally in kind, according to the number of dependent persons was the custom in every civilised country." All this, however, is doubtful history and still more doubtful logic. With the same airy insouciance the author forges his way through every difficult problem he tackles and in the course of his progress gives short shrift to many a venerable doctrine of accepted economic theory — not excluding the theory of value itself. His own constructions, however, are built on sand and rarely stand the test of scientific analysis. Nevertheless the book has a value in that it will compel the believer in traditional theory to re-examine and in some cases modify his ideas so as to make them less open to attack. Anything that is calculated to discourage an attitude of undue self-complacency should be welcome and the book under review serves this purpose admirably for the student of economics.

G. B. J.

RUSSIAN ECONOMICS.

THE ECONOMIC POLICY OF SOVIET RUSSIA.

By PAUL HAENSEL. (King.) 1930. 32cm. 190 p. 9/-

RUSSIAN DEBTS AND RUSSIAN RECONSTRUCTION.

By LEO PASVOISKY & HAROLD G. MOULTON. (Brookings Institution, Washington.) 1924 20 cm. 247 p. \$ 2.00.

THE situation with regard to literature bearing on Soviet Russia is not without its paradoxical features. Much is being written about conditions in Russia but owing to the propagandist nature of a large proportion of the stuff, little enlightenment is to be found in the same. The book of Prof. Haensel has a peculiar significance. His authority for writing a book on Soviet economic policy is unchallenged. For over twenty-five years Prof. Haensel held the chair of Public Finance in the University of Moscow. In Tsarist times he was a Director of the State Bank of Russia. Even during the Soviet rule from 1921 till 1928, when the professor had to leave his country behind him almost as an exile, he was the president of the financial section of the Institute of Economic Research attached to the Commissariat of Finance of U. S. S. R. Prof. Haensel claims to be a non-party man and besides his work in the capacities above-noted he had considerable direct experience of the formulation and working of Soviet economic policy. Though it would be too much to expect that the exiled and disgraced—Prof. Haensel's chair at the University was taken away from him while he was doing temporary research work in London—professor has painted a thoroughly unbiased picture of the economic policy of the Soviet, still it is by far the most discriminating and scientific treatment of the subject that we have come across.

Prof. Haensel's book contains a masterly survey of the origins of Bolshevist rule and the later introduction of the 'NEP' (New Economic Policy). The present situation in Russia in respect of such matters of vital social importance as the state of agriculture and the agriculturist, the history of Russian industrial policy and its effects on the workers, trade and transport, and public finance is lucidly described by the author. In view of the very interesting position of the "Five-Year Plan" now being followed by the Russian Government the firsthand infor-

mation contained in Prof. Haensel's book will be found highly valuable. The significance of the Soviet war on Kulaks which is now intensifying is clearly brought out by the author. It is no mere academic insistence on the completion of the Communist doctrine of the extinction of private enterprise that is traceable behind this new fangled enthusiasm for exterminating the independent farmer. To secure increased agricultural production with a view to feed the growing city population and to create enough surplus for export purposes would appear to be the chief motives of the Russian Government in this respect. The earlier policy of lowering the price of agricultural produce having resulted in a serious contraction of the supply of food-stuffs and raw materials the Soviet had to take recourse in a policy of expropriation and forced labour. The Soviet authorities have failed as yet in replacing the economic motive by another of a higher civic or moral value. Instead of recognising their failure and reorganising the whole of their national and international policy, as was foreshadowed by Lenin when he adopted the 'NEP', the Russian authorities are proceeding to wipe out such vestiges of free industry as still remain in the country. Unless Russia produces a leader whose courage and vision are equal to the task of giving a new and, what would at the outset be, an unpopular turn to Russian policy, a reaction against Soviet rule is only a question of time.

There are other features of Soviet economic policy which also point to the inherent weakness of the present Russian order. The dictatorship of the proletariat is not to be distinguished either in its political or ethical significance from the domination of one man or of a few intellectual and wealthy persons over the rest of the community. An order based on class-struggle and the domination of one class by another can have no elements either of permanence or of cultural excellence in itself. In Prof. Haensel's book readers will find a sober yet illuminating description of the special hardships to which all but the industrial workers are subject under the present regime in Russia. Prof. Haensel has not been slow to recognise the merits of the Soviet rule in such matters as improving the lot of the industrial worker, giving the landless peasant a new sense of self-esteem and the rapid industrialisation of the country. But whether the superstructure of Soviet economic policy is based on the sure foundations of a reliable human motive and a just social machinery is more than doubtful.

