

The Servant of India

EDITOR : P. KODANDA RAO.

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

VOL. XVI, No. 3. }

POONA—THURSDAY, JANUARY 19, 1933.

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

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK.	25
ARTICLES :—	
Bombay Village Panchayats Bill.	27
Constitutional Reformers !	29
OUR LONDON LETTER.	30
REVIEWS:—	
Indian Income-Tax System. By P. J. Jagirdar.	31
A Frenchman on India. By G. S. K.	33
Acharya Ray's Life. By D. Seshagiri Rao.	33
Sex Education for Children. By Bhaskar D. Karve.	34
Expansion of Soviet Trade. By V. Bhuvaramurthy.	34
Definition of Sociology. By Dr. G. S. Ghurye.	35
SHORT NOTICE.	35
MISCELLANEOUS :—	
Representation of the Aboriginal and Hill Tribes—Mr. N. M. Joshi's Note.	36

Topics of the Week.

Mr. Devadhar's Appeal to the Viceroy.

THE Viceroy's decision whether to give or withhold his previous sanction to the Bill permitting to untouchables entry into Hindu temples which Dr. Subbaroyan seeks to introduce in the Madras Legislative Council is not yet known. Among the appeals addressed to him in recent days not to stand in the way of the introduction of the measure may be mentioned one by Mr. G. K. Devadhar, President, Servants of India Society, who spent nearly a month in South India in studying the Guruvayoor situation on the spot. In the course of the appeal which he telegraphed to His Excellency the Viceroy, Mr. Devadhar says: "This measure, in my opinion, is a more effective and speedier method than any contemplated enquiry by committees for gauging public opinion and meeting popular prejudice which vary in degree and detail from place to place. I feel confident that reformers like myself are keen on the removal of untouchability and its Southern Indian phase of unapproachability in some parts and will cautiously put into operation, powers and machinery embodied in the Bill coupling it with educational propaganda without offending the reasonable and genuine religious beliefs of any section, this being the ruling principle of the proposed Bill.

I trust that my life-long devotion to social uplift work of Indian masses including depressed classes, so very well-known to His Excellency during his

regime as the Governor of Bombay and Madras, will convince His Excellency that with people of my way of thinking and life-long national service, the immediate removal of untouchability is an earnest and honest humanitarian social effort, necessary to improve the general condition aiming at all-round uplift of the untouchables and is not a mere political stunt or propaganda as wrongly described in some quarters. . . .

For emancipating untouchables who are an integral part of Hindu Society and for raising their social status and economic condition, a fundamental change of psychology is necessary. Their admission into temples has special value by way of removal of the inferiority complex. . . ."

* * *

Open Letter.

WE have received many letters of angry denunciation from correspondents for giving publicity in our columns to an Open Letter by Mr. Vaze. If instead our correspondents will furnish reasoned criticisms of the views expressed in the Letter we will promise them equal publicity—within the limits of our space. In the meantime we reproduce below a paragraph from the *People of Lahore*: "Mr. S. G. Vaze's Open Letter in the *Servant of India* to the Indian Federalists, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and Mr. M. R. Jayakar, raises a very important issue and deserves the attention of all interested in the shaping of the Indian constitution. Having been requested by its author to call attention to his 'Open Letter' we very gladly reprint it elsewhere in this issue. The question raised by Mr. Vaze is whether central responsibility is or is not constitutionally possible without the Princes' consent. The question sounds rather queer, for outside India it has always been put in the form whether responsible government and federation are compatible at all—and many leading authorities would seem to hold that they are not. In India that question does not seem to bother anybody excepting Syt. C. Vijayaraghavachariar, and another issue has been raised whether the relations of the Crown and the States permit of 'central responsibility' if the States are not party to it. Sir Leslie Scott argued the negative side at the time of the Butler inquiry. His arguments were effectively met by leading Indian lawyers—notably in Sir Sivaswamy's *Constitutional Problems* and in the Nehru Report. Sir T. B. Sapru was known to be amongst the authors of that report, and Mr. Jayakar was also amongst those who accepted it. How could then they both agree to the proposition that there were constitutional difficulties in the way of central responsibility, to overcome which it was necessary to pay the Princes any price they demanded for condescending to join the proposed federation? And if they did really accept it, how can they now urge on the Secretary of State not to

defer central responsibility even if the Princes are not joining the federation? If their present demand for central responsibility (even without the federation if necessary) is constitutionally correct, surely there is no reason to offer the Princes heavy bribes for condescending to join the federation and make a mess of the entire constitution."

* * *

Bengal Hindus' After-thought.

THE recent Conference of Bengal Hindus under the presidency of Sir B. B. Ghosh is indicative of the realisation on their part of the implications of the Poona Pact. What has alarmed them is apparently the fact that the Hindus, thanks to the pact, would be reduced to the position of a small minority in the provincial legislature. They would count not more than a fifth in a house of 250, whereas under the Premier's award they would have numbered 20 more. It is obvious that in all these calculations they look upon the depressed classes as non-Hindus, which is inconsistent with the anxiety universally exhibited so far to include them in the Hindu community. Should the so-called generous treatment of the depressed classes in the Pact make the Hindus in Bengal lose their balance to the extent of regarding them as aliens? Is it right on their part to wish at this time of the day to go back upon the Pact on the alleged ground that it was arrived at behind their backs and in the absence of any representative of the Bengal Hindus? The grounds put forward by them for resiling from the Pact cannot be said to have much substance in them. In the first place, the Pact was not an arrangement secretly concocted between two or three persons who took care that the world should have no scent whatever of their doings and intentions. Secondly, if, as alleged, the case of Bengal Hindus went by default, they must thank themselves for it. They were not prevented from recording their demurrer at the proper time. The fact was that despite Mahatma Gandhi's protestations to the contrary, his threat to fast unto death did coerce people, among whom the Bengal Hindus must be included, into becoming consenting parties to a settlement thoroughly distasteful to them. People naturally took time to get out of the "stupor" occasioned by the Mahatma's threat and to realise the consequences of their actions. That seems to be the real explanation of the entire absence of any discordant note about the Pact when it came to be made. The proceedings of the Conference once again make this clear. In passing it is interesting to note that the electoral method in the Pact was characterised by one speaker at the Conference as "little better than eye wash for common electorates" and primary elections as "another name for special electorates, whatever our constitutional Pundits may say."

* * *

Bombay Non-Brahmans on R. T. C. Results.

THE non-Brahmans of Bombay Presidency who met in Conference last week-end in Poona have expressed themselves on the results of the Round Table Conference which their president characterised as "disappointing." Like all progressive sections of opinion they thoroughly dislike the idea of making federation dependent upon the entry into it of the States. They would certainly like them to come in and would even provide for it in the Reform Act; but to hang up everything till the States choose to join the federation is a course of action which does not commend itself to the non-Brahmans. They strongly object to the large special powers proposed to be reserved in the Viceroy and Governors and would explicitly limit their operation only to a break-down of the administration and the protection of

minorities. While they would have no objection to the Army being included in the list of crown subjects, its Indianisation and military education they would place in charge of a minister responsible to the Indian Legislature. The views of the Bombay non-Brahmans on the work of the R. T. C. as expressed in the resolutions passed by them run, it will be easily seen, on the lines of the position taken up by Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and Mr. Jayakar in their speeches in the Conference and in the memorandum they jointly submitted to the Secretary of State on its conclusion. They differ from the opinions expressed by the two leaders only in one respect. Whereas Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and Mr. Jayakar seem to have reconciled themselves to the representation of States' subjects in the Federal Assembly by representatives, not of the subjects' choice, but of their rulers, the non-Brahmans have not. They insist, in the first place, that in the lower chamber of the Federal Legislature at any rate the States must not be allowed seats in excess of their population and that their representatives there must in no case be the Princes' nominees but persons elected by their subjects. The resolutions passed by the Conference must be said faithfully to reflect public opinion on the work of the R. T. C. and the non-Brahmans deserve praise for their espousal of the cause of the subjects of Indian States.

