

The Servant of India

EDITOR : P. KODANDA RAO.

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

VOL. XVI, No. 4.

POONA—THURSDAY, JANUARY 26, 1933.

INDIAN SUBSN. Rs. 6.
FOREIGN 15s.

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK.	37
ARTICLES :—	
Bombay Leaders' Manifesto	39
The Sheet-Anchor of Federation. By S. G. Vaze ...	40
France and Italy. By Madame L. Morin. ...	41
OUR LONDON LETTER.	42
REVIEWS :—	
Novel Economic Remedies. By Prof. G. B. Jathar, I. E. S. ...	43
Indian Religious Life. By Prof. Suryakanta Sastry. ...	44
"Free-Rendering" of Jnaneshvari. By Prof. S. V. Dandekar. ...	45
SHORT NOTICES.	45
MISCELLANEOUS :—	
Results of the R.T.C.—Mr. N. M. Joshi's Statement. ...	47
BOOKS RECEIVED.	48

Topics of the Week.

Disallowance of Temple Entry Bill.

To those who have been following news from Delhi during the last few days, the Viceroy's decision to withhold his previous sanction to Dr. Subbaroyan's Bill allowing to untouchables the right of entry into Hindu temples, however regrettable, cannot have come as a surprise. Lord Willingdon's principal ground for disallowing the Bill is that though it relates to places of worship in the southern presidency, its passage cannot but have repercussions in other provinces seeing that some of the temples at any rate are objects of reverence to Hindus all over India so that the Bill was really of an all-India character. Without seeing eye to eye with the Viceroy, one can say that the consideration advanced by him in support of his action is not quite unsubstantial. At the same time one cannot escape the inference that in coming to this decision the Government allowed themselves to be unduly influenced by caste-Hindu opinion.

The only consolation is that the Government do not wish to stop altogether the discussion of measures aiming at the removal of social disabilities to which the untouchables are subject. Thus while disallowing the Madras Bill, the Viceroy has thought fit not to obstruct the introduction of Mr. Ranga Iyer's Bill in the Assembly. This Bill differs from the Madras ex-Minister's bill in this that while the latter sought to do nothing more than open the doors of Hindu temples to members of the depressed classes on

the basis of local option, Mr. Ranga Iyer is desirous of banishing untouchability in all its aspects from Hindu society. The operative section of his Bill runs as follows :—

"Notwithstanding anything contained in any existing enactment, regulation or order, and notwithstanding any custom or usage or interpretation of law, no penalty, disadvantage or disability shall be imposed upon or any discrimination made or recognised against any subject of the State on the ground that such person belongs to an untouchable caste or class among Hindus, and no Court, civil or criminal, shall recognise any custom of untouchability or base its adjudication on such a custom."

It has been made clear that the Viceroy's sanction of this Bill does not commit the Government to support it in its later stages. The wording of the decision conveys a broad hint that after the introduction of Mr. Ranga Iyer's Bill they would welcome its circulation for the expression of public opinion. Having regard to the volume of public sympathy and good will towards the untouchables, of which unmistakable indications have been recently forthcoming, the delay involved in the action contemplated by Government would appear to many as being avoidable. Government's anxiety to adopt a neutral attitude in regard to a measure affecting the religious beliefs of a large section of the Indian people can be easily understood. But their object would be as effectively served by leaving the decision of the question to non-officials.

The Meerut Trial.

THE long-drawn out Meerut trial which has cost the taxpayer over Rs. 16½ lakhs concluded last week by the Sessions Judge acquitting three of the accused and sentencing the rest to terms of imprisonment varying from transportation for life to rigorous imprisonment for three years. Quite naturally, the sentences are generally looked upon as extremely severe, especially in view of the fact that all that seems to have been proved against the accused was that they held Communist views and did some propaganda in Communist interests. Unprejudiced observers cannot obviously regard this as synonymous with an attempt on their part "to deprive the King of the sovereignty of British India or any part thereof." British sovereignty of India must indeed be very insecurely based if it can be shaken by a handful of Communists trying to popularise their views. Indian Communism was never a very serious political factor in this country and left to itself, would perhaps not have been able to make much headway. As pointed out by Mr. Lansbury, however, the Meerut trial has helped to secure for it "an unexampled advertisement."

The judicial proceedings in the case dragged on perhaps for the longest time in the history of crimi-

nal trials in this country or for that matter in any part of the world. The accused were arrested nearly four years ago and have continued in confinement ever since. They numbered 32, 24 of whom were Hindus, 4 Muslims, 3 Europeans and 1 Parsi. In the words of the *Indian Social Reformer*, "The sentences are much in excess of the requirements of both law and justice, as there was no attempt to raise an armed insurrection which is the essential ingredient of the offence. We cannot believe that even if there are no appeals, Government will allow the sentences to stand as they are. The fact that the men have been in jail for more than three years is itself a strong reason for the mitigation, if not the remission, of the sentences." All that we need add is that the suggestion made by our contemporary has our strong backing.

* * *

Opinion on Second Chambers.

PUBLIC opinion in two more provinces has expressed itself on the desirability or otherwise of a second chamber as part of their constitutional machinery. Contrary to the practice generally followed in such cases, the question was debated in the C. P. legislative council on a non-official motion, the Council's decision being against the establishment of that fifth wheel in the coach. It may be mentioned that the views of the local Government as expressed in their memorandum to the Franchise Committee were identical with those held in non-official circles, the Government vetoing the proposal on the ground amongst others of want of suitable material. The provincial Franchise Committee too took the same view of the matter. With official and non-official opinion thus united in disapproving the constitution of a second chamber, the C. P. Council's present decision opposing its establishment was almost a foregone conclusion.

The state of things in Bihar and Orissa where too the question was considered during the last few days was quite the reverse. There both the Government and the provincial Franchise Committee apparently believe that they cannot well do without a second chamber. This is not surprising in view of the predominance of zamindars in the province. Fairness however requires us to state that an influential section of opinion is opposed to a second chamber per se as being a drag on progress. The zamindars seem to insist upon a second chamber as a shield for their interests. Their apprehension is that a popular legislature would place on them financial burdens from which the permanent settlement at present effectively protects them. Whether and how far the fear is well founded, it is not our purpose here to examine. But those who look up to a second chamber to make any infringement of the permanent settlement impossible must logically ask that the chamber should consist of none but those belonging to the zamindar class. For it is obvious that a second chamber consisting of members elected by the lower house and nominated non-officials besides zamindars, as proposed by the Government of Bihar and Orissa, would not be inclined to regard the permanent settlement quite as sacrosanct as the present advocates of a bi-cameral legislature for the province would wish it to be.

