

The Servant of India

EDITOR : P. KODANDA RAO.

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

VOL. XV, No. 19. }

POONA—THURSDAY, MAY 12, 1932.

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

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK. — — —	149
ARTICLES —	
Imperial Preference. — — —	151
Federal Finance.	158
REVIEWS :—	
War and Peace. By Prof. R. Sadasiva Ayyar. ...	154
Christian Education. By S. P. Andrews Dube. ...	155
SHORT NOTICES.	156
BOOK RECEIVED.	156

Topics of the Week.

Cabinet's Policy.

THE London correspondent of the *Leader* in his dispatch of the 15th April gives the following reassuring news about the Cabinet's intentions in regard to the measures to be adopted to break the present political deadlock in this country :—I have the very best reason to know that in the highest political circles in this country the most anxious and continuous thought is being given to the question of how to emerge from the present impasse and secure such a restoration of confidence between the two countries as will give a reasonable prospect of rapid constitutional progress. I believe that in that section of the Cabinet that is most influential in Indian matters there is no desire to delay Indian political advance by one day beyond what is necessary for completing the picture of reforms, and its elaboration in the framework of a Parliamentary Bill."

Cry a Halt.

WE are happy that the venerable veteran of the Congress, Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, has been released. He is essentially a man of peace and no role fits him so well as that of a messenger of peace. We would appeal to him, as the one person outside the jail who commands the greatest respect and authority in Congress circles, to persuade Congressmen to cry a halt to their aggressive campaign of civil disobedience. Even ardent Congressmen must have realised by now the futility of their present activities, which at best can only cause local irritation and occasional embarrassment to Government but which cannot subjugate them, much less win them over to the cause of the Congress. As long as the Government are able to collect enough revenue and command the loyal co-operation of their employees, they will not be in a hurry to capitulate to an open challenge. And Congressmen must have realised that in both these respects Government are not faced with any serious embarrassment. Hateful as is the *lathi-raj* of the present Government, it is being financed by

Indian revenues and executed by Indian hands with a zeal worthy of a better cause. The only consequence of the present activities of the Congress is to give an excuse for prolonging the repressive policy, prolong the reign of lawlessness, and postpone the prospects of reconciliation. We hope Congressmen will realise the utter futility of their campaign of pin-pricks, and abandon it, and thereby facilitate the task of peace-making.

Non-Violence and Repression.

MUCH of what the *Indian Social Reformer* says in reply to our comments on the subject is irrelevant and only serves to cloud the issue. But apparently it does maintain that a movement which does not seek to effect its purpose by the use of physical force can claim on that ground alone and irrespective of the attendant circumstances to be allowed to go on without let or hindrance from any quarter. If it is so, would the *Reformer* argue that the authorities at Nasik can in no circumstances issue any restrictive orders or take any preventive action against those satyagrahis whose avowed object is to assert without resort to violence the right of the depressed classes of enter temples, no matter what the reactions of this satyagraha may be? We have never seen our contemporary protesting against the repressive measures taken against these satyagrahis on this wide ground as it protests against the repressive measures taken against the Congress satyagrahis. What can be the reason for it?

Interim Reforms.

MR. HORACE G. ALEXANDER, whose friendliness and solicitude for India's welfare are beyond doubt, desires in a letter to the *Manchester Guardian* that, as proof of British good faith, some reforms which are immediately practicable should be at once introduced, and in that connection, suggests that the Indian personnel in the Cabinet of the Viceroy should be enlarged, that the votable items in the central budget should be increased and that law and order in the provinces should be transferred to responsible Indian ministers. Well-intentioned as are these suggestions, we fear they will fail to produce the results which he wishes. They will only drive suspicion deeper that larger reforms were being thereby put off. The best proof of goodwill and good faith that the British Cabinet can give is to expedite, as Sir C. P. Ramaswamy Ayyar and Mr. M. R. Jayakar have asked in their interview from Simla, the communal award and re-assemble the third session of the R. T. C. as soon as possible. Britain's goodwill and good faith will be tested by nothing so much as the quality of the communal award: whether it is calculated to foster a common nationality in India and weld the heterogeneous communities in India into a political nation or to keep India divided into hostile camps.

The Irish Oath.

THE Irish Free State Parliament has passed by a large majority President De Valera's bill for the abolition of the oath. The controversy between Ireland and England is both political and legal. Mr. De Valera rests his case primarily on political considerations. According to him, and mainly at his instance, the people of the Free State consider the oath of allegiance to the British King as humiliating to them, as perpetuating their subjection to England, as the cause of division among them, and as an imposition on their unwilling selves by threat of war and coercion. The people of the Free State have now declared that the oath should go, and that is conclusive. As against this view might be urged that Mr. De Valera has no majority of his own party in the Parliament, that it is his alliance with the Irish Labour Party, with far different programmes than his, that has put him in power, and that, therefore, it is inaccurate to claim that the majority of the people of the Irish Free State insisted on the elimination of the oath. The oath of allegiance is not a mark of subservience to England: Canada and Australia, equally jealous of their self-respects have never taken that view.