* * *

Restoration of Cut or Relief to Tax-payer?

IN anticipation of a budget surplus next year the Government of India are apparently laying out plans for its disposal. The idea that is generally believed to have found most favour with them is to restore the salaries of the services to the old level by doing away with the 10 per cent. cut introduced more than a year back. From statements recently published in the Press however it would appear that their mind is not yet finally made up. They yet seem to be undecided as to whether to abolish the cut altogether or only in part. It is true that they are legally bound to restore the cut from the beginning of the new official year unless of course Parliament is induced in the meanwhile to grant a longer lease of life to the reduction in the services' salaries. But for the moment we are concerned not so much with the legal position of the cut as with the view public opinion takes of the action Government is reported to be contemplating in regard thereto. And here let us make it clear that on this point Indian opinion is in no way different from European. This will be obvious to anybody who has taken the trouble to follow the proceedings of the recent meeting of the Associated Chambers of Commerce held in Calcutta—a body which consists of European merchants. Even that body shares the Indian view that if the Government's financial position has improved, as it is reported it has done, the overburdened tax-payer has a prior claim to relief at their hands rather than the overpaid services. As one speaker at the meeting of the Associated Chambers pointed out with great truth, the improved financial position of the Government was made possible by the additional burdens placed on the tax-payer and that the services' contribution to its betterment was comparatively negligible. The Finance Member who was an eye-witness to these proceedings could of course not be expected to disclose any of his budget secrets or to commit himself one way or the other. But he cannot have failed to take note of the fact that if his choice lies between relief to the tax-payer and abolition of the cut in the services' salaries, he must unhesitatingly go in for the former, even if he wants his budget to have no more than a tolerable reception in the country.

* * *

BOMBAY VILLAGE PANCHAYATS BILL.

THE report of the Select Committee on the Bombay Village Panchayats Bill has been published.

The Bill will now be considered by the Bombay Legislative Council in its session commencing on February 6 and an examination of the measure as it has emerged from the Select Committee with a view to finding out whether the amended Bill is an advance on its original or otherwise will not be inopportune.

The Bill as framed by Government provided for the nomination only of the Inamdar, wherever he existed or his representative — a provision which met with strong public disapproval. The Select Committee, instead of removing this objectionable feature of the Bill, has flown in the face of popular opinion by proposing a wide extension of the principle. Before seeing how the provision would work in practice, let us remind ourselves of how the Decentralisation Commission, whose recommendations form the basis of this Bill, views the idea of nominating members on panchayats. Their opinion on the point is unambiguously expressed. Says the Commission:

"We are not in favour of the appointment of the members of the *panchayat* by outside nomination as proposed by some witnesses. This would defeat the object we have in view, of enlisting the interest of the villagers as a whole, while it would encourage interference by subordinate officers of Government, upon whose recommendations most of the nominations would have to be made."

Nay, more:

"Finally, it is most desirable that the work of *panchayats* should be free from interference by the lower Government subordinates. Men of this class have their own reasons for opposing any real local control."

The views of the Commission commanded greater respect even from the completely irresponsible Government of those days than its supposedly responsible successors of the present day with the result that their Panchayat Bill of 1920 contained no provision for nomination. In fact the absence of such a provision was rightly acclaimed as the principal merit of the Bill. As explained by Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola, member in charge of the Bill, in his speech moving its second reading:

"The structure of the Bill is based on this principle that the panchayats will practically be wholly elected and that there shall be no nomination whatever. I repeat that this is the only local self-government enactment which is so far brought forward before the Legislative Council which does away altogether with the principle of nomination."

Those who are at all in touch with the discussions on that Bill in the Legislative Council will remember that the proposal to make the *patel* simply an *ex-officio* member of panchayats was so abhorrent to some non-officials that they were prepared to allow one-fifth of the membership of panchayats to be left open to nomination. Their view, however, failed to commend itself to the Government as then constituted with the result that in the panchayat legislation as finally passed, nomination was conspicuous by its absence. It is, however, pertinent to note Sir Ibra-

him's remarks in combating the view referred to. He said:

"The majority of non-official members prefer not to have any nomination on these panchayats, and I cordially share their sentiments. When we are introducing a measure of this character putting these panchayats on an advanced democratic footing, the principle of nomination is out of place."

One would have expected that what was considered out of place twelve years ago would be regarded as simply unthinkable at the present day, and would be vetoed by the present more popular Government. But the expectation has been belied.

Now, what is the extent to which nomination will hold sway in panchayats, according to the proposals of the Select Committee? In this connection, it is necessary to remember that the power both of fixing the number of elected members necessary for the formation of a panchayat and of nominating members thereto is proposed to be vested in the Collector, the only limitation on his discretion being that he can nominate only so many as, with the elected members, will not number more than 15. One wonders if those who have been parties to the new arrangement have an adequate idea as to the excessive influence which the Collector will enjoy in the constitution of panchayats. As a careful study of the relevant section in the amended Bill will show, a Collector, if he is so minded, can manipulate his powers so that the elective element, which should really be in a decisive majority in the panchayat, will be converted into an insignificant minority. To illustrate our meaning, let us take the case of a panchayat in the case of which the number of elected members has been fixed by the Collector, after consultation with the district local board, at 6. There appears to be nothing in the section as at present worded which will come in the way of the Collector proceeding to make up the number 15 by nominating as many as 9 members. Apart from the fact that these 9 owing their seats directly to the Collector will be under his thumb, the *ex-officio* member and the Inamdar may also be expected to be amenable to his influence. Thus in a body of 17, as many as 11 would be people who would for all practical purposes be prepared to do the Collector's bidding. We should like to know if the popular representatives on the Select Committee really intended this when they appended their signatures to its report.

And why does this vicious principle now find a place in the Bill? The justification is said to be the need to correct inequalities in representation and to give a reasonable assurance to the minorities that their rights and interests will not be absolutely at the mercy of the majority. It is said that if this was not done by means of nomination, the minorities' demand for special protection by the reservation of seats in panchayats would have been irresistible and we are expected to be thankful that that calamity was avoided by the Committee very cleverly hitting upon the device of nomination. Those who take up this

position seem to take it for granted that while communal electorates are an evil to be shunned at all costs, nomination is not. Anyhow they look upon the latter as a lesser evil. On no other supposition is their present action defensible. If communal electorates are so abhorrent to them in the formation of such comparatively unimportant bodies as village panchayats that they would be prepared to pay any price for their elimination, it is only fair to assume that they would be far more so in relation to vastly more important bodies like Legislative Councils and the Assembly, which enjoy wider powers and have extended responsibilities. But in their case the proposal to substitute nomination for communal electorates has never been seriously made by anybody. Not only that, but there, as everyone knows, the fight is for the complete eradication of the nominated element, so as to make those bodies really popular. If the omission of nomination is necessary and desirable in the case of higher bodies, it is equally so in the case of panchayats, as their working will so vitally touch the daily life of the people within their jurisdiction. Nobody will of course be prepared to defend separate electorates as an ideal electoral arrangement; but few indeed will be found to see eye to eye with the Select Committee in thinking that they are a worse calamity than nomination. It is really a wonder to us, as it doubtless must be to many others, how with the past experience of nomination to guide them and in face of the clearly expressed warning of the Decentralisation Commission, the popular representatives on the Committee so far forgot themselves as to allow the promising future of the new bodies to be endangered by allowing an influx of nominated members into them.