Is the opinion of the provincial council on this subject to be considered as binding also on the people of Orissa? The impending splitting up of the province into two, Orissa and Bihar, gives occasion for this question. The people of Orissa cannot be blamed if they wish that the new Oriya province should not be saddled with a second chamber unless their wishes are separately consulted.

* * *

Equal Educational Facilities for Untouchables.

THE Bombay Government have recently issued two resolutions which are indicative of their firm resolve to see that their policy to ensure equal educational facilities to the depressed classes no longer remains a mere pious wish. Nearly ten years have elapsed since they first expressed their disapproval of any differential treatment of the depressed classes children in educational institutions wholly or partly maintained out of public funds. This is not to say that cases of untouchable children being made to sit apart from higher class pupils have completely disappeared. Experience has shown that the Government's beneficent intentions towards the depressed classes are often nullified on the pretext that the buildings in which schools assigning a separate place to Harijan pupils are held are temples from which depressed classes are barred or have been rented on the express understanding that untouchable pupils would be excluded from their precincts.

This the Government are not going to tolerate for very long. For in their recent Resolution they lay down a definite procedure, which, if strictly observed, should lead to such differentiation to the detriment of the untouchable pupils becoming a thing of the past in the near future. In the first place, with a special officer in charge of the interests of the depressed classes, it may safely be assumed that cases of unequal treatment of depressed class pupils will not remain undetected, as heretofore. When such cases are brought to the notice of the Director of Public Instruction, as they are sure to be by the Backward Class Officer, he has been enjoined carefully to look into them. In cases in which "differentiation is proved on the ground of custom, religion or orthodoxy of the Hindus," he will give the management of the school concerned reasonable time to remedy the grievance. Should the matter not be set right before the expiry of the allotted time, the Government will seriously consider whether the grant paid to such a school should not be reduced. We have no doubt progressive public opinion will be behind Government in the action they propose to take in order to ensure the grant of equal educational facilities to depressed class children.

While on this subject, attention may also be drawn to the bill which has been passed by the C. P. Legislative Council on the motion of Mr. Gavai, a depressed class leader. It lays down that "no public place should be closed to any person by reason of his caste or creed," and "public place" is defined as including roads, schools, markets, gardens, serais, resthouses, watering places, burial and burning grounds, etc. constructed or maintained by the local Government." The penalty for obstruction to the use of such places by the so-called untouchables will be a fine of Rs. 50.

* * *

Export of Vegetable Oils.

IT is yet too early to talk of the results of Ottawa. A comment on how the case for the Agreement was bolstered up by baseless arguments may, however, be allowed. A great deal was said by the Delegation and by the supporters of the argument of the enormous possibilities of the export of vegetable oils from India. In view of this the following paragraph from *Agriculture and Live-Stock in India*, the journal of the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research (Sept. 1932), will be found to be very instructive. It describes the fundamental difficulties in the way of the export of vegetable oils and comment is unnecessary as to whether a small tariff concession can

bring about any material change in the situation within a few years. The paragraph runs:

"In conclusion, I suggest that note be made of the fact that I have taken export of oil, presumably to Europe, as being economically possible. Actually this is by no means certain. Some export is done, but, in general, experience is that export of oil is not profitable. This of course only refers to ordinary commercial oils and present conditions. It will not necessarily apply to special or modified oils, unusual conditions or changes produced by tariff modifications. Europe consumes both oil and the residual cake and it is obviously cheaper to freight seed to there than oil in containers plus cake, so that both oil and cake cannot be exported unless crushing costs are less in India than in Europe. This is axiomatic. Costs in India are, however, on the average, equal or higher, so that it is impossible to export both oil and cake; seed may be exported, and oil or cake but not both. Cake is not extensively used in India, except at very low prices, so it is the cake which goes to Europe. A reversal of this procedure requires a revolution in the ideas of the Indian farmer who at present cannot or will not use cake extensively for feeding cattle. It is this situation which forces the writer to regard the sale of feeding cake in India as the crux of the oil-industry. Until the farmer is willing or able to buy cake in quantity I am convinced that the question of considering the export of oils whose cake has a value as food-stuff will have little more than an academic interest."

Articles.

BOMBAY LEADERS' MANIFESTO.

THE Liberal Party in India is to be congratulated upon having given to the country a vigorous lead in respect of the future constitution. Sir Chimanlal Setalvad and a few other leaders from Bombay made their own position clear in speeches the other day at Sholapur. They are shortly for conditional acceptance of the federal scheme evolved at the R. T. C. They have suggested improvements in several directions, some of which at any rate must be effected in order to win their approval of the scheme as a whole. Naturally it will take some time for the Party to decide which of the improvements are merely desirable and which absolutely necessary. One thing, however, is clear that the scheme as outlined by Sir Samuel Hoare in his speech would be unacceptable unless it undergoes changes in several important respects. The lead which was thus given has been followed up by the publication of a memorandum embodying the views, not merely of Liberal politicians, but of politicians of other shades of moderate thought as well. This memorandum clearly sets forth the points on which the numerous safeguards proposed in the scheme will have to be relaxed, but the one demand which stands out from all the rest is that the safeguards, whatever they be, must be limited in duration. The view has been held by several prominent politicians in the country that, provided the safeguards are not too many and too drastic, they may be trusted quietly to disappear or fall into disuse after a time, and that the period of their currency need not be restricted statutorily. The signatories to the above memorandum are not of that view. They urge that the period after which the safeguards are to come to an end should be

specified in the statute. They dismiss the objections which constitutional purists may raise against such a procedure as puerile. Without such a clause setting a definite limit to reservations, the constitution will appear to the public as affording a dangerously wide latitude to the heads of government to interfere with the responsible Ministry. If a clause like this is inserted the people will be willing to put up with many limitations at which they would otherwise chafe.