Whatever may be said in criticism of the Soviet rule there can be no doubt of the fact that a great, almost unprecedented, experiment in social and economic reconstruction of human society is going on in Russia. The more of informed and impartial literature we get on the subject, the easier it would be for thinking men all the world over to appreciate the permanent significance of the Russian experiment. Prof. Haensel's book will serve a very valuable purpose in educating the public mind on the economic merits of Soviet rule.

The book on Russian debts and Russian reconstruction has mainly a historical importance. The primary purpose of the study was to present in proper perspective all the facts bearing on Russia's foreign indebtedness and the country's capacity to repay the same. Such a study was very essential when American financiers were contemplating a huge Russian loan in 1924. Under similar conditions elsewhere and at other times the book will not fail to be serviceable.

D. G. KARVE.

A DEFENCE OF BOLSHEVISM.

THE CHALLENGE OF BOLSHEVISM. A NEW SOCIAL IDEAL. BY D. F. BUXTON. (Allen & Unwin.) 1928. 18cm. 95p. 2/6.

To outsiders who rely upon the propagandist press for information about Russia the impression generally conveyed is that it is a country which is under the heels of a most heinous system of tyranny and that the people there groan under disabilities which are not to be found anywhere else. This is, if one has the eye to see through it, a grossly exaggerated picture of what is actually happening in Russia and one invented by the press in bourgeois countries interested in presenting the Communist experiment in the worst possible light, without caring to look at the other side of the picture. They forget that there is nothing like unmixed good in the world and that each civilization and order of society has got its own advantages and disadvantages; and if there are defects and drawbacks in the Russian Proletariat-cum-Communist regime, there are equally grave, if not graver, defects in the capitalistic civilization obtaining elsewhere. It is this point of view that is presented in the book under review written by Mrs. Buxton. Her thesis is that though Communism and Sovietism are atheistic in their outlook, autocratic in the extreme and all that, still their atheism and autocracy and everything else are much better than the supposed religiousness and their so-called freedom etc. of other countries, in so far as the former are based upon the principles of equality, humanity, love and faith.

Communism in Russia, according to Mrs. Buxton, has to its credit the practical realization of the following doctrines:—(1) A sense of the value of life in itself. (2) A realization of the unity of mankind and the good of each as contained in the good of all. (3) Faith that life here can be made good and beautiful for all. (4) Faith in the motive of service rather than in that of acquisition.

She has a good word to say of everything that the Communists have done and are doing, as, for example, look at this statement: "In the Communist State a most valuable experiment is in progress which will help to show how much wealth can be allowed to each individual as a stimulus to effort and saving without conferring privileges and powers which are undesirable from the point of view of the community". Or again this: "the most important change introduced by Communism is not merely an economic change nor yet a political one," though in the opinion of the author the Soviet system represents an invaluable and original political experiment, but "it is a change in values represented by the replacing of the motive of acquisition by the motive of service to humanity."

Anyway, the book is a challenging one and those who are interested in the problem of sociology and practical religion should hear what the author has to say; for the questions that she raises are fundamental and she avoids ground that has been covered before.

C. V. HANUMANTHA RAO.

A SEVENTEENTH CENTURY ENGLISH STATESMAN.

STRAFFORD. VOLS. 1 & 2. By LADY BURGHCLERE. (Macmillan, London.) 1931. pp. 348, 373. 30/— for 2 vols.

THIS is a courageous attempt to vindicate the reputation of one who has unfortunately been made responsible along with Laud for the personal government of Charles I. Lady Burghclere who by the way

is not a novice in the art of writing biographies, for she has already published the Life of George Villiers, 2nd Duke of Buckingham, Life of James, 1st Duke of Ormond, etc. with the help of papers supplied by Lord Fitzwilliam, has boldly challenged a comparison between the Strafford of history and the Strafford painted by the Whig historians of the nineteenth century. The verdict of public opinion has long since been given on the other side. Owing to the unfavourable picture of Macaulay and the Whig historians of the nineteenth century Strafford has suffered in the estimation of the public. Even a judicious historian like Trevelyan has based his estimate of Strafford upon the prejudiced accounts of Whig historians. But the charges against Strafford have never before received the searching criticism which they require, and after going through Lady Burghclere's searching examination of all the available evidence of the period, we feel that Strafford was "more sinned against than sinning." To historical students Strafford was the Sir Thomas Wentworth who figured prominently on the Opposition bench during the debate on the Petition of Right, but who subsequently joined the side of the King and became President of the Council of the North and Lord Deputy of Ireland.