From the legal point of view, Mr. De Valera urged that the oath was not mentioned in the Anglo-Irish Treaty, it was inserted in the Irish Constitution by the Irish Constituent Assembly, and its retention or elimination was, therefore, a domestic concern of the Irish Free State, and that, as a Dominion and under powers expressly acknowledged by England in the Statute of Westminster, she was entitled to amend her constitution, and that he did not contemplate a revision of the Irish Treaty to which alone England was a party. For the other side, it was argued that the oath was an integral part of the Irish Treaty inasmuch as Sec. 2 of the Irish Constitution expressly gave legal authority to the Irish Treaty. It says:

The said constitution shall be construed with reference to the Articles of Agreement for a Treaty between Great Britain and Ireland set forth in the second Schedule hereto annexed, (hereinafter referred to as "the Scheduled Treaty") which are hereby given the force of law, and if any provision of the said constitution or of any amendment thereof or of any law made thereunder is in any respect repugnant to any of the provisions of the Scheduled Treaty, it shall, to the extent only of such repugnancy, be absolutely void and inoperative.

The Irish Treaty is therefore an integral part of the Irish Constitution. And Clause 2 of the Treaty runs:—

Subject to the provision hereinafter set out, the position of the Irish Free State in relation to the Imperial Parliament and Government and otherwise shall be that of the Dominion of Canada, and the law, practice and constitutional usage governing the relationship of the Crown or the representative of the Crown and of the Imperial Parliament to the Dominion of Canada shall govern their relationship to the Irish Free State.

And according to the law, usage and conventions of Canada, the oath is an integral part of the constitution, and as such is mandatory on members of the Irish Free State Parliament. It is incorrect to contend, as Mr. De Valera contends, that in eliminating the oath, he was merely amending the Irish Constitution and not trenching on the Anglo-Irish Treaty, and that it was therefore, no concern of Great Britain.

Even if it were merely the amendment of the Irish Constitution, there are strict limitations imposed on the Irish Parliament's power of amendment. Art. 50 of the Constitution permits amendments only "within the terms of the Scheduled Treaty."

Whatever be the legal merits of the controversy, Mr. De Valera has taken the plunge, though he has a long way yet to go before he attains his ambition. The Senate must approve of his bill, which must then be submitted to a referendum under Art. 50 of the Constitution. Even if it jumps these hurdles, it remains to be seen if the judicial courts will sustain the amendment as legal. The question may not come up directly before the courts but a tax-payer refusing to pay taxes levied by an "illegal" Parliament may compel the courts to pronounce on the validity of the De Valera amendment. England can wait and see.

* * *

Ireland and the Philippines.

THE *New Republic* received in mail week takes rather a gloomy view of the prospects of Philippine Independence. Notwithstanding that the Hare Bill, which provided for it at the end of eight years, secured a majority of 306 to 47 in the House of Representatives, there are many lions still in the path of that Bill. The chief opponent of the Bill was Secretary Stimson, who was formerly the Governor General of the Philippines. His objections sound very familiar to us in India: the Philippines developed and thrived under American leadership and guidance and they prospered because of the American market being free to them. Their independence would reduce the moral prestige of the United States in the Pacific; it would destroy the political equilibrium in the Pacific, which is very unstable at the present moment, thanks to the Chino-Japanese-Russian tension. Similar objections of incompetency as well as other have in the past been urged to justify the denial of home rule to Ireland. It is therefore, gratifying to come upon the following tribute to the achievements of the Irish Free State by the *Statist* of London:—

As far as the Irish Free State was concerned, we saw her develop in a few years from a subject nation to one helping to direct the destinies of the world through her seat upon the Council of the League. We saw the growth of new industries and sources of income within her territory, and even the casual visitor could not fail to be impressed, after a few years' absence, with a marked improvement in the general wellbeing. While the rest of the world was groaning under the burden of unemployment and economic depression, Irish Free State, until recently appear to have maintained some semblance of prosperity in a world where the word has long since been forgotten.

May it not be the same with the Philippines and with India?

* * *

The Jute Crisis in Bengal.

IT is time the Government of Bengal took a hand in resolving the jute crisis in Bengal. Jute is as important an industry in Calcutta as cotton is in Bombay; it affects the province of Bengal even more vitally than cotton does the province of Bombay. The trade boom of a decade ago brought into existence a number of new jute mills and the total production is more than the normal demand. The recent economic depression has considerably reduced the demand for jute manufactures; and stocks have increased enormously. Prices have fallen very low as a result. The only method of saving the industry from collapse was to restrict production by limiting the hours of work, and sealing up some looms. This could be achieved only by joint action. Most of the jute mills have joined together into an organisation, but some have stayed out. The latter decline to be bound by the voluntary restrictions recommended by the Jute Mills Association. They plead, not without justification, that they are the newer and weaker firms, without the reserves which the Association-

mills have accumulated, and that, therefore, they cannot afford to work short time or seal up some of their looms. The Association-mills admit the difficulties of the non-Association mills and offered some facilities. But the latter mills went on bargaining for more concessions and more, with the result that no agreement was possible. The non-Association mills are Indian firms. It has been suggested in certain quarters that racialism has tainted the controversy which is highly deplorable. The Bengal Government will be well-advised to appoint an expert committee to go into the whole question before taking any precipitate action, which might result in fanning the flame of racialism.