The memorandum also emphasizes the need of introducing central responsibility for British India if either "a sufficient number of Princes do not come forward to join federation before the meeting of the Joint Select Committee takes place", or the Reserve Bank cannot be set going. Apparently they do not think that an effective federation is possible merely by a State or two coming in, as Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and Mr. Jayakar hold, nor are they certain, as these two leaders are, that "a vast majority" of the States will join. It is therefore natural for them to ask for central responsibility for British India in the event of a federation not coming about. But on the extent of central responsibility that is possible we see a sharp cleavage of opinion between the signatories to the memorandum and the R.T.C. leaders. The latter do not appear to contemplate more than the barest minimum of central responsibility without the Princes the former, on the contrary, seem to insist upon the same quantum of reforms and think that it ought to be possible. This is a matter to be decided not merely by political considerations, but mainly by constitutional principles, and if it be found, as is held by Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and Mr. Jayakar, that, on account of the treaty engagements of the British Crown with the Princes, the power vesting in the Secretary of State cannot be appreciably curtailed except with the consent of the Princes, then it is no use laying too much stress upon British Indian reform. It would on the contrary be the part of wisdom to let the Princes in on any terms that may be sufficiently attractive to them, and, what is more, to keep them in all the time. In this view of the case it would be no exaggeration to say that British India cannot pay too high a price to the States. We do not know whether Sir Chimanlal Setalvad and one or two other signatories, who may be assumed to know something of law, agree with this view or not, but if they do not surely they will tell us by what means, if at all, we can get out of the grip of the Princes, supposing that they cannot be persuaded to join the federation, which fortunately is not the case.

The precise improvements suggested in the memorandum are more or less the same which Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and Mr. Jayakar have themselves urged, though in some respects slight differences are noticeable. For instance, the memorandum takes exception to the requirement that bills dealing with the currency and exchange policy should receive the prior consent of the Governor-General. Public opinion is certainly behind the memorandum in making this point, but Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru does not

think much of it. In any case the Governor-General will have the power of veto, he says: what does it matter, then, whether he has also the additional power of withholding previous consent? The Bill cannot anyway be translated into an Act. As it happens, the public has just now become familiar with the consequences of lodging this additional power in the hands of the Governor-General on account of the widespread demand for previous assent to Temple Entry Bills. If he is given this supplementary power, not only can he prevent a measure being given legislative effect, but he can prevent its being discussed. The matter is not therefore wholly negligible. The power of choking off discussion is an important power, on which we cannot afford to be indifferent. There are certain other matters on which a more advanced demand is made than was put forward by Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and Mr. Jayakar. For instance, the Bombay leaders' memorandum asks for a defined time-table and programme in the matter of the Indianization of the Army, the whole to be completed within fifteen years. Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and Mr. Jayakar did not embody such a demand in their own memorandum to the Secretary of State and perhaps they will not object to spreading out the process of Indianization over a longer period. But barring such matters, the improvements asked for are in most cases identical and Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and Mr. Jayakar will, we feel sure, feel grateful to the Bombay leaders for taking energetic steps to give them a strong backing.

THE SHEET ANCHOR OF FEDERATION.

I MUST confess I have had my answer to the question asked by me of Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and Mr. Jayakar in these columns. If federation becomes impossible on account of the States' unwillingness to join, these leaders will not demand for British India central responsibility in as full a measure as they have been demanding for Federal India. They are of the opinion that the conferment of the same amount of power will be not only a political but a constitutional impossibility. The British Government cannot grant to British India even if they wish to do so that quantum of self-government that they may grant to combined British and Indian India. In fact, the measure of central responsibility that it will be open to them to devolve upon British India, not merely for reasons of political expediency but of legal theory, can only be of an extremely exiguous kind; it will be purely nominal.

Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, in his speech to the Allahabad University on the 14th inst., said: "it must be a truncated responsibility" that British India alone can obtain without the States. Mr. Jayakar, in his speech in Poona on the 22nd inst., said: "Without the Princes most of the reforms proposed (in the federal scheme) would be impossible." Sir Tej did not give a reason for such a necessary attenuation of powers if the Princes were not included in the constitution; but Mr. Jayakar did. It is this: "Their (the Princes') treaties involved the protection of the British Army. How could that be reduced unless

they were willing? Their contracts and obligations were with the Secretary of State. How could the Secretary of State and the India Office disappear unless the Princes said, 'Yes, we are willing'?"

Public life in India is no longer in a static condition, it has great dynamic force in it. There could be no more eloquent testimony to the remarkable elasticity of mind of our political leaders than the rapid movement of opinion amongst them on the subject of the relations of the States with the paramount power. One would have thought that a question like this can afford but little scope for a change of front even for our politicians. But witness the complete transformation that has taken place in their current views within the brief space of four years! In 1928 the orthodox doctrine was to the effect that a complete transfer of power from British into Indian hands was possible, whether with the Princes or without them. This doctrine, having the authority of the Nehru Report behind it, was in high favour then with our statesmen. But this very doctrine has now become a heresy, and the correct theory at present is just the one that they had very nearly destroyed four years ago, viz. the constitutional impossibility of transferring power except with the Princes' consent. It is certainly an augury of the greatest promise for the future of our country that Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and Mr. Jayakar can so readily and neatly convert themselves into a pair of Sir Leslie Scotts!

But of course it is not to be expected that all our politicians would be capable of similar turns and twists, and some of these are peculiarly immobile. Dr. Ambedkar and Mr. Joshi belong, it is to be feared, to the latter class. Both of them complain that British Indian reform was unnecessarily made to hang upon federation, and that no clue has yet been given as to what would be done for British India if federation proved impossible of achievement. In the light of the constitutional theory which Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and Mr. Jayakar in their latest political incarnation have advanced, these complainings will be seen to be wholly futile. It does not lie within the competence of the British Government, be they never more sympathetic, to concede any but a small modicum of power to this country, unless the Princes join. To ask what portion of the power which they can concede they will be willing to do is very much like posing the question, how to divide zero into segments!

But is it not doubtful wisdom on the part of Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and Mr. Jayakar to have raised the question of central responsibility on a non-federal basis at the R. T. C. at all? Have they any doubt even about a single State joining the federation, which is all that seems to be necessary to bring the federal scheme into operation? Have they any doubt even about one half of the States joining, a condition stipulated by Sir Samuel Hoare? On the contrary, they are certain that the Princes will join in shoals—they have stated that "a vast majority" of the States will join, making all the sacrifices required of them. Why, in the name of common sense, then raise the question at all and demand

reforms which they themselves know must necessarily be of the thinnest, in a contingency which, humanly speaking, will never arise? It only gives an opportunity to mischief-makers of raking up the Nehru Report, which must now be quickly forgotten. They must realise that if we have practical statesmen of high eminence in our midst, we also have unpractical men like Dr. Ambedkar and Mr. Joshi, who are hopelessly rigid and incapable of adjustment in their mental make-up.