Much has been made of the "apostasy" of Wentworth and of his responsibility for the personal government of Charles I. It has been maintained that Strafford who had supported the Petition of Right spent the rest of his life in trying to subvert its principles and that together with Archbishop Laud he set up the prerogative courts above Parliament and the common law. Lady Burghclere undertakes in this book to refute the charges of "apostasy" and tyranny levelled against Wentworth.

The learned author admits that Wentworth was ambitious, but that his ambitions were administrative, not constitutional. She points out how during the discussions on the Petition of Right, Wentworth represented the spirit of compromise which is the hallmark of the English gentleman turned politician. Wentworth's aim was the peace and happiness of the people and he felt he could achieve it by the joint individual well-being of sovereignty and subjection. His model was the Elizabethan state but unfortunately his sovereign was Charles I who proved a broken reed. Hence his failure. The author shows how Wentworth did not like the *jehad* that Pym and other Puritan members were waging against Charles. He felt that the Puritan party was going too far. At such a time when he felt powerless in Parliament, an appointment under the King was certainly attractive to him, especially as it would enable him to reconcile sovereignty and subjection. As the author says:

It must have been galling to Wentworth, immediately on the revelation of his gifts of leadership and constructive statesmanship to be reduced to powerlessness by extremists. To remain content in a state of detachment can only be achieved by the saint or the invertebrate. Wentworth was neither. Moreover, he may well have considered that with the passing of the Petition he had fulfilled his obligations to the reforming party. He was free to seize on the best opportunity that presented itself for service to the Commonwealth.

It is usual to state that Wentworth became a Privy Councillor at Michaelmas 1628, that is to say four short months after the passing of the Petition of Right, while Charles' foreign policy to which he was opposed was in force. As a matter of fact, the author says, Wentworth became a Privy Councillor only on November 10, 1629 i.e. more than a year after the murder of Buckingham, "the grievance of grievances."

The author describes at great length Went-

worth's work as Lord President of the Council of the North, and how freed from the meddling interference of the Royal Court he carried out his policy of "Thorough". The author asks us not to be carried away by the Long Parliament's denunciations of the tyrannies perpetrated by the prerogative courts. "In passing judgment" says the author, "we should never forget that paternal government was regarded as that of the pattern state in the seventeenth century."

The learned author devotes many pages to the proconsulship of Strafford. She points out the confused state of Ireland and how a strong man was needed. We certainly agree with the author that Strafford's Irish administration should not be judged by English standards. Some of Strafford's acts in Ireland have their justification, but when the author wants us to believe that Strafford's Irish administration was a success, we are unable to agree with her. We feel that the outbreak of the Irish Catholic rebellion of 1641 was a measure of Strafford's failure in Ireland.

With regard to the part played by Strafford towards the close of the period of Charles' personal government, the author is right in saying that Strafford advised Charles to summon the Short Parliament for he did not share the King's horror of Parliaments. The author also points out that Strafford advised Charles not to dissolve the Short Parliament and if his advice had been followed, the Short Parliament would not have been replaced by the Long Parliament.

The author clearly points out in the concluding chapters of the second volume how the end of Strafford was due to the malicious treachery of Secretary Vane and the vindictive attitude of Pym and his satellites in the Long Parliament.

Such is the authentic history of Strafford. That he had some faults few will deny. He was ambitious, arbitrary on occasions, and intolerant. The author does not claim for her hero immunity from the errors and influences of the times in which he lived. But she claims that he shall not be solely judged by the libels of Pym and the prejudiced views of Whig historians and that the stain of apostasy shall not on such authority as that, for ever soil the reputation of a high spirited and illustrious Privy Councillor.

We have no hesitation in saying that it is a book which no student of English history should be without.

M. V. SUBRAHMANYAM.

SHORT NOTICES.

SOCIAL CHANGES IN 1928. Ed. By WILLIAM F. OGBURN. (University of Chicago Press.) 1929. 24cm. 223pp.

THE book consists of a number of reprint articles which originally appeared in the May 1929 number of the *American Journal of Sociology*. The intention of the Editor was to present a number of research articles written by specialists each dealing with one particular aspect of the cultural evolution of American life during the year 1928. The studies which are 21 in number cover every conceivable phase of contemporary developments in the social and economic life of the American people. Indeed the interest of the book may be regarded to have been broadened much beyond the ground that may be expected to be covered in a purely sociological study. Reference, for instance, may be made to the articles on foreign policy and government, each of which contains an interesting recital of the salient facts relating to what may be considered the political domain. The current politics of a people, both domestic and foreign, may not be without its sociological signifi-

cance. But if the book were to be planned with such a wide scope, one might have reason to regret the omission of a study devoted to contemporary thought and religion. Further, from the very nature of the studies they have been more descriptive than critical. A year in a people's history is too short a time unit to allow a new tendency to manifest itself or an old one to harden. Indian readers, therefore, will miss in these articles that intellectual illumination which is associated with critical studies which are excellent in themselves containing, as they do, a valuable collection of facts.