Child Marriages.

It is welcome news that the veteran publicist of Bangalore, Sir K. P. Puttanna Chetty, has sponsored a bill to be introduced in the Mysore Legislative Council to restrain child marriages in the Mysore State. Travancore has gone one ahead, and her legislative council has actually passed by 33 to 6 votes a bill to the same effect. While we congratulate these two premier States in South India on the progress made, it passes our understanding why even in matters of social legislation, Indian States lag behind British India. Surely, in such cases it cannot be pleaded that the foreign bureaucratic paramount power was in the way!

One of the opponets of the measure in the Travancore Council was reported to have remarked, with unconscious humour, that Travancoreans would migrate to British India to celebrate child marriages. Is the Sarda Act such a dead letter in British India that Travancoreans bent on child marriages could seek refuge there? The Madras Government had better sit up and take notice.

It is gratifying to note that the Women's Indian Association, Madras, has resolved to take active steps to bring to book violators of the Sarda Act, and has undertaken to advance a loan of Rs. 100 to any social worker or association for deposit in court when reporting violations of the Act.

Christian Untouchables!

It appears that the Christian Untouchables—mark the paradox!—of Trichinopoly held a meeting recently to consider their grievances against their priests. They decided to stop contributing for the support of the priests, and fixed Re. 1 as the

priest's fee for solemnising marriages, and resolved to go without his assistance if it could not be had for that sum! It is a remarkable performance for the Untouchables and a credit to their Christian enlightenment. The spirit of their resolutions may well be followed by the so-called higher classes, who as a rule, are as priest-ridden and as improvident in their social expenditure as these humbler folk. Their action must bring joy to the heart of Sir M. Visveswarayya, who tried to persuade the citizens of Mysore State to impose limitations on such expenditure. Whether the Christian Untouchables of Trichinopoly will be able to stick to their resolutions is more than we can say. Their anti-priest attitude will bring joy to a rationalist, like Dr. R. P. Paranjpye, though his joy will be somewhat diluted by the fact that the priest is still in the picture, though under reduced circumstances.

The Power of the Vote.

MR. K. G. SIVASWAMI, of the Servants of India Society, who has for some years been devoting his services to promoting panchayats under the Madras Panchayat Act in the Trichinopoly and Coimbatore Districts, was recently responsible for bringing into existence a new organisation in Trichinopoly consisting of social workers in the rural areas of the district. The object of the new organisation is to coordinate the work of the social workers and to prepare surveys of the needs of the rural population, like water supply, communications and education, and to press them on the notice of the Government and local bodies and to secure for the helpless rural population the full benefit of the services maintained for them by the Government and the local boards, which are now more or less monopolised by the more vocal and more alert section. While, on the one hand, these social workers have been and will continue to use their good offices and superior opportunities to intercede with the authorities on behalf of the villagers, they propose, on the other hand, that the villagers themselves should be taught to stand on their own legs, realise their newly-acquired power as voters, claim their adequate share of the beneficent services provided by public authorities and for that purpose, use their voting power judiciously and effectively to return to local bodies candidates who pledge themselves to pay due attention to their wants. It is very welcome move; and the experiment will be watched with considerable interest.

IMPERIAL PREFERENCE.

THERE is much in the circumstances prevailing in India today which render any proposal for Imperial Preference absolutely unacceptable to the great bulk of Indian public opinion. As long ago as 1922 The Indian Fiscal Commission expressed themselves impressed by "the almost complete unanimity with which Indian witnesses opposed the principle of Imperial Preference." Events since, and in particular, the temper prevailing today, have certainly not improved the prospects for Imperial Preference; its very mention provokes an immediate and indignant repudiation. This attitude is not without cause and justification. The way the Government of India have acted with reference to India's participation in the Ottawa Conference was susceptible of great improvement. They might have consulted the central legislature with regard to the policy

to be pursued at Ottawa and the personnel of the Indian Delegation; they might have included some expert non-official Indians among the Advisors to the Delegation. The present political tension between the Government and the people is not exactly propitious for an unbiassed examination of the implications of the Ottawa Conference, nor calculated to put India in a frame of mind proud and solicitous of Empire solidarity and prosperity.

Nevertheless, it is well that efforts should be made to set aside for the moment the distempers of the day and give adequate and unbiassed consideration to the problem of Imperial Preference. The reasoned objections to the policy are political and economic. But there can be no doubt that the political overshadows the economic. The Fiscal Commission recorded that "the main cause however of the

general hostility displayed by Indian witnesses to the idea of Imperial Preference is, we think, political." The Dissenting Minute confirms this view of the Majority Report. It says, "It will be obvious that Indian sentiment is practically unanimous against Imperial Preference in view of India's present political status in the Empire." The same reason is now reiterated by the Bombay Indian Merchants' Chamber and the Indian Chamber of Commerce, Calcutta and echoed by other similar and allied Indian organisations. Thus the Calcutta Chamber says: "But the most important consideration is that India is not free, that is, does not enjoy Dominion Status in the Empire."