The entry of the States being so essential to any substantial reforms beyond the provincial sphere, may I utter a word of warning to our statesmen? They must not attempt to drive too hard a bargain with the Princes. If the States want equality of representation in the Upper Chamber, let not British India quarrel overmuch with them. A sort of sham fight might be permissible, but we must know when to yield and in any case we must not let it be said of us that we wrecked the federation. Fifty per cent. representation might be unfair, but the important thing for us to secure is not mathematical justice, but an advance in the constitution. When justice conflicts with progress, we must as practical statesmen give the former the go-by. And, after all, as Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru knows full well, the States will not vote *en bloc*. What then can be the possible harm in letting them have a slightly excessive representation? For the sake of this small point which weighs with doctrinaire politicians let not federation, which is the sheet-anchor of our hopes, be put in jeopardy!

S. G. VAZE.

FRANCE AND ITALY.

THE nomination of M. Henri de Jouvenel as the French ambassador in Rome testifies to the French Government's desire to restore and maintain the best of relations with Italy. Before this final move, many premonitory symptoms had been noted by attentive observers, for instance, M. Herriot's declarations in the Toulouse Congress, the permission given to the Senate's Foreign Affairs Committee to examine the documents on Franco-Italian relations, and, generally speaking, the importance given to the subject in the press of late.

M. de Jouvenel is not going to Rome as an ordinary ambassador: he is intended to stay there for six months only, and it is an open secret that he is expected to fulfil a special mission. Interviewed by *Le Matin*, he said that his intention was not to become a diplomat, but to remain a journalist and a politician. "As a journalist, I shall study the Franco-Italian problem", said he, "as a politician, I shall endeavour to solve it." M. de Jouvenel also recalled the fact that he had always energetically protested against the way in which Italy was treated by Mr. Wilson, Mr. Lloyd George and M. Clemenceau. Since then, the misunderstanding between the two countries has grown more serious. Being offered an opportunity to try and alleviate the present tension, M. de Jouvenel was not slow to seize it. His

impression is that a frank exchange of views ought to have been sought much earlier. Postponement had engendered confusion and led each country to evade this necessary mutual "explanation." All French people will be grateful to M. de Jouvenel if he succeeds in the very delicate task that he is hoping to carry out.

The fact is that a disquieting situation has been allowed to develop in Central Europe. Two blocks of nations are facing one another. One of them is grouped around the Little Entente and is, generally speaking, in favour of a static policy. It includes, Yugo-Slavia, Czecho-slovakia and Rumania. Its opponents overemphasise the fact that France is its guide and inspirer. The second block insists on the revision of treaties. It is composed of all the discontented elements which have gradually crystallised around Berlin and Rome, Austria, Hungary, and Bulgaria. These countries refuse to accept the situation originated in 1919. Soviet Russia favours this second group, and part of British and American opinion has also granted an appreciable measure of support to its revendications.

From an international point of view, it is evident that the growing opposition of these two groups is an increasing menace not only of war, but of constant economic disorder, because of its direct bearing on the economic situation and commercial exchanges. It is, in fact, responsible in no small measure for the present depression. It is high time to realise that antiquated diplomatic conceptions have often had an unfortunate tendency to emphasise and perpetuate similar divisions, without understanding that they mean economic paralysis and ruin for the very countries they intended to serve. National prestige should no longer be allowed to overrule vital necessities. It must be acknowledged that some treaties have been too exclusively political. Political rights have their own undeniable value; but the rights to life, sustenance and work, are perhaps still more essential to human beings. A country does not need political freedom only, but also a minimum of security and prosperity; this presupposes the possibility of exchanging its products with its neighbours, failing which the proudest frontiers are changed to so many tomb-stones.

Europe cannot be at peace and prosperous unless some solution is found to the Central European problems. It is natural that prominent nations should take their share and even their share of sacrifice, in this work of salvation. It is hardly fair to expect much from Germany at a time when both her inner difficulties and the orientation of her foreign policy have placed her in momentary isolation. France and Italy, who are both directly affected by the Central European unrest, ought to unite in some concerted action.

Fascism, it is fair to acknowledge, has not always met with much sympathy in France, especially in socialist circles. Dictatorship does not chime in with French political traditions, we have been slow to understand that after all each nation's inner policy is its own concern. In the meanwhile, fascist Italy

has turned her eyes more and more towards the Danube, after her disappointment over the 1919 Treaty. While she was opposed to the "Anschluss," which was a threat to her own Danubian interests, she could only rejoice at the splitting of the Little Entente into the above-mentioned groups, and she therefore favoured the discontented fraction, who occasionally came to Rome for political and diplomatic advice.

France, on the other hand, has no doubt been guilty of laziness, when watchfulness combined with coldness was the only serviceable policy. France has lavishly poured financial help into Central Europe, and subscribed to the loans of her former allies as well as to those of her former enemies, with equal, and excessive, generosity. But she has inconsiderately neglected the Italian factor.

Rome and Paris cannot persist in this policy of mutual ignorance without creating a grave danger to world peace. If both Governments sincerely desire it, they can bring about some kind of Central European economic federation.

Conciliation can be brought about between the static block and the dynamic block, and practical cooperation will come as its fortunate consequence. If Paris and Rome agree, peace and prosperity can be restored to the Danubian countries.

L. MORIN.

Our London Letter.

(From Our Correspondent.)

(BY AIR MAIL)

LONDON, January 13.

THE VICEROY'S VETO.

THE Indian Conciliation Group, meeting at Friends House, continues its efforts to promote a better understanding in this country of the real state of affairs in India. While there is plenty of information for public consumption on the State of Alwar there is not very much news of what is happening in British India itself. Nothing so far has been said about the reactions of the Round Table Conference on Indian opinion, although most of the delegates have by now returned to India and are directly in contact with Indian thought and feeling.