If nomination as contemplated by the Select Committee is to be regarded as a safeguard for the minorities, it must be presumed that they pressed their demand between October when the Bill was introduced and the sittings of the Select Committee with unanswerable logic and irresistible force. For in opposing the Depressed Classes and Muslim demand for special protection during the first reading stage of the Bill only in October last, we find that Sir Rustom Vakil, Minister in charge of the Bill, spoke as follows:

"It is a fact, sir, which cannot be disputed that communalism is absolutely conspicuous by its absence so far as the rural areas are concerned. It is in the big cities only or principally in the big cities that it is making itself manifest in forms which are most objectionable. If the proposal of communal representation is carried in this House now or at the time of the second reading, I am afraid we shall be merely transmitting the poison to rural areas where people live in peace, harmony and happiness. This view has been corroborated by my honourable friend Sir Shah Nawaz Bhutto also and one or two other honourable members in the House." (our italics.) ●

He further emphasised this point thus:

"There is another point why the villagers themselves do not need the treatment of special representation. For many many years past there have been village panchayats—since 1920 and there are sanitary committees and sanitary boards and the Government are not in possession of any single evidence which has indicated the need on the part of the villagers for this kind of treatment".

If in October last the Bombay Government as represented by Sir Rustom Vakil was unconvinced as to the necessity of special protection for minorities in rural areas, what was it, it may be legitimately asked, that had made them change their mind in the meanwhile? What made them consent to become parties to the transmission of the communal poison to rural areas, which they were so unwilling to do only a brief couple of months ago? Moreover, are they sure that the minorities will accept nomination as a satisfactory substitute for a representative of their own choice?

Let us now turn to the other features of the Bill. If the test of the devolution of power in favour of popular representatives is applied to the amended measure, it will be found to be worse than the original Bill. Whereas in the latter the Collector was not very conspicuous, the Select Committee's scheme makes him a present of powers which should, really speaking, have been granted to district local boards. The Bill as framed by Government expected the boards to fix the number of elected members in the new bodies. This power is now taken away from them and given over to the Collector who is only required to consult the board before fixing the number. Further, it is he who is to determine how many members shall form the village bench for the exercise of judicial powers and to select, from amongst the members of the panchayat, three or five persons in case the bench is to consist of five or seven members as the case may be. The two non-members to serve on the bench as also its chairman are to be nominated by the Collector. Thus under the revised panchayat scheme the Collector will come to occupy a predominant position not only in relation to the constitution of panchayats but in that of the village benches which are to dispense justice to the villagers. How far this would promote the growth of the genuine panchayat spirit among the villagers and whether this is progress or retrogression we leave our readers to judge. Incidentally, it may be doubted how far the amendments introduced by the Select Committee by which only some members of the panchayat in association with two outsiders will be selected to exercise the judicial powers will carry out the original object of making these bodies responsible as far as possible to the people of the village concerned, ever supposing that the new arrangement does not result in friction between the parent body and the bench.

It is a matter for deep regret that the Select Committee has not seen its way to remove the sex bar to the membership of panchayats. To allow women to sit as members of the legislatures but to prevent them from serving on panchayats is a glaring inconsistency in conduct which will need a good deal of explaining. It is to be hoped this defect will be removed by the Legislative Council in due course.

Though we have so far dealt only with the more unsatisfactory features of the new scheme, we are free to admit that the original measure has also been improved in some respects by the Select Committee. The administrative powers of panchayats have been widened by e. g. allowing them to look after village forests and distribution of irrigation water, as sug

gested by public opinion. The imposition of house tax has been made discretionary instead of compulsory till now, which is generally believed to have interfered with the successful working of panchayats in the past. The provision to make the panchayats amenable to the District Judge in regard to their civil work and to the District Magistrate in regard to criminal will also be widely welcomed. The special arrangements, though only of a permissive nature, proposed for fostering the growth of panchayats on the part of district local boards and the provision enabling them to avail themselves of the services of honorary workers for the purpose are doubtless a step in the right direction.

But apart from these satisfactory points, frankly speaking, the Bill as amended by the Select Committee can hardly be looked upon as an advance on the original scheme. The proposal to invest the Collector with large powers of nomination in relation both to panchayats and to village benches augurs ill for the success of the new

village bodies. The fear is widely shared that the setting up of two bodies for the exercise of functions meant to be discharged by the panchayat as a whole would result in clash and conflict between the two and would open the door to interference by subordinate officers in the working of panchayats. For obvious reasons this would be unpropitious for the success of the new experiment. The idea to hand to the Collector powers and functions which ought really to vest in district local boards hardly accords with the spirit of the time and as such will fail to meet with public approval. It cannot be denied that the recent working of some of these boards is not as satisfactory and efficient as it might be; but there is no reason to suppose that it will continue or will be allowed to continue to be so for long. To prefer the Collector to the district local board as a supervising and controlling agency, as is proposed in the revised scheme, is to give proof of the distrust of the people's capacity to manage their own affairs. This is unsound policy and doubtful wisdom.

CONSTITUTIONAL REFORMERS!

(Contributed.)

EVEN competent critics often fail to recognise that the federation that we have set our hearts upon in India is not to be a mere replica of the federations that have gone before, but is to be of an entirely new type. In attaining our political salvation we do not want to be mere copyists, but wish to add a chapter of our own to the sum of human knowledge of constitutional law and practice. One would have thought that it was fairly well-known by now that in our future constitution there will be not only local subjects and federal subjects such as are to be found in every federation, but that there will be a third group of subjects, viz. central subjects, not known to any existing federal constitution. The federal government will deal with these subjects, but they will not be common to all the units of the federation. Our inventive genius is perhaps shown to its best advantage in making this departure for the first time from the established practice of the world. But we do not always get due credit for the display of our constitutional talent. Even such a well-informed person as Sir Robert Holland seems to be labouring under the mischievous delusion (vide "Political India" published by the Oxford University Press) that in our new polity we shall adhere strictly to the principle of uniformity in assigning powers to the federating units. He ought to have known, if anyone, that this principle simply finds no place in our constitution. We have agreed not to insist upon Indian States giving up as large a sphere of their activities to the federal government as British India will give up. For instance, civil and criminal law will be a local concern for Indian States, but a national one for British India. Orthodox constitutionalists, not daring to travel out of the rut, would have made this subject a local one for British as well as Indian India.

But we reformers do not place too high a value upon the so-called constitutional principles. We have set up a new precedent by making certain subjects federal in one part of the constitution and local in other parts. Our decision may have been due to political exigencies. No matter. It is nonetheless true that we have succeeded in exploding sky-high the old-world idea that the federal government should operate over an identical field in all the units that federate. Our central subjects are not an anomaly, but a reform of far-reaching importance. It is no small contribution to the development of political morality.