It does not follow from this however that Indian sentiment was or is opposed to Imperial Preference as such. The Dissenting Minute, not to speak of the Majority Report of the Fiscal Commission, said: "We are in favour of the principle of Imperial Preference on the distinct condition that India should in this matter be put on the same footing of freedom as is enjoyed by the Self-Governing Dominions." The Minute went further and agreed to the immediate application of the principle even under the existing constitution, provided the decision was left to the free vote of the elected non-official members of the central legislature. It recorded that Lala Harikishen Lal, the prominent industrialist of the Punjab, was in favour of the policy. As recently as last week, Sir Phiroze Sethna, the eminent businessman of Bombay and sometime President of the Liberal Federation, in an interview published in the *Free Press Journal*, stated that: "I personally hold that whenever India gets equality of status with the other Dominions she will not hesitate to plump for Imperial Preference." It is common knowledge that during his tour in Lancashire, Mahatma Gandhi himself offered Imperial Preference. It is evident, therefore, that Indian political sentiment, apart from economic considerations, is not opposed to Imperial Preference on principle; rather, is favourable to it. Only, India should have the power and the status to offer it freely; the offer should follow the attainment of Dominion Status by India.

Now it may be considered whether the process may not well be reversed, whether it would not be to the advantage of India to offer Imperial Preference here and now, before the attainment of Dominion Status, and whether such an offer will not, by itself, greatly facilitate such attainment. Be it noted that Imperial Preference involves some sacrifice on the part of India in favour of the other Dominions, but primarily, England. It is true that Empire sentiment, if ever it was strong in India, is now at a terrible discount, and cannot be invoked to sustain a plea for Imperial Preference. But prudence and enlightened self-interest may recommend such a course. For some time past, for reasons which are easily understood and partly sympathised with, India, to the extent to which the Indian National Congress could influence her, has embarked on a policy of boycott of British goods. Whatever be its effectiveness, a persistence in the advocacy of such a policy is not calculated

to sweeten the temper of the British towards India's claim for Dominion Status. It requires no Solomon to tell the British that if the present boycott temper continues—the Mahatma was unrelenting in his desire to exclude foreign cloth, including British,—the grant of Dominion Status would only result in placing in the hands of India of power to manipulate tariffs and to take such other legislative and administrative action, which will be far more effective in bringing about the boycott of British goods than any amount of voluntary action on the part of private individuals. It may be urged that boycott was adopted solely for the purpose of putting pressure on England, and that the moment Dominion Status is attained, it will automatically be lifted. This prospect does not seem to have inspired confidence in British industry and commerce, for we do not recall any instance of Lancashire or any other British industry connected with India having, as a result of the present boycott and the prospect of its withdrawal, attempted to persuade the British Government to expedite the grant of *Swaraj* to India. Boycott will only cause suspicion, antagonism and resentment in Britain and alienate British sympathy for Indian *Swaraj*, rather than win it. If India, on the attainment of *Swaraj*, is willing to discard boycott, and not only admit British imports but is further prepared to inflict sacrifices on herself in order to assist England by the offer of Imperial Preference, will it not be more prudent and more advantageous if India abandoned at once the policy of boycott and offered Imperial Preference? It would go a long way to create mutual goodwill and confidence, and an atmosphere in England propitious to the early grant of *Swaraj* to India. If England is assured here and now that the new powers that India seeks will not be used to hurt England in a revengeful spirit, that India prefers Cosgrave to De Valera, she will be less reluctant to part with power than now. After all, there is no getting away from the fact that India will sooner attain *Swaraj* with the goodwill of Britain than against her opposition.

It is not suggested that India should offer Britain preference unlimited in extent or duration. Such agreements should be for a definite period, at the end of which the situation should be reviewed, and the agreements terminated or renewed with suitable modifications. Nor can the preference be unconditional. Indian industry must be fully and securely protected; that is the first charge on India. It is only as between England and foreign countries that preference can be given to England. It is for industrial experts to suggest on what items and categories, if any, preference can be given, and its measure and duration. The important thing for the moment is to make a gesture of goodwill towards England, a pledge that the *Swaraj* that India seeks will be used for the good of India and not for the injury of England, and that to the extent that economic considerations permit, England shall have prior claims on the indulgence of India.

FEDERAL FINANCE.

THE Report of the Federal Finance Committee is on the whole disappointing and, in some respects, even objectionable. It is supposed to deal with federal finance; it actually confines itself mostly to British Indian finance, Central and Provincial. An adequate treatment of federal finance must await the publication of the report of the Davidson Committee. It would have been far better if the Percy Committee had waited till the Davidson Report was in their hands before making their recommendations. Failing that, the Percy Committee might have paid some attention to the Nind Committee Report on the financial relations between British India and the Indian States. The forecast of the federal budget that the Percy Committee has made is an inadequate basis for discussion.