Cablegrams received in London this week from Mr. Rajagopalachari, and Mr. Birla as Chairman of the Anti-Untouchability League, make it clear that a very critical situation may arise at any moment if the Viceroy withholds his assent to the introduction of Dr. Subbaroyan's Bill in the Madras Legislative Council. It has, of course, to be recognised that there is considerable difference of opinion in the Hindu community on the question of temple entry. But whatever view an outsider may take, it seems reasonable that every facility should be given for the subject to be discussed, both in the Legislative Assembly and the Provincial Councils. It is stated here in some quarters that it would be unwise for the Viceroy to determine a matter which is primarily of religious significance; that, in fact, we are bound by pledges not to interfere in any matter affecting religion. But the reply to that statement is that the Viceroy is not asked to determine this question for

himself, but to allow those who are most concerned to settle it for themselves.

Obviously the Madras Legislative Council (the great majority of its members as we know are Hindus) has a much greater right to pronounce upon this question, intimately affecting so many millions of its own people, than a Britisher, even a Viceroy, has to veto the introduction of legislation for dealing with it.

FREEDOM TO REMOVE SOCIAL INJUSTICE.

Mr. N. M. Joshi had a letter on this subject in *The Times* of the 11th January, in which he points out that power to withhold sanction in India has been given to the Governor-General for the introduction of Bills affecting religion in order to prevent discussion of any legislation which, being seriously offensive to the religious susceptibilities of any community, is likely to create disturbance in the country. Such power, as Mr. Joshi says, was certainly not intended to prevent the removal of social injustices where the majority of a community is prepared for the change. In the present instance the arbitrary exercise of Governmental power would not only prevent the removal of social injustice, but would make it impossible to discuss the matter to any purpose in the legislatures. There is little doubt as to Hindu feeling in the test case of the Guruvayur Temple where, so Mr. Joshi informs us, a majority of seventy-seven per cent. has been recorded in favour of unrestricted entry.

"In this matter", concludes the Indian Labour leader, "it must be remembered that the treatment of the untouchables by the higher caste Hindus is one of the grounds on which constitutional safeguards are sought to be imposed."

It is profoundly to be hoped, however, that Mahatma Gandhi will not carry out his threat of self-immolation even if the Governor-General does insist upon withholding his sanction to the introduction of the proposed legislation. There are so many people in all parts of the world who look to Mahatma Gandhi, and many, if not most, of these do not feel that he would be justified in sacrificing his life at the present time for a reform which is bound to be realised, in any event, before very long. To many of us also fasting to death is a form of suicide and requires a great deal of understanding and justification. That this latter statement will make no appeal to Gandhiji we know, but those who believe in the things he stands for are compelled to urge him to live to continue his work, and to take whatever steps they can to prevent his death.

GANDHIJI'S FREEDOM.

Perhaps the best thing any of us can do here to help India at this time is to agitate and agitate for the release of Mahatma Gandhi. In jail he is handicapped, and, with his limited possibilities of getting first-hand knowledge of events moving in his country, may not quite know what is happening and certainly is not able to direct events. The Conciliation Group and other bodies are untiring in their efforts to get Gandhiji released.

Private representations have already been made to the Secretary of State with the object of pressing forward the opinion that the Governor-General ought, by some means, to be moved to give his assent to the introduction of the proposed Bills, and these may be followed up by a request for a deputation to discuss the question with Sir Samuel. Mr. C. F. Andrews is sparing no effort to bring about the result which we all desire. If nothing is done in the meantime the subject will almost certainly be raised in the House of Commons when Parliament reassembles next month.

INDIA'S MILITARY BURDEN.

A pamphlet of great value has just been written by Mr. F. J. Pratt of the Indian Conciliation Group, and brought out by the latter. It is prefaced by an extract dealing with the military question taken from Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru's and Mr. Jayakar's statement made just previous to their departure for India. In the pamphlet Mr. Pratt points out how gravely imperilled the reformed Provincial Governments will be if their budgets are starved by financial stringency consequent upon the demands of the Centre for the maintenance of an excessive military establishment. Mr. Pratt quotes Sir Walter Layton's statement that the present military expenditure of India is so large, both absolute and in relation to the revenue of India, as to be a dominating factor in India's financial situation. He gives figures to show that India, in spite of her poverty, has to bear a military burden relatively heavier than that of Great Britain and ten times heavier than that of Australia, which has no land frontier and is protected by the British Navy. India's expenditure on the Army has risen from £20,000,000 before the war to £40,000,000 at the present time.

India's military expenditure, Mr. Pratt shows to be the dominating factor, not only in her financial situation, but in her constitutional development and the writer's object in putting forth the pamphlet is to suggest the urgent need for a searching enquiry into its justification.

INDIA AND LANCASHIRE.

Sir Alfred Watson's speech, and his reference to the cotton trade, given to the Royal Empire Society last week has not been received with favour, especially in the cotton industry areas. It has in reality called forth a great deal of comment and activity, and has once again helped to focus the industrial and commercial mind upon the political situation in India and its recent boycott of British goods. Sir Alfred in his speech gave his hearers to understand that he saw little or no chance of Lancashire ever again recovering her cotton markets there, and suggested that the Indian millowners would eventually secure the monopoly for their own home products. This situation would arise, said Sir Alfred, not because of the greater efficiency of the Indian cotton industry, for that, he continued, was by no means an efficient one. On the contrary, he considered the Bombay mills distinctly inefficient, though he did pay a tribute to the mills of Ahmedabad, but he recognised that several factors were at work to bring about this end, including the developing industrialism of India and the present political situation. Sir Alfred was but stating in other words much that was said by Sir Thomas Ainscough a couple of weeks ago at a luncheon in Manchester. Sir Thomas then warned Lancashire that it must face a permanently reduced cotton trade with India, and stated that in the future more and more the mass of Indian people would be clothed in cotton products of their own country. In some quarters these two gentlemen are considered to be unduly pessimistic, especially so since it is stated that business in Lancashire shows signs of improvement, and enquiries are steadily coming in from Indian firms. That, however, as most cotton manufacturers know, gives no real security for future trade, and so a second meeting in connection with the movement to preserve the cotton and allied trades from falling away from Great Britain has been called to take place this week. In the circular that has been sent round to business men in connection with this meeting, it is made clear that it is not only the competition of India's developing mills and hand-looms that is feared—for over that they cannot, even if they would, exercise control—but Japanese cheap

labour and her increasing export trade. Suggestions will probably be made at this meeting to ensure for Britain a satisfactory preference over foreign competition, and much discussion will take place about it. That, however, would mean fresh duties imposed against the latter, and it is scarcely likely that India will bring forward a measure of the kind desired for some long time to come, even if she ever does, unless it is to protect her own industry from outside competition of any country, whether Britain or any other.