K. M. P.

INDIAN CIVILIZATION AND ITS ANTIQUITY.

By BHUDEB MOOKERJI (The Author, 41A, Grey Street, Calcutta.) 22cm. 122p. Rs. 2/-

The book is a repetition of the Biblical theory that the world was created about 4000 years before the Birth of Christ, and that the composition of the ancient Vedas of the Hindus could not be placed earlier than 2000 B. C. and that the Hindu epics of Ramayna and Mahabharata are unhistoric. The author attempts to revise this theory on the basis of his researches. He believes in the Puranic theory of the origin of the world and the antiquity of the Indian civilisation. "The world is eternal, creation being taken to mean periodical reconstruction after dissolution. The age of the present Kalpa is 1955,885027 years." This is really staggering to persons who are not initiated into the ancient Indian science, history and scriptures and who believe in the Christian theory of the origin of the world. The author shows here that therefore the great antiquity of the Indian civilisation need not be doubted, that it is much older than hitherto it was considered to be. This conclusion is irresistible if books on astrology, chemistry, the Purans and the Tantras are properly and intensively studied. His four chapters viz. (i) Phallism and the spread of Indian culture even in pre-historic time, (ii) The Gipsies and the spread of Indian culture, (iii) The antiquity of Indian chemistry and (iv) Borrowed words of Sanskrit in European languages show clearly the great antiquity of Indian Civilisation: as they prove conclusively the racial and cultural dependence of the West on India, and the Indian basis of the Egyptian, Assyrian and Babylonian civilisation.

K. S. V.

TOLKAPPIYAM. THE EARLIEST EXTANT TAMIL GRAMMAR.

By P. S. SUBRAHMANYA SASTRI (The Correspondent, Journal of Oriental Research, Madras.) 1930. 21cm. 105p. Re. 1/-

TOLKAPPIYAM is the oldest extant Tamil grammar of the eighth century. Veerasoliyam is another grammar of the eleventh century. Both these have been superseded by the famous Nannul of Pavanandi Muni, which has in modern times attained the position of a leading authority in Tamil grammar. The book under review may not appeal to the wide Tamil reading public except to the small circle of Tamil scholars engaged in research work and to other European and English scholars of comparative philology. The author, an Assistant Editor of the Tamil Lexicon published by the Madras University, has given in this book an English translation of the *sutras* with short explanatory notes in English. We wish he had given also examples illustrative of each *sutra* instead of a mere explanation. As it is, we fear the book may not be of much use to Tamil students on account of its English translation and meagre notes. To make the book really useful for philologists and scholars, the author would have

done well to have given the texts of the *sutras* in Tamil with a comparative and critical study of the other two grammars mentioned above.

In this volume, the chapter dealing with phonology or Eluthathikaram of the Tolkappiyam has been published. We hope the author will bring out the other chapters as well with the text of the *sutras* and explanations in Tamil with critical and explanatory footnotes in English, so that the book may appeal to a wider reading public.

S. R. VENKATA RAMAN.

VINAVASAVADATTAM. AN OLD SANSKRIT DRAMA. [Madras Oriental Series No. 2.]

(Published in the Journal of Oriental Research, Madras.) 21cm. 52p. As. 8/-

PARTHYODA RAJA decides to give his daughter Vasavadatta in marriage to Sanjaya but in a dream he is directed to give her to Vasthya. Vasthya mighty but he is to be conquered and then married to Vasavadatta. The only means of conquering him is through elephants as he was so cursed by a Rishi. The name of the play does not seem to be justified by the text except for the fact that Vasthya conquered the elephants with the help of a Veena. The play being incomplete we are not in a position to decide about its merits.

V. S. VENKATRAMA SASTRY.

RICHARD HENRY TIERNEY. PRIEST OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS. By FRANCIS X.

TALBOT. (The America Press, New York.) 1930. 20cm. 200 p. \$.3-00.