The personnel of the Committee included representatives of the States in the persons of Sir Akbar Hyderi and Col. Haksar, but did not include a single British Indian non-official representative. The Report would not have been different if it had emanated solely from these two representatives of the States. It very nearly proposes that British India should pay the piper while the States shall call the tune!

It was very unfortunate that the Committee did not invite non-official evidence, but contented themselves with official evidence in secret and private conversations with non-officials. It was inevitable that the Committee should have had to make a large number of assumptions of doubtful certainty in trying to forecast a federal budget, since the necessary data were unavailable. But it is open to grave doubt if they were wise in taking the taxation imposed by the First Finance Act of 1931 as typical of normal conditions, which they wished to adopt for the basis. The Committee were again very unwise in assuming that excise revenue in the Provinces would increase instead of decreasing. In passing, we may add that the Committee might well have spared their *obiter dicta* on the excise policies of the Provinces.

The federal forecast prepared by the Committee budgets for a revenue of Rs. 84,60 lakhs, inclusive of income-tax receipts amounting to Rs. 17,20 lakhs, and an expenditure of Rs. 80,10 lakhs, and a surplus, of Rs. 4,50 lakhs. No justification has been offered why income-tax revenue, contributed by British India alone and not by the States, should be included in the federal budget. The Committee state that the principle of equalising burdens as between all Units of the federation is accepted by all section of opinion, but refuse to interpret it. The Peel Committee recommended that income-tax should be made over to the Provinces and should be excluded from the federal budget. That would lead to a considerable deficit in the federal budget. In the Percy forecast the deficit would amount to Rs. 12,70 lakhs. Instead of laying both the States and the Provinces under contribution for the purpose, the Peel Committee recommended that the federal deficit should be made

good in the first days of the federation by contributions from the British Indian Provinces alone. These contributions were, however, to be extinguished in the course of a definite period of time. That would compel the federal government to raise more federal revenue from States and Provinces alike and ultimately balance its budget without provincial contributions. Unjust as was the Peel proposal to British India, The Percy Committee abandon it in favour of another which is even more unjust. They find that, if the system of provincial contributions was adopted, it will be impracticable to lay down a time table for its elimination and recommend that the federal government should retain income-tax from British India as a permanent source of federal revenue. That would leave the provinces in a bad plight with heavy deficits. To meet this distressing contingency, the Percy Committee propose that the federal government should distribute its surpluses among the provinces. The committee looked for other sources of federal revenue and found that only an excise on matches was practicable and that it could bring in an appreciable revenue of Rs. 3 crores for all-India and Rs. 2-50 for British India alone. They accordingly recommend the levy of this tax, but take into account only the proceeds from British India and not the States. While expressing the hope that the States would be persuaded even before federation materialises to go in for a similar levy in their jurisdictions, the Committee leave the question open whether the proceeds of the levy in the States shall accrue to the federal government or be retained by the States themselves.

The Peel Committee was optimistic enough to believe that the Princes would agree to the federation levying the corporation tax for federal purposes; the Percy Committee have dissolved the illusion. The Princes might agree to the federal Government imposing the tax, but would be reluctant to pass on the proceeds of the tax from the States to the federal exchequer.

The net result of all this is that, on the basis of the abnormally high taxation levied by the first Indian Finance Act of 1931, the forecast of the strictly federal budget discloses a deficit of Rs. 12,70 lakhs. To make good this deficit no fresh federal taxation is to be levied which will bear equally on both British India and the States. Instead, the income-tax revenue, amounting to Rs. 17,20 lakhs, contributed solely by British India, should be permanently retained by the federal Government. As this leaves some provinces with deficits and all with a legitimate grievance, it is proposed that the federal surplus should be doled out to them; and if the provinces will want more money the federal government will tax them and distribute the proceeds among them. If certain provinces are unduly hard hit, the other provinces, like good members of a federation, should share the burden. But under no circumstances should the States be asked to pay a penny of additional taxation.

This is evidently a foretaste of the federal government to be. British India will find most of the

money necessary for federal puposes and Their Highnesses will take a share, not an inconsiderable share, in its disposal! There is some grim irony in Col. Haksar and Sir Akbar Hyderi preaching to British India that :—

"It is doubtful whether a jealous comparison of relative burdens offers a sound basis for successful partnership. Each partner in a new enterprise must bring something substantial unto the common pool and may expect to derive solid advantages from the partnership commensurate with his contribution: but if these conditions are fulfilled, the partners will be unwise to insist on a meticulous equality. They will probably find it best to take their associates as they are. Similarly a new federation may find, at the commencement of its existence, that the conception of maintaining the *status quo* in non-essentials is a better guide to policy than any ambitious ideals of equality or uniformity."

Federal finance is a non-essential, indeed!

But this is not the worst feature of the Report. Discussing the desirability of vesting in the federal government new sources taxation for normal, as distinct from emergency, purposes, the Committee envisage a federal constitution with "strict limitation of federal functions" and in the case of emergencies, dependent on doles from the Units. That will be a disastrous policy. The Federal Government will be weak and inefficient. Evidently, the recent happenings in Australia have been wholly lost of the Committee.