Reviews.

NOVEL ECONOMIC REMEDIES.

LIFE AND MONEY. By EIMAR O'DUFFY. (Putnam, London.) 1932. 20cm. 231p. 5/-

ORDEAL BY BANKING. By W. ALLEN YOUNG. (Cecil & Palmer, London.) 1931. 20cm. 96p. 2/-

BOTH these interesting books are concerned with pointing out the way out of the present economic muddle with its world-wide scope and unprecedented difficulties, uncertainties and embarrassments. Also their approach to the problem is similar in that they both regard our planless and antiquated monetary and financial arrangements as the sole cause of the mischief. At the very outset, however, it may be pointed out that most economists are agreed that many causes are in reality at work and that in order to deal with the problem effectively it must be attacked on many fronts at once and that the civilized nations must take concerted action.

Mr. O'Duffy diagnoses the situation thus: "The economic troubles of the world are occasioned by the fact that a monetary system which originated at a time when the demand for goods was greater than the supply, and when competition between man and man was inevitable, is still in use at a time when the supply of goods is greater than the demand, and competition is giving place to co-operation." His proposal therefore is to adapt the monetary system to the new conditions. The idea is so to regulate the amount of currency that it should be exactly sufficient to purchase the goods produced, the currency to be distributed among the population in such a manner as to make this possible. The money to be issued is to be of two kinds, of different appearance but identical denomination:

1. Consumers' Money, called C money.
2. Producers' Money, called P money.

C will be issued in order to place in the consumers' hands purchasing power equivalent to the year's output of goods, as estimated on the basis of (a) the previous year's output and sales; (b) the known productivity of the plant at the community's disposal; and (c) information collected as to the demands for new or special kinds of goods.

P will be issued for the purpose of enabling the producers, that is, the owners of plant and natural resources, to set their producing machinery in motion in order to satisfy the consumers' needs and also to keep this machinery in repair.

C is to be distributed among the consumers partly as a loan and partly as a gift, so that they can proceed with their purchasing as goods become available. The equivalent amount of P money is issued simultaneously to the producers who will employ it to pay for labour, machinery, raw materials, etc. and it will ultimately find its way into the pockets of the consumers, who will use it to repay the P money which was issued to them by the currency authority. Thus in the end both debts will have been cleared off.

the producers will have made and sold their goods without any hectic anxiety about overproduction, labour costs, or other worries, and the consumers will have been enabled to satisfy their desires, and all this will have taken place without leaving any complications behind.

Mr. O'Duffy is 'neither a banker, treasury official, nor academic economist.' He has simply attacked the problems he deals with, with a layman's common-sense. It may, however, be greatly doubted whether a mere layman's commonsense can possibly lead us very far towards a solution of the complicated economic difficulties from which the world is suffering. The ingenious plan which we have set forth above (mostly in the author's own words) may strike some as simple and plausible. But the optimism which expects it to work without a hitch appears to us to border on madness. The difficulties will be innumerable and some of them so elusive that no amount of ingenuity will quite overcome them. To mention only one difficulty, Mr. O'Duffy assumes that the calculations regarding the amount of currency required will be sufficiently reliable for ensuring the smooth working of his scheme. This assumption is wholly unwarranted and if it is admitted that there is every danger of the calculations being far out, should we not be blundering just the same as now or worse? Mr. O'Duffy would have a competent Currency Board, its chairman being a Cabinet Minister of the first rank and its members being partly representatives of Parliament, and partly experts on finance, currency, and the chief branches of economics. However, even if the Currency Board were to be manned by supermen, serious errors and miscalculations would be unavoidable. It should also be quite clear that Mr. O'Duffy's scheme implies such a drastic change in the existing economic organization that anything like it must at once be voted as being outside the bounds of practical politics. We must therefore conclude that on the constructive side the author does not offer us anything useful or valuable. Nonetheless he has written an eminently readable and stimulating book and in the course of his argument he has found occasion to demolish with much wit and vigour quite a number of current economic fallacies. Mr. O'Duffy on the whole dislikes economists, and his criticism of them (and these include some of the greatest names in economics like J. M. Keynes, Pigou, Stamp, etc.) is scathing, vehement and severe, though we fear not always just. It is all the more surprising therefore that he ends up by insisting on their presence on his Currency Board. It reminds one of what the little girl said of the dog who was barking while at the same time wagging his tail: "He is pleased at one end and angry at the other!"

Mr. Allen Young is also apparently an amateur, but he writes in a more moderate tone and shows a greater awareness of the extreme complexity of the subject and the great difficulty of suggesting an altogether satisfactory way of escaping from the present economic labyrinth. He starts from the premise that an artificial deficiency of purchasing power is the root cause of stagnant industry and trade and for remedying this deficiency he pins his faith to the plan suggested by Major Clifford Douglas in his "Economic Democracy" and other books and also in his evidence before the Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce in Ottawa (1923), and before the MacMillan Committee (1930). The policy proposed is the novel one of bringing about a *reduction* in prices by *increasing* the supply of money. The economic system is at present blocked because the consumer cannot buy all he wants at the present price-level. New credits must therefore be created and applied so as to

remove this block by financing a reduction of prices. Credits should be issued to make up the difference between the present price of an article and the price necessary to enable that article to be sold. Thus, suppose a purchaser can only afford to spend £750 on a car but the seller cannot afford to accept less than £1,000. Under these conditions £1,000 is paid in the usual way, but the purchaser receives a Treasury voucher entitling him to claim a transfer to his account at his Bank of public credit to the extent of £250. Thus the purchaser pays £750 and the seller gets £1,000, and both live happily ever afterwards. All this is no doubt very puzzling. It would however take too much time and space to explain the project fully, and the curious reader must refer to the book itself for more light.

Amateur writers on economic subjects are apt to adopt an attitude of pity mingled with contempt towards the professional economist. The economist, however, would generally do well to treat his laymen critics with attention and respect. Because buried in his conventionalism he may fail to see what is clear to the clever and shrewd outsider. The vision of the layman combined with the economist's expert knowledge often furnishes a valuable foundation for sound practical policy.