THIS book is the inspiring biography of a man that gave the strength of his body, mind and soul to his work, having dedicated them to God. This outpouring of self resulted in great work, not only in the realm of literature and polemics but more in sympathy and service of mankind. Such a life must teach us that results will be forthcoming only if lives are dedicated to service as was Fr. Tierney's.

FR. YESUDAS, C. S. S.

Miscellaneous.**SOLUTION OF THE INDIAN PROBLEM.**

MR. SASTRI'S SPEECH.

The following is the full text of the address recently delivered to the British public by the Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, and broadcast by the British Broadcasting Co.:-

ONCE last year, at the end of a speech on Indian politics, I was asked the question, 'If you are a Moderate in Indian politics, what would an Extremist be like?' It is an old gibe that the Extremist is but the Moderate in a hurry. The distinction between the two is clear enough to those who are in the movement but the outsider is apt to be in confusion. The confusion is worse confounded by the intruding personality of Gandhi. In praising him and his sincerity, in acknowledging his chastening influence on politics and politicians and in endeavouring to meet his viewpoint and win his co-operation there is marked unanimity among Indians of all shades of thought. My friend, Mr. Yusuf Ali, is an exception. The volume and genuineness of this common homage obscure the difference between those who follow and

those who merely respect and admire him. The difference, however, is there.

Before coming to the difference let me state the agreement behind it, which is equally striking. We all seek the freedom of India with no subordination or exploitation. Equal and honourable association in the British Commonwealth is the cherished ambition of the Centre Party and of the Right as well. The Left-winger would be content with it. So far the Centre Party politician has retained his faith that British policy, unstable and disappointing as it has often been, will fulfil his ambition. Its vacillation and delay have thinned his ranks, and if they persist he may cease to be a factor in Indian political life. Mr. Polak, whose understanding of the inwardness of the Gandhi movement cannot be surpassed, told you some days ago that this faith in Britain was shared by the Mahatma till quite recently. Sad was the day when his faith was quenched; sad were the events which did the deed. Still, he can sympathise with those of his countrymen whose faith in Britain, more robust than his own, has survived that day and those events. Between him and the leaders of the Moderate school the bond of sympathy has always been more real than between his followers and them. His vision is larger than theirs; it can appreciate more and subtler affinities, and the next session of the Round Table Conference need have no misgiving because he comes unattended. His critics in this country will have the surprise of their lives when they discover how easily the tenderness and chivalry of his nature can be touched, and how privations of the flesh and wounds of the soul have left his reason without a cloud.

UNATTAINABLE DREAM.

I could wish, though, like Mr. Yusuf Ali, that the civil disobedience movement had never been started. India's salvation had chances of attainment through less subversive means. And those chances were well worth the taking. Let no one deny the value of the sacrifices made, the courage evoked, the political wisdom gained or the national grit acquired. But is it possible to ignore the entries on the other side—the debauch of emotionalism, the corrupting and coarsening of young hearts, the wild dreams of prosperity and happiness which no 'swaraj', not even 'Purna Swaraj,' which is Sanskrit for complete independence, will bring, the spirit of irreverence and disregard of law, now exalted to the rank of virtue, but for a long time henceforth certain to be a menace to society and a thorn in the side of an indigenous government? Also, alas! for the perversity and contradictoriness of our nature: though non-violence was the creed, love and peace the watchwords, and meekness and suffering the only means to be employed, the air resounded with cries of campaigns and war councils, marches and raids, flag wavings and hoistings; men were bidden to abandon their professions, boys and girls enlisted in the 'National Army,' and passionate appeals and provocations and incitements proper to a state of war were made day after day to all ranks and conditions of men. What if destructive weapons were not employed? War reigned in the breasts of Congressmen, and the grimness of spirit and the fierce animosities roused by picketings and enforced 'hartals' unchained the anti-social qualities of human nature to such an extent that one could not truthfully describe it all as a manifestation of soul-force.

A MATCH TO GUNPOWDER.

The men of moderate views, while they recoiled from these methods, not the less disruptive because they were styled non-violent, did not foresee the extent to which they would spread among the people or the magnitude of the response which they would

evoke from the country. The hatred of British rule, or at any rate the discontent with the existing order, which made the work of destruction easy, was scarcely suspected by the leaders of a school which had never made the political education of the masses its duty. The discovery came as a shock and paralysed their wits. If this be the case even with those who are in intimate social relations with those affected, is it any wonder that the Europeans in the land, divided by race, language and other barriers from the community around them, do not realise that they are living on the side of a volcano until an eruption actually occurs? I well remember one of your statesmen, discussing the anti-British demonstrations in Egypt some years ago, observed that his men on the spot had not given him in their reports any warning of the danger that was brewing. The situation is far more tragic when the men on the spot warn again and again but the statesmen at home do not heed. The warning comes to you today from all sides. The gravity of the crisis cannot be exaggerated. The only question is, what is the remedy?