Indeed, we have carried the principle of diversity still farther and made a wider breach in the prescriptions of constitutional writers than would appear from the preceding paragraph. We have not only allowed one unit of federation to keep to itself a larger number of subjects for local management than the other, but we have also agreed to the component parts of the former unit enlarging their sphere of local administration as they please. It is not merely that the States' list of federal subjects will be smaller than British India's, but that each State will be able to cut it down further if it so chooses. This list will merely lay down a maximum beyond which no State will have a right to cede more powers to the federal government, but there will be no minimum limit below which it will not be possible for any State to go. This again is an entirely new departure. No constitution that has been framed so far has introduced such an element of flexibility in the matter of distribution of powers. It takes tremendous courage to do so, and reflects really great credit upon our constitution-builders. It is no wonder therefore that this part of their achievement should be

consistently ignored by European observers. For instance Sir Robert Holland says (*ibid.*, p. 278): "The rulers have no doubt realised that it will not be possible for each individual State to preserve discretion upon which it will enter a federation. The powers of the federal legislature and executive must be uniform throughout the federal area, and it will, therefore, be necessary for all the States which decide to adhere to the scheme to enter upon the same platform, that is to say, upon terms which will be generally identical for them all." Why MUST the powers be uniform for all units of federation? That is no doubt the prevalent idea, but we are not so hidebound as to follow it. We shall put uniformity on one side and give free scope to all the States to move up and down the line of demarcation between local and federal subjects according to their pleasure. Our constitution besides will not be marked merely by the quality of flexibility which is not to be found in other federal constitutions, but be it noted that while it will be marked by extreme flexibility in the States part of it, it will preserve orthodox rigidity in the British Indian part of it. For only the States will be at liberty to curtail the list of subjects in respect of which they will enter the federation, but British India will be under an obligation to maintain intact this list, which for it will be longer than for any State. Flexibility and rigidity at the same time! All our constitutional architects are by nature modest men; but really without being immodest, they can claim to have brought about a complete revolution in the prevailing notions on matters constitutional.

Can it not be, however, that the statement of Sir Robert Holland, quoted above, is due, not so much to ignorance of our leaders' capacity for introducing novel features in the constitution, as to the Machiavellian design of frightening away the Princes? Sir Robert perhaps banks on the Princes turning their backs on federation by telling them that there can be no discretion left to them as to the subjects on which they will federate; that if they agree to federate at all, they must federate on all subjects included in the federal list. He may or may not be a secret agent of Sir Samuel Hoare employing every means in his power to prevent formation of federation, but it is quite possible that that may be his evil intention. The practical difficulty of seeing that the representatives of a State vote only on those matters in the federal legislature which it has ceded will no doubt increase hundredfold if these matters vary from State to State. But we may be sure that our leaders who have introduced so many reforms in the established constitutional practices will be quite up to finding a way to the overcoming of this difficulty. They must have some definite plan in mind, though they have not given it yet to the world. But may I suggest one myself? Besides solving this particular technical difficulty, it will make the path of the Princes much smoother and also induce the British Government to part with even more power. My plan is very simple: it is that all the States' representatives should be allowed to vote on every subject on which British representatives can vote, irrespective of the number of subjects

which any particular State may have ceded. It may seem contrary to right doctrine to some of our purists in constitutional law that a State should be allowed a voice in determining policy in a matter in which it has no concern, but is it not our firm resolve, while working out the country's political destiny, to take no account of pure doctrinaire objections? Shall we then flinch just when we have an excellent opportunity of both smoothing out our own difficulty and persuading the British authorities to concede more power? There can be no doubt that my suggestion, if adopted, will lead to the latter result. The British Government is willing to make such a large surrender of power because they are aware that in the Princes there is a conservative element which will check the exuberance of enthusiasm on the part of British Indian hot-heads. Naturally if the conservatism of the Princes is brought to bear not only upon an exiguous list of federal subjects, but upon the whole gamut of subjects dealt with at the centre, then it is obvious that the British Government will relax the safeguards upon which it now seems to insist. And there will then be no occasion for Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and Mr. Jayakar at all to contemplate, as they are forced to do at present, of a state of things when the Princes will not form part of the constitution. With their own internal sovereignty securely guarded and with the power to vote upon matters which do not belong to them, they may be counted upon to join the federation. This is a sacrifice which is clearly demanded of our tact and statesmanship.

It is hardly necessary to add that the States (of course not British India) will have the liberty, when they have once ceded certain powers to the federal government, of withdrawing any of them at will in future. We are now agreed—at any rate the more statesmanlike among us—that the States will have the right of seceding from the federation. When this extreme form of withdrawal is permissible it follows that the withdrawal of particular subjects from the federal scope must be allowed. Things will then be in a beautiful state of flux all the time in our federation, such as has been the lot of no federation before.

Our London Letter.

(From Our Correspondent.)

(BY AIR MAIL.)

LONDON, December 30.

THE END OF THE R. T. C.

IT was in the true spirit of Christmas that the Third Indian Round Table Conference was brought to an end on Saturday morning last, the 24th instant. The text of the speeches delivered in the general discussion, opened late on Friday night by Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, at the invitation of Sir Samuel Hoare, who presided, must have reached India ere this, and the substance of them had already become known to the pressmen who had gathered by invitation to attend the final ceremony in the Robing Room of the House of Lords, with its frescoes depicting scenes of the Round Table of King Arthur. Lord

Sankey, who presided in the unavoidable absence of the Prime Minister, detained at Lonsismouth, under medical advice for reasons of health and overwork (Mr. Lloyd George's somewhat blatant attack upon Mr. MacDonald has been widely regretted and resented, for the strain under which the latter has lain for some time has been almost unendurable for any human being, whatever his resources of vitality may have been), very properly drew attention to the excellent spirit that prevailed among the delegates, within their respective groupings and relatively to each other. There is no doubt whatever that, notwithstanding the tendency at the beginning of certain prominent members to keep each other at arm's length, there had been gradually established in the Conference a mutual respect and regard for an understanding and appreciation of each other's point of view that enabled crises to be reached and partially overcome, not only without bitterness but even with an admiration for each other's tenacity and method of approach.

The greater part of the time available was occupied with a final speech by the Secretary of State for India, of which the full text must already have been telegraphed, and which was more remarkable for its conciliatory and sympathetic tone than for its substance, which was rather guarded and indefinite. Indeed, of all the personalities of this Conference, Sir Samuel Hoare has grown in stature and in the esteem of his colleagues. He has been friendly, courteous and tolerant in a high degree and he has succeeded in disarming very largely the critics who had, at earlier sessions, strongly resented the somewhat professorial manner in which he appeared to treat the British Indian members as very inexperienced and somewhat irresponsible schoolboys. It has been said that, so soon as the latter came to grips with the realities implicit in the details of constitution-making, they realised the need to "modify their transports" and came down to business. With some of them, this may have been good criticism, but certainly not of the leaders amongst them, who have throughout tersely and clearly put their points. But however true it is that the British Indian delegation was driven, by the compulsion of circumstances, to deal with realities, it is equally true of the British delegation. The British Indians, as Sir Tej Bahadur pointed out on Friday night, no longer regard Lords Peel and Winterton as exponents of "diehardism". The latter and their British colleagues, even when unable sometimes, owing to conditions beyond their control, to accept the British Indian arguments or accede to their demands in full, have not been slow to acknowledge the force of those arguments and their underlying sincerity. Probably never before has it ever been so well-understood or sympathetically treated. If for no other reason, the Conference may be treated as unexpectedly successful. There are, of course, other reasons, but these will perhaps appear more clearly when the full picture is drawn in the forthcoming White Paper, which will resume in formal language the gains and losses of the exchanges in debate, both in the Committees and the full Conference. On the whole among the more authoritative members, a feeling of cautious optimism prevails. "It might easily have been worse." "If the Conference has not succeeded better, it nevertheless has not failed." "There is still work to be done by us and further room for negotiation." "The door has certainly not been banged in our faces." "The difficulties unsolved are not of the Government's making. They have to listen to the City, which so far has not understood the bearing of political and national psychology upon financial safeguards." These and other similar observations come to my mind after talks with dele-

gates since the Conference was wound up with a challenging speech by the Lord Chancellor addressed largely to the Princes and the States, and in reinforcement of Sir Samuel Hoare's appeal to them to make up their minds soon and come into the federation graciously and effectively. Lord Sankey's message of peace and goodwill to India was little more than an echo of what the British people genuinely feel for her, and it will be a severe disappointment to many here, as well as to multitudes on your side, if Mahatma Gandhi and his fellow-political prisoners are not speedily released and an atmosphere generated favourable to the reasoned discussion of the results and the implications of this Conference.