G. B. JATHAR.

INDIAN RELIGIOUS LIFE.

KABIR AND HIS FOLLOWERS. By F. E. KEAY.
(Association Press, Calcutta.) 1931. 18cm.
186p. Rs. 2/-

ANOTHER valuable contribution to the Religious Life of India series has recently been made by Rev. F. E. Keay whose work on Hindi Literature still remains our handiest reference book in English, on this vast subject. The present work was originally the author's thesis for the degree of Doctor of Literature in the London University, which has been considerably revised and in parts rewritten. Our general view is that Dr. Keay has fully lived up to his reputation as a thorough and deeply-penetrative scholar of Indian religious literature. He has very ably handled all his resources and the beautifully printed and rare illustrations add considerably to the merits of the work. We have no doubt that Kabirites as well as the students of the mediaeval bhakti cult will fully appreciate the services of Dr. Keay and express their sincere gratitude for his untiring labours in the cause of our mother-tongue.

On several points of fact and interpretation we have our differences with Dr. Keay. But it is no fault of the work or of the author if all the MSS. available to others better situated could not be consulted by him. Dr. M. Singh of the Oriental College, Lahore, who has been for several years working on "A History of Panjabi Literature" and whose work will soon see the light of the day, has with the help of several newly discovered MSS. shown that Kabir died long before Nanak had been born, that the influence of Kabir on subsequent sects has been much less than is alleged by Dr. Keay. The writings of several sects said to have been influenced by Kabir have been unearthed by him. In this connection we cannot but refer to several old MSS. of the Bani of Kabir, Ramanand, Dadu, Sandar, Namdev and Ramdas which are to be found in the Panjab both in Hindi and Panjabi scripts and to the Panjabi lives of these saints written during the seventeenth century which have also been lately given to the public by Dr. Singh. We hope that in his next edition Dr. Keay will be able to incorporate

more valuable evidence and enhance the prestige of his scholarship which is already exemplary.

SURYAKANTA SASTRY.

"FREE-RENDERING" OF JNANESHWARI.
GITA EXPLAINED BY DNYANESHWAR MAHARAJ. Trans. into English by MANU SUBEDAR.
 (Manu Subedar, Palli Hill, Bandra.) 1932. 35cm.
 330p. Rs. 2.

THIS is an attempt to put before the English-speaking world a free rendering of Jñāneshvari, a well-known Marathi commentary on the Bhagvat-Gita by the 13th century Maratha saint-poet, Jñāneshvar. Jñāneshvari is one of the few works in the Marathi language for which that language should be studied even by foreigners. It is an attempt by one master mind to interpret the thoughts of another master mind. And on account of the richness and flow of style, beauty and simplicity of expression, depth of thought, and above all the great variety of rich spiritual experience embodied therein, this attempt—the Jñāneshvari—has proved such an eminent success that it is no exaggeration to say that few works of this type in any language can equal it. For the last six hundred years and more, it has been a source of inspiration to millions of Marathi-speaking people. A translation of such a work was long over-due and Mr. Subedar is to be congratulated upon having done this signal service to the gospel of Jñāneshvar. It is almost a truism that such works, of superb art baffle all attempts at exact translation. They are, truly speaking, to be read in the original. Perhaps being conscious of this, Mr. Subedar has offered to his readers what he calls a free-rendering. But even 'free-rendering' has its limitations. As it is after all a rendering, it can never be absolutely original. For instance, it is essential to make a distinction between a free-rendering and an incorrect translation. Mr. Subedar's free-rendering is unfortunately wrong in some places. Of these we give below a few instances:—

P. 37, 26th line. "I am like a star facing the sun." What is meant is not "star" but "fire-fly."

P. 42, 5th line. Favour of the Preceptor (Guru-Bhakti). This is misleading. As it is, the word 'Guru-Bhakti' means the love of the disciple for the Guru. In the original, there is Guru-Kripa.

P. 86, 10th line. 'The Yogi does not see (with his mind's eye) the world.' It ought rather to be "Just as the spirit goes unobserved, this Yogi, though functioning along with our embodied beings, remains unrecognised by them."

P. 238, 16th line. "These two persons have one mother." Exactly opposite is the idea which Jñāneshvar wanted to express. The third Purusha is not their 'mother' but their 'devourer.'

These few typical examples are sufficient to show that this free-rendering ought to be read with great caution. The reference to these errors is however not meant to be little the value of the attempt before us. Nobody is more conscious of the difficulties of Mr. Subedar's task than the reviewer and if a reference is made to the mistakes in his work it is with a view to prevent their being perpetuated.

Mr. Subedar at times seems to have read more into some passages of Jñāneshvari than is warranted. In the 11th verse of the 9th Adhyaya, Jñāneshvar is criticising those who would look to God only with physical eyes. But we are doubtful if Mr. Subedar's "smash the idols" is a faithful representation of his meaning. In this connection, we should like to draw the attention of Mr. Subedar

to what Jñāneshvar himself has said in the 16th Adhyaya about what Mr. Subedar has rendered as "men with evil attributes," or men who may in general be called heretics.

Though the original charm of the work is not likely to be derived in this rendering, the reader will, on the whole, certainly get a fairly good idea of what Jñāneshvar felt and wanted to express by a perusal of this book.

S. V. DANDEKAR.

SHORT NOTICES.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE PRINCIPLES OF CIVICS. By SUDHIR KUMAR LAHIRI AND BENOYENRANATH BANERJEE. (The Book Co., Calcutta.) 1932. 20cm. 136p. Re. 1-12.

THE authors "felt that there was room for an introductory work which would give to the Indian reader a clear grasp of problems relating to citizenship" and have succeeded in presenting in the short space of 130 pages the main principles governing the State, Government and Citizenship. It is a welcome publication for the casual reader as well as for the serious student.

The treatment is academic. Quotations of phrase and sentence from well-known western authors abound in the book, without, however, obtruding on the reader's attention. The authors have been very cautious in their criticism of Indian conditions. No serious attempt has been made in the book to evaluate Indian social life and indicate how the new demands on the individual might be related to the old ideals.

On the whole, the book offers a good summary, in simple and clear language, of the results of western experience in civic and political life.