CART BEFORE THE HORSE.

Mr. Yusuf Ali insists that law and order must be restored before anything else is done. He is obsessed by Cawnpore. It was a disgraceful communal outburst, savage and of almost unredeemed brutality. What a sad reflection that the outburst need not have gone to such terrible lengths but for official incompetence! But such things have happened before and may happen hereafter. Our course should not be altered on their account. The Round Table Conference still holds the only promise of a successful solution. The effort to restore law and order cannot be suspended for a moment, but for its full fruition the satisfaction of India's political aspiration is essential. He is an obstructionist who dwells on the inconsistencies of the Indian Congress, the contrast between Hinduism and Islam, and the differing connotations of the phrase 'Dominion status' in the minds of those who use it. To say, as Mr. Yusuf Ali does, 'first change the atmosphere and then hold the Round Table Conference' is to go round the vicious circle. The atmosphere cannot change without the Round Table Conference. Let us get along with it. I must also take leave to point out that his attitude is more that of the die-hards in this country than that of the Right Wing of his own countrymen, whom he was supposed to represent.

WANTED—A MEDIATOR.

The Hindu-Muslim tension is a stumbling block. Mr. Yusuf Ali hit the nail on the head when he said that religion does not come into it. It is dragged in as a cloak for masking secular disputes. Nor do I believe that a fully self-governing India would never see again a sanguinary riot between the roughs of the two communities. But it is well to remove the political bickerings which, every time a constitutional move is contemplated, provoke communal strife and bring joy to the camp of the enemies of India's freedom. The leaders of the Centre or Liberal Party made great efforts to bring about a reconciliation but these came to nothing. No better fate has attended the attempts of Mr. Gandhi during recent months. But in the political sphere the unexpected does happen occasionally. In these days when political opinion ripens fast, we may indulge the hope that reconciliation is not far off.

Should this hope be disappointed, may we not fall back on arbitration? Arbitration has been adopted by the League of Nations as an honourable and efficient method of promoting the peace of the world. What is good for contending nations should be good for the rival communities of India. Unfortunately so far has bitterness gone that there is not one in the coun-

try who commands the confidence of the two communities in sufficient degree to be chosen as mediator. I see no humiliation in bringing the dispute over to this country for settlement. It will not be difficult, if the plan be agreed upon, to find persons among you who can be trusted to hear both sides and give an impartial award. The Government of India, which has the final word in the matter, may accept the award and put it into operation. It is time we got a move on. If it is not right for the Mussalmans to block progress because their demands are not met, it is no more right for the Congress people to hold up things because their ideal solution is unattainable.

RESERVATIONS AND SAFEGUARDS.

The other main difficulty in the way of the Round Table Conference is the question of reservations and safeguards. An idea is being sedulously propagated in this country that certain safeguards were adopted as final and unalterable by agreement on all sides at the end of the Conference. This is by no means correct. Both British and Indian delegates expressly reserved their right to reconsider all matters and no one was held to be irrevocably committed. Lord Irwin in his truce with Mr. Gandhi has stated that the Congress representatives will be free to discuss the safeguards in order to see whether they are in the interests of India. Where is the harm? Apparently, a certain section of critics here wish some safeguards in the interests of Britain and British people, and are afraid that they would be impossible if the sole test were to be India's good. Lord Reading, who proposed the financial safeguards, said clearly that they were meant to maintain India's credit abroad and keep her currency policy safe from political vicissitudes.

The difficulty is that all these safeguards take the form of investing the Viceroy with power to override the decisions of the legislature. In exercising this power he would be responsible to the Imperial Parliament here. All such exercise, besides being a derogation from Dominion Status, is liable to be attacked in India as having been dictated for the benefit of this country. This is a contingency which it is desirable to avoid. And for this purpose, I understood from a common friend, Lord Reading was willing that the Viceroy's instrument of instructions should contain a clause to the effect that it is the policy of Great Britain that the special powers reserved to the Viceroy should be exercised only for India's good. If the powers are to be there, this clause in the instrument of instructions may be of some use. But the major point is worth examining, namely, whether it is necessary to vest such powers in the Viceroy. Some Indian delegates did question the necessity at the time. The issues are clear, and no calamity need be apprehended if they were the subject of discussion once more. The heads of defence, external affairs and political relations are more easily disposed of. It is well known that in the Indian Congress circles some radical views are entertained regarding the use and control of the army and its expenditure. Nothing but good will come if they are brought to the test of general discussion in an assembly where other views are also strongly represented. It may be that certain aspects of defence are proved to be suitable for transfer to the control of the Indian legislature.