YET ANOTHER CONFERENCE?

As both Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and Mr. Jayakar, who, on Tuesday, presented to the Secretary of State a long and reasoned memorandum of their views on the results of the Conference, have been at pains to point out in their interviews to the Press, the matter does not end at this point. There are matters upon which it now becomes vitally necessary to canvass and organise progressive Indian opinion before the Joint Select Committee stage. The difficulties here have to be realised, put into their proper perspective in relation to what has been achieved, and met with reasoned solutions. "There is still room for further negotiation." That ought to be the key-note of the events of the next few weeks. It seems inevitable, therefore, that yet a fourth Round Table Conference will have to be convened at the time that the Select Committee begins its work of discussion of the Bill to be formally introduced into Parliament before the Easter recess.

I understand that the Government propose to set up the Joint Select Committee some time in February, to begin to function by the third week of March. The reason for this expedition is to ensure against delays that might carry the Bill beyond July next. It might easily be impossible, owing to pressure of other essential legislation of a domestic character, to pass the Bill into law this year if it is carried over into the autumn, and the delay of a fortnight now might upset the entire time-table. It is expected that both the Indian and the British membership will be limited to a very small personnel. The definite decision of the Government that the Mohammedan representation in the Indian Legislature is to be confined to one-third of the British Indian quota, plus such further seats as the States may arrange for, either of their own initiative or with the friendly services of the Government, ought to terminate the period of communal tension and make it easier for the two sections of the British Indian delegation to work together more closely and harmoniously than they have hitherto been able to do. The States, too, are likely to be making up their minds on many subjects that are now the subject of acute domestic controversy, before the conclusion of the next session of the Chamber of Princes.

Reviews.

INDIAN INCOME-TAX SYSTEM.

TAXATION OF INCOME IN INDIA. By V. K. R. V. RAO. (Longmans, Bombay.) 1931. 230m. 327p. Rs. 6.

THE main portion of this book, as the author says in the introduction, is that which treats the subject analytically, to which the historical review of the tax serves as a background. A theoretical discussion preceding these historical chapters about the income-tax and its place in the tax-system would not have

been out of place. Apart from this, the book is complete in its study of the subject. The present position of the income-tax regarding the scope of the tax, exemptions, computation of income, personal allowances, rates, assessments, and collection is described in chapter III; and then a chapter or two are devoted to the study of each of these aspects.

Even a cursory glance at the taxation of income in India reveals glaring defects. Total exemption of agricultural incomes, want of differentiation between earned and unearned incomes, and the absence of personal allowances for children are such obvious drawbacks that they should have been removed by now. They only illustrate the truth in the author's remark that "throughout the whole of its long career, the Indian income-tax has never been subjected to a rigorous theoretical scrutiny." The author has honestly done this job, and has been able to bring out also the less obvious defects of the tax. For instance, he is able to show that "from the point of view of the territoriality of income, the scope of the tax is determined by the origin of the income, but so modified by the 'receivability' theory as to result in the exemption of large amounts of such income accruing abroad", an exemption which is unfair to India.

The author would have gladly advocated "the abolition of the land revenue, followed by the amalgamation of agricultural incomes into the ordinary income-tax," but refrains from doing so, because this "would entail a great reduction in revenue which the provincial governments are not ready to face." Leaving alone these unfortunate payers of land revenue who are paying more than what is warranted by their ability, he is for making the richer agriculturists pay according to their ability, i. e., at the normal rates of income-tax to which their income would be liable if their income were non-agricultural.

For the temporarily settled estates the exemption limit proposed is at Rs. 30,000, below which, the author believes, the payment of land-revenue will be made at a higher rate than that of the income-tax. Incomes above the limit should pay the difference between the income-tax and super-tax on the entire income, and the land-revenue paid by them.

The author is not precise in the use of the term "incidence" when he says, on p. 98: "It cannot be said that the incidence of even that amount of land-revenue which is actually paid falls on these (permanently settled) zemindars... The ultimate pressure of the tax undoubtedly falls, not on the landlords, but on the cultivators." Had the author meant this, he would not have proposed taxation in addition to this revenue.

The proposals regarding the taxation of income of permanently settled zemindars need to be reconsidered by the author. All such zemindars "with incomes of Rs. 2000 and above per year will be brought under the operation of the ordinary income-tax law of this country. They will be allowed, however, to deduct from their taxable income the land revenue paid by them. It will be seen that the ryotwari landholders will be better treated, because they will be allowed to deduct the amount of their land-revenue from the income-tax payable by them... This difference is made because the land-revenue paid by temporarily settled agriculturists is really in the nature of a tax" (p. 99). On p. 91 it is explained, rather too briefly, why "land revenue is essentially a tax." "In the calculation of net assets, the value of the cultivator's labour service is not necessarily included. Similarly, no mention is anywhere made of any deduction for interest on his capital. The result is that the payment made goes beyond rent, and enters into the personal subsistence and profits

of the individual." If that be the case, differential treatment should depend on two considerations, viz., (1) whether the landholder has rendered labour service and invested capital, and (2) whether land-revenue includes the cost of his service and the interest on his capital. The second of these points is of no weight, for, even if some tax on wages and interest has been included in land revenue, it will be automatically deducted from the income-tax when land-revenue is so deducted. The first consideration need not present any difficulty if differential treatment is given to 'unearned' agricultural incomes, and allowance is made for capital invested by the landholders. The difference in the treatment suggested by the author has little to do with the causes of the difference.

The general exemption limit, the author proposes, should be Rs. 2000. Due to administrative difficulties, he would confine allowances only to children below 21 attending either schools or colleges; and the allowance would be made in the form of a deduction of Rs. 250 from the assessable income for every child up to a number of six. The relief should be restricted to incomes below Rs. 10,000. This limit, however, appears to us too high.

It is proposed that unearned incomes should pay in addition to the tax ordinarily payable by them 10 per cent. more of such amount. The present system which is not sufficiently progressive and which suffers from the defect of sudden "jumps" is to be replaced by another under which (1) a fixed abatement of Rs. 2000 is to be given on all amounts irrespective of income; (2) the standard rate of income-tax is to be fixed at 2 annas in the rupee; on the first Rs. 15,000 of the individual's income, however, the tax is to be levied at half the standard rate; (3) the super-tax is to begin on incomes exceeding Rs. 30,000. The rate is to be more sharply progressive than at present. Under this scheme, when the income reaches Rs. 60,000, about 36 per cent. of it is to be taken by way of income-tax and super-tax, which need not provoke opposition, as the corresponding proportion in the United Kingdom, Canada, and South Africa is 44, 34, and 35 per cent. respectively. The author believes the proposed scheme will involve no financial loss, and that it may probably result in an appreciable increase of revenue.