All that can be said in extenuation of the Peel and to a lesser extent, of the Percy proposals (provided the excise on matches is not levied) is that the federation does not impose any fresh burdens on British India. Justly and unjustly, British India has all these years been shouldering more than its proportionate share of federal taxation, and will continue to do so even if federation were dropped. On the other hand, it will rightly be contented on behalf, of the States that if British India has suffered an injustice in the past, they too have suffered an injustice, though of a different kind. They have been contributing to the federal resources without having a voice in the raising or the spending thereof, if only to the extent that is permitted, under the present constitution, to British Indian tax-payers. British Indians will not object to the redress of this grievance, provided that it is commensurate with the obligations undertaken. According to the Nind Committee, the federal obligations of the present Government of India amounted to over Rs. 65 crores, while the contribution from the States amounted to under Rs. 11 crores at best. The States, rather the taxpayers in the States, have a claim, therefore, for a sixth of the representation in the federal legislature. But under the Sankey scheme, the Princes, not the tax-payers in the States, are to get representation of 40 per cent in the Upper and 33½ in the Lower Chamber. This amounts to giving the Princes the lion's share in the government of the federation while British India will foot the lion's share of the bill.

Reviews.

WAR AND PEACE.

PROBLEMS OF PEACE. Fourth and Fifth Series. (Oxford University Press.) 1930, 1931. 20cm. 224, 324p. 8/- each.

SOCIETY AT WAR, 1914-1916. By CAROLINE E. PLAYNE. (Allen Unwin.) 1931. 22 cm. 380 p. 12/6.

THE colour kudos of war fascinate the imagination of men more than does the wan virginity of Peace. Mankind, like the dazed Paris of the Greek myth, would any day award the apple to the Aphrodite of War rather than to the Athene of Peace—to the one who destroys by wooing the *heart* rather than to one who saves by winning the *mind*. World opinion is an emotional attitude rather than a judicial outlook: and if only this attitude could be captured more than half the problems of peace would be solved. 'Public opinion' is a tangle of vested interests, a medley of voices, and yet it could be invoked by a whisper of chauvinism though it may remain dead and unresponsive to all the furious conjurings of Murrays and Madariagas. To many an intelligent man, the fundamental issues of banking policy, commerce, transport, public health and rival armaments, are surrounded by a mystery, like that of a North-American Indian's powwow that serves to keep him away from them. In India, this ignorance is more broad-based and seeks to compensate itself by a cynical suspicion of the League of Nations and a contemptuous sneer of pacts and conferences. Nor are the nations who assemble in the one and enter into the other such "honest injuns" as to make cynicism look small. Talking with the tongue in one's cheek or through the hat is as common in the League as turning one's coat is in politics, but that excuses neither the pervading indifference to, nor the bumptious ignorance of, the efforts that are being made to-day to render the world safe for humanity and civilization. To such efforts, the lectures delivered annually at the Geneva Institute of International Relations for the last five years by eminent authorities on their respective subjects, are no mean contribution. The Fourth and Fifth Series of these Lectures continue the tradition of the first three in respect of weighty matter and delightful presentation—the style and thought bespeaking vivid personalities and opulent minds acting and acted on by an alert audience not the stodgy dissertations of a Bodleian. Where Professors Delisle Burns, Gilbert Murray, A. E. Zimmern, Madariaga, Rappard, Sir Andrew MacFadyean, Mr. J. L. Garvin and other old stagers are the performers, the result would certainly not be a Jazz-band but an orchestra. They have rendered these two volumes as valuable as any two of treble the size could be on international affairs.

The problems in their outline are not new even to the uninitiated. They teem in all the paradoxes of human nature. We have Disarmament Conferences conducted, like the London Conference of 1930, on the certain assumption, by parties, of imminent war. All know this, but not all have grasped with the clearness of Professor Madariaga how "every nation is now flirting with the neighbour but one" (—to wit, France with Poland, Germany with Russia and Spain, Italy with Hungary, Jugo-Slavia with France, England with Italy). We have heard of the astronomical figures spent in armaments,—4,400 million dollars by the United States. But the