CONCILIATION.

To sum up the position of the Liberal or Centre Party in India; we stand firmly by the magnanimous and far-sighted policy of conciliation adopted by Lord Irwin as the only policy that will save India and Britain. We believe in the British connection and would strive for its maintenance, but only on a footing of complete equality within the Common-

wealth, nowise inferior in status to any of the Dominions. We are opposed to direct action and hope, with the aid of the new spirit which makes for universal peace, to achieve the destiny of our Motherland through constitutional means. We shall work for a lasting and honourable understanding between the various communities of India, so that all might work together for her welfare and be welded together into one nation. Towards these high ends the Round Table Conference appears to us to be the only efficacious means. When through its agency the present acute dispute is ended and something like normal conditions are restored, we have full faith that we have a great part to play under the banner of peace, progress and all round reform.

EQUALITY OF TRADING RIGHTS.

MR. SASTRI'S VIEWS.

At the East India Association in London Sir Hubert Carr recently read a paper on "The Briton in India and Constitutional Changes." Participating in the discussion on the paper, the Right Hon'ble Mr. Sastri spoke as follows:

MR. SRINIVASA SASTRI craved leave to put the case that Sir Hubert Carr had expounded from a slightly different angle. Towards the end of his paper Sir Hubert Carr had this sentence: "The Briton in India has a genuine sympathy with the advance of India to self-government and with Indian claims for equality of status with the Dominions of the Empire." Upon that they took their stand, and he was very happy to find that their claim to equality with the Dominions had the sympathy of the Briton in India. (Hear, hear). He wished however to ask whether its implication was realised in full. In the British Empire as at present constituted each Dominion had the power, and exercised it, for discriminating against those who were not its nationals. That was laid down in the law; it was exercised in the daily administration. The people of India had cause to feel the edge of that power. Was it realised that this was a time when India was growing to full status. It was said: we are all in sympathy with endowing India with a constitution tomorrow, purporting to put it upon a level and equality with the Dominions. The proposal as set forth in the paper was to handicap India at the very outset, to deny to her the power which the other Dominions had, and were daily exercising. He did not say that if they were given that power they were going to exercise it against the Briton in India. That was far from his desire and was far from the point of view which he wished to urge. But it could not be claimed by the European community that they were sympathetic to the demand for equality with the Dominions of the Empire, and at the same time at the very start to seek to handicap India in a way in which no other Dominion was handicapped. That was the legal position. He was no merchant; he was not engaged in any industry; he was one of those people who was considered a danger to the State, whose one occupation was political agitation; he paid no income-tax even. Speaking, therefore, as a pure politician—of which he was not ashamed—he desired to point out that there was a fundamental inconsistency between profession and practice in this matter. It might be said: you will have theoretically the power. As the language of the understanding embodied in an earlier part of the paper showed it must be implicitly recognised. He was one of those who with Sir Hubert Carr laboured to bring that clause into effect, and it was passed at the meeting of the Minorities Committee at the instance of the British Commercial