The author has also dealt with the problem of taxing income from companies, partnerships, and Hindu joint families. He does well in dealing separately with two types of Hindu family, viz. (1) joint in estate as well as in living, and (2) joint in estate but not in living. He proposes that the former should continue to be treated as individuals, but that they should be allowed to deduct from their taxable incomes the necessary expenditure spent on the maintenance of coparceners; and the latter, he proposes, should be treated as registered firms, taxable at the maximum rate but with suitable provisions for refunds.

Regarding business incomes, the author pleads that losses should be allowed to be carried forward against future profits. The chapter on "Economic Condition as Reflected in Income-tax Statistics" arrives at some interesting conclusions. The author is to be congratulated on the painstaking manner in which he has collected the relevant figures, and prepared explanatory graphs. The book is carefully and methodically written, and will occupy a high place in the literature on income-taxation in India.

P. J. JAGIRDAR.

A FRENCHMAN ON INDIA.

INDIA: A FOREIGN VIEW. By ANDRÉ PHILIP.
(Sidgwick & Jackson, London.) 1932. 24cm.
260p. 10/6.

THIS is a book of Indian impressions by a Frenchman, whose views may be expected to be more or less impartial, except perhaps where the claims of Asian people clash with those of Europeans generally. A perusal of the book leaves the impression that the author has attempted to view things dispassionately and has on the whole understood the feelings and the point of view of the native Indian. The book is divided into three portions—Agricultural India, Industrial India and the Political Aspect.

Discussing the social structure, the author examines various theories about the formation of the caste system and the village communities, giving us some very interesting information including the effect of British rule on these communities. Economic statistics are examined and the author concludes that "although there is no absolute overpopulation in India, yet there is relative overpopulation; triply relative, to the present system of the distribution of wealth, to the backward condition of agricultural technique and lastly, to the retarded industrial evolution of the country." The position of the peasant and the progress of the co-operative movement have been thoroughly examined with the result that the peasants are found to be too uneducated to act for themselves and the intellectuals are entirely absorbed by national political activities. The examination of the question of agricultural productivity is rather superficial, and this is inevitable in any attempt to study India as one agricultural unit. The large irrigation works in different parts of India are noticed as being to the credit of British rule in India. We also find the usual European estimate of the Hindu religion and its comparison with Christianity with the usual lack of perception and appreciation of Hindu ideals.

Examining the poverty of India, the author gives a graphic account of the results of British policy which resulted in the ruin of the artisan class and its reversion to agriculture, the gradual diminution of the area owned and cultivated by each family, and the creation of a rural proletariat. Modern industry in India is shown to be largely in the hands of foreigners. A very interesting analysis has been made of the wages earned by workers and the dividends paid out to the shareholders of such concerns. The picture drawn of the conditions of the workers, their standard of living and the result of these conditions is really moving. From this we are led on to a discussion of Mahatma Gandhi's position with regard to Swadeshi and cottage industries. The movement initiated by Gandhi, the author considers as being a merely futile and disappointing struggle against the progress of industrialisation and considers the Trade Union movement as being far more effective.

The political aspect has been discussed in a very informative way, and the growth of national consciousness is clearly shown. The policy of the East India Company and Macaulay's educational policy, are shown to have given rise to a sense of the economic unity of the Indian continent and to a demand for political and social reforms. The growth of national feeling, the Montagu report, martial law in Punjab, the non-co-operation movement, the civil disobedience movement, the Amritsar massacre, the Simon Commission, Lajpatrai's death, the Nehru report, have all been examined thoroughly. The author's fears of clumsy methods of repression, and

the recrudescence of the civil disobedience movement have proved correct.

The most interesting portion of the book is the introduction by Lord Burnham, whose views are those of a typical diehard Conservative. The major part of it deals with the benefits conferred on India by "British irrigation", and one gets the impression that the whole thing is in the nature of a New Year gift on the part of the British to India and not done at the expense, to India, of a good deal of money, a goodly portion of which has reached English shores by different ways. Without belittling the value of the irrigation projects, one cannot help feeling that his Lordship has hit the nail on the head when he assumes that the author is not inclined to give Great Britain credit for much more than a shrewd sense of self-interest in her Indian policy. The latest discussions on Financial and Defence safeguards tell their own story. Everything that is unfavourable to Britain is flatly denied and the hackneyed arguments about India having a number of languages and of its never being a nation, are dished up with great relish. Those who have taken pains to ascertain historical facts will know how matters actually stand. On the whole the book is an excellent antidote to the stuff that is served up in the English press, and deserves a wide circulation.

G. S. K.

ACHARYA RAY'S LIFE.

LIFE AND EXPERIENCES OF A BENGALI CHEMIST. By PRAFULLA CHANDRA RAY.
(Chuckervertty Chatterjee, Calcutta.) 1932. 24cm.
557p. Rs. 5.

THE life-story of Dr. Ray is a chapter taken from contemporary history. It is a study in mental evolution, and an example of what faith and perseverance can do in a good cause. But the story has suffered in the telling; it is buried in a mass of discussions on diverse topics—scientific, political, social—from which the reader has to extricate incidents of the author's life and details of his career and piece them together. The picture thus recovered is somewhat disappointing; it is seen in mere outline. The reader loves to peep into the intimate personal life of a personality, whose character and work he has learnt to respect and admire. He delights in being able to trace the growth of the great mind—from boyish pranks and escapades through youthful dreams and adventures to the wisdom and experience of maturer years—and to realise, with relief, the warm throbbing human heart behind this mental evolution. Dr. Ray has supplied the facts of his life, but has not infused into them the spirit of the living breathing human personality that we know to be his.

It is, on the whole, a bleak and brief record of an eventful and epoch-making life by one who is impatient of the trivialities of life and is hurrying through to set down the serious thoughts that crowd the mind. With so much to impart, there is an obvious inability to hold back what is uppermost in his mind. The result is a string of incidents interspersed with frequent digressions and occasional moralisations, put down as they occurred.

But the story, though meagre and colourless, has been simply and delightfully told. We are introduced to the author's father who had a secret weakness for chicken curry and was a warm advocate of widow marriage; to the student in London whose suit of chaga and chapkan by a London tailor would not fit because he was so "lean and lank." These and other incidents have been told with a frank directness and happy unsophistication. There is a certain disregard for sequence that is a little disconcerting

The author frequently strays away from his theme; it may be to initiate a discussion, to enter a protest or to state a reminiscence. Quotations from books and extracts from speeches have been freely intercalated. These disturb the even flow of the narrative and are at times tiresome reading. Almost every page bristles with foot-notes—needles appendages to a literary composition.

A book of reminiscences grows round the life-work of its author. The best portion of Dr. Ray's life has been devoted to chemistry and the first part of the book—the autobiographical—is mainly a rambling account of his associations with the science—as a student and teacher and of his pioneer service in the cause of chemical research and industry in Bengal. His science had possession of his heart; on it he bestowed the love and care that a family which he never acquired would have asked of him. He tells a proud tale of students and grand students, who in their successful careers shed glory on the master at whose feet they sat; mentions every one of this distinguished coterie, affectionately by name, and gives an enthusiastic account of their achievements. This list given in detail is rather a monotonous reading and may have been curtailed or leavened with other material, so as not to look so palpably like a mailing or passenger list. They are surprisingly all Bengali names.