figures become luminous with a new significance when we learn that if the nations of the world would contribute but for one year a just 5 per cent. of their armament budgets, the interest on the money would run the League, without any further contribution from any nation, for the rest of history—for 5 per cent interest on it yields 6 million dollars a year, which is rather more than the League's annual expenditure at present. We have heard, too, something of the problem that complicates the Freedom of the Seas, how *Land States*, ever on the watch to clip the claws of a Sea Power, to cut down the over-balance of advantage held by it, are always blatant champions of that Freedom; and, again, how neutrals only desire the elementary right of trading with both belligerents, unattacked by either. But we never probed the problem to the quick, as Mr. Alec Wilson enables us to do, when he says how it has so stubbornly resisted solution because "both Land States and Neutrals are inviting a Sea Power to give away the principal means whereby its power is exercised." By depriving it of the power of cutting off the enemy's food-supplies, you are depriving it of the only means of defeating him in modern warfare. Mr. Wilson follows it up with the very crux of the problem: How can a member of the League, who is a Sea Power, with an enfeebled navy undertake the obligation imposed on all members by Article XVI of the Covenant of severing all trade or financial relations with an aggressor member? Great Britain, seeking to cut off the peace-breaker's commerce with other countries, among which is America, would either have to fight America or wreck the League. America is not a member of the League, but she is the premier signatory to the Kellogg Pact which declares unlawful the "settlement of international disputes by any but pacific means." The Pact is curiously important, for it does not arm the signatory nations with the economic sanction against the Pact-breaker. It is here that we appreciate such a flash-light observation as: "The Covenant, minus America, may have been incomplete: but the Pact, minus the Covenant, would be nearly meaningless." What world-wide pacific machinery can there be, save that of the League? The conclusion is that if America does not want to stultify the Pact, she must sooner or later become a member of the League—a conclusion driven home by more than one speaker.

Professor Delisle Burns takes us behind the scenes to a near view of the manoeuvres of nations in their grab for oil, of the wire-pullings of armament firms, of the floating of loans to promote armament industries in the lending country—the pages dealing with these forming a brilliant footnote to Major Bratt's on the same theme in *That Next War*. Professor Murray, isolating the nerve of the "minorities problem," reminds us of how the Council of the League, being a political body, studiously avoids decisions on complaints preferred to it by maltreated and oppressed minorities—the weaker the oppressed party the worse its chance with the Council. In suggesting the formation of a Permanent Minorities Commission, like the Mandates Commission, he shows the only way out of the present theatrical futility. The Council in shelving the questionnaire (of 118 questions), bearing on occurrences in A, B, and C Mandates, and addressed to it by the Mandates Commission, illustrates only Professor Murray's dictum: "Politicians and diplomats do not seek quarrels; rather they evade duties in order to avoid quarrels." From Dr. Kastl (former German member of the Mandates Commission) we learn that this Commission is not, however, all a sham. As there are two rival views about the duration of minorities, so there are two rival views about the duration of the Mandate. There is always bound to

be a hint of the hawk's view of the quarry it has secured, in a mandatory's view of the territory entrusted to it. Dr. Kastl betrays a moment of naive overconfidence when he speaks of "the systematic endeavour on the part of the British authorities to cultivate 'indirect rule' among the natives entrusted to them."

Professor Madariaga, once again, with his wonted power of touching fakes and dogmas with an Ithuriel's spear, shows up the much-invoked Monroe Doctrine for the meaningless and mischievous anachronism that it essentially is—as being responsible for loosening the bonds between the League and some of its South American members like Peru, Nicaragua and Honduras, for giving the United States an undue hold over South American States and leading her (the United States) "now and then into international action not strictly in the spirit of the Covenant." Listen again to Professor Rappard on "The Beginnings of World Government." Listen to everyone of these speakers—all speaking the golden tongue that the gospel of Peace has taught them, their brows corrugated by pondering over human affairs in the large and their eyes fixed, in grave apprehension, on the horizon hung with sombre tapestry of war-clouds. If it is the easy, lucid eloquence of well-stored minds, it is also the restrained eloquence of balanced judgments.

Society at War is another stone for the temple of peace, not for the porch but for one of the corners. One of the numerous studies of war-psychosis that have appeared in recent times, it justifies itself both by its style and by its punctilious documentation, the war-pronouncements of press and statesmen, between 1914 and 1916, in the belligerent countries, being liberally, but quite tellingly, sewn into the texture of the narrative. A book of gripping interest though not quite a revelation of war-psychology. But is there anything really new under the sun?

R. SADASIYA AIYAR.

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION IN INDIA.

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION IN INDIA. By GEORGE ANDERSON & HENRY WHITEHEAD. (Macmillan, London.) 1932. 20cm. 116p. 3/6.

OF all the comments and criticisms passed on the Lindsay report on the Christian Higher Education in India, the one by Sir George Anderson and the Rt. Rev. Bishop Whitehead contained in this small book seems to be the most clear, comprehensive and convincing. The joint authors are very well qualified for the work they have undertaken, for one is an educational expert, having held the high office of Director of Public Instruction in the Punjab for many years, and the other occupied with distinction the eminent position of being the spiritual head of Christian work in the Presidency of Madras, where the largest Christian population in the country lives and where educational activities of the church cover a wide field.