Committee. The principle was generally agreed that there should be no discrimination between the rights of the British mercantile community and the rights of Indian born subjects, and that an appropriate Convention based on reciprocity should be entered into for the purpose of regulating these rights. That language clearly implied that there should be a Convention hereafter based upon reciprocity between Britain and the people of India or the nationals of India. In another part of the Paper Sir Hubert Carr had definitely claimed in language which, by the leave of the Chairman, he would say was emphatic, and left no room for ambiguity, and was by no means soporiferous, that the Briton in India should not be treated as a non-national. Was it possible without a law of nationality that that clause could be brought into effect? They had not yet clearly defined what Indian nationality was. It would be time enough when they had made that definition to introduce an appropriate clause which would bring about the very point sought for by this Convention. A Convention based upon reciprocity was asked for which would give to the Briton in India—that was the Briton who had become the national of India in a legal sense—every right which any Indian born subject had. By all means let such a law be brought into effect, and let them make that Convention; but it would be a derogation absolutely unwarranted and involving humiliation to insist beforehand that a Constitution that they were framing now should start with a handicap upon the powers of the Indian to legislate in his own country. Sir Hubert Carr was perfectly entitled to ask what their intentions were; they should state them. Sir Hubert was perfectly entitled to ask that they should come to some understanding on the subject. But, first of all, India should be put in a position where she could negotiate on equal terms. The Government of India was dominated today by the British. Any Convention entered into between India and Britain was only nominal. Nobody would allow it to be as between two peoples based upon parity. Any Convention entered into today, as they were, would merely mean the British ruling in India and in England. He asked to be given power; to be placed as nearly as possible, subject to certain reservations to which they could all agree, upon Dominion status, then a Convention might be asked for. That was fair and square. Those very Congress people whose misdeeds had aroused suspicions and alarms amongst them would then perhaps be found to accord to the British, in their entirety, the privileges for which they asked. But they must first show their intention to place India upon an equality. What were the steps towards Dominion status that were absolutely essential? They were with regard to the external relations and dealing with the Indian States and so forth. They would ask that in economic matters such as tariffs and other things there should be no reservation or safeguard embodied in the statute in which, in an unconstitutional or arbitrary manner the Governor or Viceroy would be able to enforce against the Indian people, because in his view that seemed to be the wrong way of going about a business as to which in substance there was as he ventured to think nearly complete agreement between those whom Sir Hubert Carr was speaking for and those whom for the moment he was speaking for. Britain should not seek to handicap them further than was absolutely essential, (hear, hear), and should not seek to get from them now while they were not free to deal with Britain on the footing of equality that which would be fair only when Indians were in their own country what Englishmen are in their own country.

On other matters, Mr. Sastri said, there might be a difference between himself and Sir Hubert Carr, but he did not wish to raise those particular issues; they were all secondary. The one he had dealt with was the important matter. He knew that those represented by Sir Hubert Carr had the matter in their hearts, and he knew that India would have to meet them upon the point fairly and squarely before anything could be done; but he asked that Indians should not have ascribed to them the view which in a moment of political excitement had found expression rather strongly elsewhere. There was, for instance, the desire of India to get away from the British Empire that was expressed by Congress when it was in open revolt against this country. Nobody said anything about that now. What was the use of bringing that up today; that was the case and no doubt Congress passed such a resolution but it passed it before the Irwin-Gandhi pact. That Irwin-Gandhi pact it was their business to confirm and turn into a lasting peace.

Sir Hubert Carr's anxiety was great with regard to business interests. Those interests had been more or less threatened, and he (Mr. Sastri) was as anxious as Sir Hubert to place these matters on another footing, but the line suggested by Sir Hubert did not seem to be appropriate; it might rupture those relations which they wished to be perfectly cordial. He appealed to Sir Hubert in the name of the future good relations of Britain and India not to press this matter to the bitter end, and not take the line that while India was still struggling rights should be taken away from her which before her very eyes the Dominions were exercising daily, because that would not be fair. (Applause).

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- SURVEY OF AMERICAN FOREIGN RELATIONS. By CHARLES P. HOWLAND. (Yale University Press, New Haven.) 1930. 25cm. 541p. \$ 5.00.
- A PICTURE OF WORLD ECONOMIC CONDITIONS AT THE BEGINNING OF 1931. (National Industrial Conference Board, New York.) 1931. 24cm. 349p. \$ 3.00.
- BRITAIN AND WORLD TRADE. By A. LOVEDAY. (Longmans, London.) 1931. 22cm. 229p. 10s.
- THE DYNAMICS OF INDUSTRIAL COMBINATION. By H. A. MARQUAND. (Longmans, London.) 1931. 22cm. 206p. 12/6.
- NATIONAL DEFENSE. A Study of the Origins, Results and Prevention of War. By KIRBY PAGE. (Farrar & Rinehart Inc., New York.) 1931. 22cm. 403p. \$ 3.00.
- THE STORY OF PUNISHMENT. A Record of Man's Inhumanity to Man. By HARRY ELMER BARNES. (The Stratford Co., Boston.) 1930. 22cm. 292p. \$ 3.00.
- A CONTRIBUTIVE SOCIETY. By J. R. BELLERBY. (Education Services, 28 Commercial St., London, E. 1.) 1931. 22cm. 224p. 7/6.
- THE FALL OF PRICES. By JOHN A. TODD. (Oxford University Press.) 1931. 22cm. 68p.
- PROBLEMS OF PEACE. 4th Series. (Oxford University Press.) 1930. 20cm. 224p. 8/6.

BAND INSTRUMENTS.

On disbandment of band 1/11th Sikh Regt., (K. G. O.), Nowshera, certain number of brass instruments of music for sale. Apply to Band President for full particulars. Greatly reduced prices.