"Science can afford to wait but not Swaraj." Perhaps Dr. Ray is right though one wistfully wonders whether such an absolute abandonment of the test tube and the laboratory were necessary. Anyhow the declaration was made and the social work and political activity undertaken after this metamorphosis, are briefly dealt with in a chapter entitled "Life Outside the Test-Tube."

Part II of the book is a slashing indictment of modern institutions; the university system, the position of national industries, the economic situation and the social fabric have all been elaborately reviewed and criticised. This part has been rather laboriously and voluminously written, the clarity of exposition being somewhat obscured by frequent interpolations from other sources brought in support of the author's theses. Dr. Ray has however kept his vision clear and undimmed through this lengthy dissertation. He fervently appeals for a return to simplicity and naturalness in the conduct of life and pleads for a reconstruction of national institutions to suit the traditions and ideals of the people.

The appearance of the book could not have been better timed. India is passing through a crisis; ideas and institutions that she has been evolving through the past two centuries are undergoing rapid destruction. A transitional darkness is on us and the "Life and Experiences" of this apostle of nationalism on whose banner is painted the dictum "plain living and high thinking" is an assurance that all is well, and that from this darkness the nation will soon emerge into glorious light.

D. SESHAGIRI RAO.

SEX EDUCATION FOR CHILDREN.

THE SEX EDUCATION OF CHILDREN. By MARY WARE DENNETT. (George Routledge, London.) 1932. 19cm. 152p. 3/6.

THIS book should receive a wide circulation in this country among parents as well as teachers, as hardly any thought is given to this subject of sex education so far and there is practically no literature available in Indian languages. The author of this book has convincingly established the necessity of giving proper

sex-education to children at as early an age as possible. She maintains that, "children acquire sex concepts anyhow, no matter what we do well or ill in creating environment in which their concepts are born and in which they grow. Children get educated whether or no. It may be true and fine education which they acquire, or it may be utter mis-education, but it is education none the less. Potent sex concepts are willy-nilly implanted in little children, and at a very early age." This is why it is necessary to establish proper concepts before the children develop an unhealthy attitude toward sex life.

The author further states that in developing the concept, actual instruction about sex matters does not so much matter as the attitude of adults towards sexual questions. She remarks: "It is what we are as parents, not what we do or say, that constitutes the fundamental influence on the children. Imitations and pretences are of no avail. Mothers and fathers may preach and moralize, instruct and dictate *ad infinitum*, and if their own attitude underneath does not truly match their sermonizing, the rules they lay down are but words, which can no more take the place of true courtesy which comes from the heart. The inner attitude wins over rules every time."

It is further shown in this book that bad concepts can be reconstructed and converted into healthy ones if there is enough intelligent effort put forth to achieve this. In the chapters titled "Fear and Shame," "The 'Sacred' Handicap," "Bravado and Verve," "Sex and Humour" and "Privacy instead of Modesty" the author shows how and why wrong concepts are formed and the last chapter gives some valuable suggestions for correcting them.

An appendix in which four plates of diagrams of the male and female sex organs drawn to scale together with explanations of the sex physiology are given. These may be very useful for adults in getting clear ideas for themselves and in conveying them to children. On the whole this is a very readable little book and every parent and teacher should read it.

BHASKAR D. KARVE.

EXPANSION OF SOVIET TRADE.

SOVIET TRADE AND WORLD DEPRESSION.

By H. R. KNICKERBOCKER. (John Lane the Bodley Head, London.) 1931. 20cm. 288 p. 7/6.

THE world is passing through acute trade depression and every government has realised the enormity of the problems arising from the economic crisis by seeing the utter futility of all its schemes to raise prices and usher in prosperous times. Russia alone among all Governments seems to have increased the volume of her export trade and to a certain extent gained from the present world crisis. The author of the book under review after a trip through Europe to investigate the reciprocal relationships of the Soviet Union under the Five Year Plan with Europe under the depression, gives an interesting account of the expansion of Soviet trade. His examination of the volume and character of Soviet trade at various ports of entry in Europe is as interesting as the account of his enquiry in the various capitals and industrial centres into the official and popular attitude of the bourgeois world towards trade with the Soviet Union. He leaves the readers to infer for themselves the advantages and disadvantages of planned national economy obtaining in the Soviet Union, with its foreign trade monopoly as compared with the unplanned private capitalist economies of the outside world with their mutually competitive producers and traders.

The author makes the materials at his command as interesting as he possibly can and shows how national rivalry and jealousy have helped the Soviet Union to extend her oil market in France and Italy. He goes into the question of marketing such commodities as wheat, oil, wood and flax by the Soviet Union and shows that "whatever difficulties the Union is facing, whatever checks it has suffered in the past, is suffering in the present, or may suffer in the future, its huge mercantiling trust, the monopoly of foreign trade, continues to-day to pour out upon the world a quantity of goods unprecedented in the history of the Soviet Union, steadily mounting from month to month." European countries realise the 'Red Menace' and condemn 'Red Russia's Ruthless Trade War' and 'Moscow's Shock Dumping'; yet they find themselves compelled to import Russian commodities. Gradually is the Soviet Union capturing ever widening markets in other countries and the facts and figures supplied by the author would show that "the interests hit by cheap Soviet goods are almost never in the land that is importing those goods, but nearly always in other countries supplying the importing lands. Soviet competition, in other words, seldom strikes directly but strikes through each country's export markets." After a perusal of this book one would be inclined to connect the ruthless prosecution of the Soviet Five Year Plan with the present economic crisis as one of the several causes. This sort of increase of exports taking place on an oversaturated market might of course have had a tendency to intensify the depression.

The author observes that 'practical politicians as well as academic economists are coming to realise that the conflict between free economy and state-controlled economy is the decisive conflict of the world crisis' and shows clearly that "interest in Europe is greater than ever in the question 'what does the capitalist world intend to do about the Soviet Challenge?'"

V. BHUVARAHAMURTHY.

DEFINITION OF SOCIOLOGY

SOCIOLOGY. By ERNEST R. GROVES. (Lippincott, London.) 1931. 20cm. 160 p. 4/6.

AMONG the social sciences Sociology is rather conspicuous for the lack of suitable-sized books giving a fair idea of the subject-matter of the science for the use of the intelligent citizen. The subject being vast has lacked precise definition, rendering the task of writing such a book very difficult. Professor Groves, who is well-known as a deep student of the American family, has attempted to wipe out this deficiency by his book which is under review.