The book is divided into three parts. The first deals with the existing educational system and details the defects found in it, particular emphasis being laid on the enslavement of the tutors and pupils, duality of purpose of the missionary colleges and their lack of contact with Christian people. The second reviews the recommendations of the Lindsay Commission, the principal ones of which relate to the building up of the department of Extension and Research in the colleges, and concentration of Christian teaching efforts on a somewhat reduced scale. The third contains the views and conclusions of the joint authors themselves, and it is this section which is highly significant and it merits serious attention at the hands of Mission

Boards in England and America and their educational advisers on the spot. The distinguished authors hold the opinion that :

(1) Men's colleges have not fulfilled the purpose for which they were originally established; nor are they now in a position effectively to fulfil the purpose, namely, Christianising the lives and minds of non-Christian students ;

(2) The main purpose of the Christian colleges being the building up of the Christian Church, a truly Christian atmosphere should pervade within their precincts. This is not possible unless a very large percentage of tutors and pupils are themselves Christians. On the basis of figures quoted in the Lindsay report, the authors advocate drastic reduction of Christian colleges from 32 to 8 and tentatively suggest Calcutta, Delhi, Lahore, Rangoon, Madras, Bombay, Alwaye and Bezwada as centres for Christian colleges in India ; and

(3) The Christian Church in India being primarily a rural institution, the Home Boards should endeavour to develop Christian leadership among village folks, which aspect has so far been sadly neglected. The present much too restricted resources of Christian Missions in men and money can have no better use than in country places which offer a fair field for service.

There will be general agreement with the authors' conclusions recorded above, among the disinterested Christian thinkers in India, and it is hoped that the Church authorities, now engaged in examining the Lindsay proposals, will give to these weighty suggestions the consideration they deserve.

There is but one view of the authors with which general agreement is not possible and that is where they sound caution in handing over administrative control of mission property and funds for college work to the governing bodies to be set up in India, according to the Lindsay recommendations. On pages 70 and 87 they say that "the ultimate responsibility should be fixed on the authorities who find the money," and that "it would be unwise to transfer the valuable property and all that it means to bodies largely inexperienced in this form of management." The authors presumably know that a considerable portion of the money for constructing buildings and defraying the recurring charges of the Christian institutions is raised in India itself in the form of Government grants, fees and public donations and some of the Christian teachers are giving their services at below the market rates. An important factor which causes heart-burning to educated Indian Christians is the dismally slow pace at which the direction of affairs is being transferred to Indian hands in Christian institutions. China and Persia, among other countries, have a law which enjoins that heads of institutions must invariably be the nationals of the country. If India has no such law, reasons are obvious. The Christian Church must not necessitate people's ideas taking that turn.

To make the new regime in Christian higher education a success, the Lindsay Board of Direction should be instituted at an early date.

S. P. ANDREWS-DUBE.

SHORT NOTICES.

KRISHNAMURTI : THE MAN AND HIS MESSAGE. By LILLY HEBER. (Allen & Unwin.) 1931. 20cm. 254p. 7/6.

THIS study of Krishnamurty reveals what a great influence he wields on modern thought.

His message is that of hope and self-confidence striving to perfection in his own individual way, depending upon no one, and bound by no tradition. "Keep life within you pure, strong and vital, and every detail of it, your physical body and all your surroundings will be stamped with your beauty. Love life. Don't try to bind it or imprison it, within any definite forms, within systems of religion, dogmas, doctrines, institutions. To do so is to kill it. Truth is like a living flame".

Lilly Heber traces the life of Krishnamurty and the evolution which has led him to perfection. Of his camp fire talks at Ommen and his influence on English, French, Swedish, Norwegian thought, she gives numerous details. Even modern thought un-influenced by Krishnamurty has the same bold note of liberation. It is not on thought alone, but on art, sculpture and science that his influence has spread.

N. S. S.

THEOSOPHY. By ANNIE BESANT. (Theosophical Publishing House, Madras.) 1931. 14cm. 51p.

IN this booklet, religious, philosophical and scientific teachings, the law of action and re-action, and the ethics of theosophy are explained in brief for the lay reader.

N. S. KRISHNAMURTHY.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

PROGRESS OF COCHIN. Ed. T. K. KRISHNA MENON. (Cochin Government Press, Ernakulam) 1932. 27cm. 394p. Rs. 3.

BARODA ADMINISTRATION REPORT, 1930-31. (Official, Baroda.) 1932. 25cm. 333p. Rs. 2/6.

THE SPIRIT OF WORLD POLITICS WITH SPECIAL STUDIES OF THE NEAR EAST. By WILLIAM ERNEST HOOKING. (Macmillan, New York.) 1932. 25cm. 571p. \$5.00.

WINDS, WEATHER, AND CURRENTS ON THE COASTS OF INDIA AND THE LAWS OF STORMS. (Government of India Central Publication Branch, Calcutta.) 1931. 24cm. 51p. Rs. 2/6.

SASTRI SPEAKS.

A record of the writings and speeches of the Right Hon'ble V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, P. C., C. H., during his eighteen months' tenure of office as the first Agent of the Government of India in South Africa. A store-house of information on the position of Indians in South Africa—political, social, economic, and educational; and as such indispensable to everybody who wishes to understand the South African Indian problem.

Mr. Jan H. Hofmeyr, who contributes a foreword, describes the speeches as

"A real enrichment of our South African life."

Besides Mr. Sastri's speeches, the Cape Town Agreement, Mr. Sastri's Memorandum and evidence on Indian education in Natal and his reports for 1927 and 1928 are among the valuable documents printed as appendices which highly facilitate an understanding of the Indian position in the Union.

Over 300 pp.

Price: eight shillings net.

The Natal Press,
Pietermaritzburg, South Africa.