Chapter I adumbrates the view that sociology deals with social experience of men in society, in interpreting which there are a number of difficulties. In explaining these the author brings out the complex nature of the subject. In chapter III the basis of this social life, which makes for social experience, is analysed. The author accepts the view that social life is the result of man's impulses as moulded by this social living. He recognizes four such main sources of motivation called *wishes*. Man's strivings in society in reference to these wishes give rise to definite patterns of behaviour, which, when they become so persistent as to be looked upon as a possession of a whole group are called *culture*. In chapter IV the reader is introduced to the study of culture, of which three varieties must be distinguished. First, a people have a certain technique related to the material part of their life, their tools and weapons

and utensils—what the anthropologist calls the material part of culture. Second, there are the thought-patterns of a people, including their religious beliefs, their attitudes to poverty, their ideas of law and government and their content of education. Third, there are the patterns of activity principally comprising their morals and art, customs and manners. The first aspect is slightly touched upon in chapter IV. Chapter V which is styled "Sociology and Social Problems" discusses chiefly the difference in the points of view of the sociologist and the social worker in respect of the social problems of poverty, vice and crime. In an organic treatment of sociology these problems should be properly treated as mere maladjustments in the last two of the three divisions of culture distinguished by the author and should be considered as the proper criteria to gauge the actual achievement of social welfare in any community. The last chapter very appropriately deals with the concept of progress. The methods adopted by the sociologist to gather his facts and to present them intelligibly are discussed in chapter II. The author unnecessarily recognises five different methods. Really speaking, there are only two methods of getting fresh facts. One, that of personal investigation, whether carried out through interviews, contacts or what the author calls 'confession' and the other, that of impersonal investigation carried on through the medium of the questionnaire, very widely distributed. While interpreting his facts the sociologist must resort to only one method and that is of correlation, whether it is purely logical or also statistical, and has to utilize all the relevant facts gathered by public agencies, government departments or by the students of other social sciences.

The book gives the reader a fair idea about sociology but does not bring to him much knowledge of sociology. The scope of sociology is fairly presented. The reader will carry some idea about the methods adopted by sociologists and will also profit by the discussion of the concept of progress as well as of culture. He is also provided with a fair amount of information on the material division of culture. But of the two remaining divisions of culture—and in sociology these are far more important than the material one—there is almost no treatment. The thought-patterns and activity-patterns are not described at all, much less in their evolution traced even cursorily. Needless to say, the so-called social problems—the maladjustments in respect of these two sets of patterns, receive no consideration. The reader will therefore leave the book without being enlightened about their extent or their gravity.

G. S. GEURYE.

SHORT NOTICE.

THE CHILD. By RABINDRANATH TAGORE (Allen & Unwin.) 1931. 20cm. 21p. 2/6.

THIS is a prose-poem in which Rabindranath voices his faith in a new humanity. The man of faith undertakes to show humanity the servant of life. Crowds follow him. But the way is difficult, and in the end he is disowned and killed. But the young press on in the spirit of the slain leader and at last are rewarded by the sight of the birth of the child, Humanity Reborn. The poem is a beautiful allegory.

J. J. VAKIL.

Miscellaneous.

REPRESENTATION OF THE ABORIGINAL AND HILL TRIBES.

Following is the text of the note submitted by Mr. N. M. Joshi to the R. T. C. on the subject of the representation of the aboriginal and hill tribes in the Central and Provincial Legislatures:—

THE Franchise Committee has recognised the need for separate representation of the Aboriginal and Hill Tribes. The Committee has recommended some form of election for the appointment of their representatives at least in Assam, Bihar and Orissa, and possibly in Madras. I suggest that the method of some form of election should be adopted in all provinces where they have been given special representation.

In the Communal Award of the Prime Minister, one seat each has been reserved for the Backward Areas, presumably for the representation of these tribes, in Madras, Bombay and C. P., eight in Bihar and Orissa, and nine in Assam. I consider that, having regard to the number of the population of these tribes, their representation is very inadequate.

The Census Report for 1921 has given 16 millions as the figure of the total population of these tribes for the whole of India, and as the population of India has increased during the last ten years, I can safely estimate the present figure of their population, for the whole of India, at 18 millions. Proportionately, their population for *British India* cannot be less than 12 millions. The figure of five millions given by the Franchise Committee is obviously a mistake. This figure represents only those who declared themselves as belonging to "Tribal Religions." But as some of these people either declare themselves as Hindus, or are put down by the enumerators as Hindus, their total population is shown to be much less than it really is. Although some of these people call themselves Hindus, and some have become Christians, their social and economic backwardness is not necessarily removed. Dr. Hutton, the present Census Commissioner, has admitted this fact in his D. O. No. 18 dated 19th September, 1932, written to Mr. A. V. Thakkar of the Servants of India Society. Dr. Hutton writes as follows:—

"I am replying to your letter of the 8th September in a purely private capacity. The actual number of aboriginal tribes who returned their tribal name for their religion in 1931 was 8,380,347 and the number in British India was 5,779,709. This of course does not represent the population of the tribes themselves as owing in part to the natural process of the substitution of Hinduism for their tribal religion, and the idea of social superiority attaching to a return to Hinduism, in addition to a very vigorous propaganda by the Hindu Mahasabha at census time, directed presumably to obtaining as large as possible a return of Hindus as might be, there has been a very considerable transfer at this census from "Tribal Religions" to "Hinduism."... My figure given to the Lothian Committee had reference to professed religion only, as I had not then any figures for the actual numbers of tribes, and I fear that I shall not have any such figures until I have all the tables of the different provinces compiled. If you will write to me again in two or three months' time I can probably then give you the actual numbers of tribes returned from the different provinces as "primitive", though here again it is often very difficult to draw a line between primitive tribes which profess Hinduism and a caste."

Estimating that their total population in British India is between 4 and 5 per cent., the 20 seats out of 1513 given to them by the Prime Minister's Communal Award are very much less than they should have on the basis of their population. Strictly speaking, they should have been given at least 60 seats. This injustice is more glaring, especially in C. P. In this province their population is more than one-sixth of the whole, yet they are given only one seat out of 112, while on the population basis they should have been given at least 18 seats. The C. P. Provincial Franchise Committee recommended two seats, but the Prime Minister reduced the number to one! On this point Dr. Hutton, the Census Commissioner, writes to Mr. Thakkar in the letter referred to above as follows:—

"I presume that it is the comparatively small number of one million odd returned as "Tribal" in religion from the Central Provinces which accounts for the fact that in the Communal Award only one representative has been allotted to backward tribes, which in point of fact constitute nearly one-fifth of the population. Even the local Franchise Committee of the Central Provinces was prepared to recommend two representatives for primitive or backward classes."

I fully realise the difficulty of changing the Communal Award. But as the representation of these classes is to come out of the general constituencies, the seats given to the Muslims and to the Depressed Classes need not be disturbed, and some measure of justice may still be done to these classes.

It is a matter of great regret that the Franchise Committee has not recommended any representation to the "Aboriginal and Hill Tribes" or "Backward Areas", as the Prime Minister's Award has termed them, although their total population is more than 4 p. c. and although the Franchise Committee and all others interested have seen the desirability and necessity of giving them separate representation.

It is not correct to think that the interests of these classes are affected only by the Provincial Legislatures. The Federal Legislature is of equal importance to them. As some of the Areas in which they live are very backward, and as in some cases are under special legislative and administrative arrangement, the Simon Commission recommended that the Central Government should bear some financial responsibility for them. Moreover, as the Federal Government is going to depend upon indirect sources of revenue which affect more adversely the poorest classes of people, which the Aboriginal and Hill Tribes undoubtedly are, the case for their representation in the Federal Legislature is unanswerable. I therefore strongly hope that, when the Government takes decision as regards the representation of various communities and interests in the Central Legislature, they will not fail to do justice to the Aboriginal and Hill Tribes or the Backward Areas as they prefer to call them. I suggest that they should have 10 reserved seats in the Assembly distributed as follows:—

	No. of Seats
1 representing Backward Areas of Assam	2
2 " " Bihar & Chota Nagpur	2
3 " " " C. P.	2
4 " " " Bombay	1
5 " " " Madras	1
6 To represent the "Aborigines of the whole country and to be co-opted by all members of the Assembly	2
	10