The price might have been lower and within the means of people even of very limited means.

K. KRISHNA IYENGAR.

A WORD TO GANDHI: THE LESSON OF IRELAND. By F. P. CROZIER. (Williams & Norgate.) 1931. 20cm. 142p. 4/6.

THE author of this book has been convinced from personal observation and experience in Ireland during the bloody months of 1920-21 of the dangers of 'Black and Tannery' and is anxious that these dangers should not be let loose on India. He therefore asks India to beware and England to behave. Though he is a supporter of firm rule and even of martial law on occasions, he says: "The lesson to be deduced for India is that Englishmen, Scotsmen and Welshmen must insist that the Lloyd-George folly in Ireland, the Churchill folly about Natal and Ireland, the Chamberlain folly about South Africa and the Coalition folly in Westminster in 1920-21 is not repeated in 1931-32 in India, Delhi and Westminster and that Right takes the place of Wrong" (p.76). He has graphically described all the horrors which Ireland went through just before she became a Free State and shudders to think what may be in store for India and England if the policy of these mad reprisals was repeated on an extensive scale. Therefore "agreement between India and England is the only way of solving the difficulties of both countries." The author is of opinion that the "most crying need to-day is for men who think as Mr. Churchill does about India to be kept out of Parliament and public life." The book was written soon after the Gandhi-Irwin Pact was signed but before Gandhi actually went to England. The author

suggests that 'immediately after the requisite power is secured by him, Mr. Gandhi should (1) appoint an Indian Viceroy, (2) appoint Indian Governors and Lieutenant-Governors, (3) uproot all extravagances, reduce budget charges and abolish all pomp, (4) (5) negotiate by agreement the position, pay and future of the British and the Indian armies in India, (6) arrange the control of finances and the safeguarding of credit with great Britain, (7) make arrangements for the termination of appointments of as many Europeans as possible, (8) reorganise the Indian police and (9) acquire safeguards from England. Having seen a great deal of force in use and applied that force for over thirty years and having experienced its utter failure, the author realises that only a return to the weapons of love, tolerance, faith and truth can save England, India and the world.

A.

A SHORT HISTORY OF THE WORLD.

H. G. WELLS. (Watts & Co., London.) 17cm
310p. 1/-

THE main purpose of this work is to introduce a layman to the study of history. The author has certainly succeeded in achieving this aim, by a careful arrangement of the subject matter and by his usually lucid style. It is no mean achievement to give a casual reader an adequate knowledge of ideas and events, from the earliest times, when life began, right down to the present day. Dealing with the great war (1914-18) the author gives us a new explanation of its causes. According to him,

"the progress of the modern technical science gives power, power over steel, over distance, over disease; whether that power is used well or ill, depends on the moral and political intelligence of the world. The Governments of Europe, inspired by antiquated policies of hate and suspicion, found themselves with unexampled powers both of destruction and resistance in their hands."

In the last two chapters, the modern development of socialism in the world and its sway over Russia are discussed in an interesting manner. An average reader, who has neither the time nor inclination to study history in detail, can acquire the necessary knowledge of history from this small volume. Moreover a book of this kind is bound to create a taste for the study of history.

M. S. CHEEMA.

WHAT I OWE TO CHRIST. By C. F. ANDREWS.
(Association Press, Calcutta.) 1932. 20cm,
511p. Rs. 3/-

I CLOSED this book with a feeling that I had been sitting near someone very dear to me. Its utter sincerity and simplicity strike one on every page. The author paints a series of cameos. Each one is so intimately personal that you feel when finishing the last chapter that you have been holding Mr. Andrews' hand.

In the introduction he says:—"There has been granted me one abiding happiness, for which I thank God every day. I have been blessed with wonderful friendships. Thank God, much love has been richly granted, surmounting all conventional barriers of race or religion. I came out to teach, but I have humbly to confess that continually I have found myself a learner at the feet of Saints whose life-surrender to the will of God was far more whole-hearted than my own. Such practical experience as this has made me unwilling to draw the boundaries of Christian faith as sharply as I did before."

Then follow descriptions of his younger days—his mother and his father, his physical weaknesses and his spiritual trials. As we read on, we cannot help making his story a part of ourselves. India has obviously played a big part in the author's religious evolution. I wonder if Mahatma Gandhi had Mr. Andrews in mind when he said, "The bloom of the rose does not need to proclaim itself loudly to the world. Its very perfume is the witness of its own sweetness. So a Christian life that grows silently like the rose is the truest witness to Christ."

ARTHUR YOUNG.

AN INDIAN PEASANT MYSTIC. TRANSLATIONS FROM TUKARAM. By JOHN S. HOYLAND.

(H. R. Allenson, London.) 1932. 13cm. 79p. 1/-

THE book under review offers 'translations' of some of the Abhangas of the poet-saint Tukaram who flourished in the 17th century A. D. and who contributed not a little to the moulding of the thoughts and the feelings of the Marathas during that eventful century and those following it. It is one of the signs of the times which augurs well for the future of India that some of the Europeans in India have taken to a study of the vernacular literatures not in a spirit of condescending superiority, but in a spirit which yearns to know and to understand sympathetically and imaginatively all that stirred the hearts of the peoples among whom they are living. The 'translations' before us are not literal translations, but they are something better. They faithfully reflect in English what Tukaram really thought and felt. Those Europeans who cannot follow Tukaram in the original and who yet wish to have glimpses of what his poetry was like should feel thankful to the translator, Mr. John S. Hoyland, for offering in this handy book 'translations' of some of the best Abhangas of that poet. The credit of popularising among Europeans the Marathi poets and especially Tukaram belongs to scholars like the Rev. Dr. N. Macnicol and the late Rev. Dr. Justin Abbott. The credit of translating, more or less literally, many of the Abhangas of Tukaram belongs to the late Mr. J. Nelson Fraser and the late Rao Bahadur K. B. Marathe. But to Mr. Hoyland goes the credit of reproducing in English something of the poetic terseness and the spiritual fervour of that Maratha poet.

V. M. JOSHI.

INDIA IN TRANSITION. By D. GRAHAM POLE.

(Hogarth Press, London.) 20cm. 395p. 8/6.

MR. GRAHAM POLE—the well-known friend of India—has attempted once again to remove the callous ignorance of the British public by writing this book. He gives a historical survey of the recent political events which is, however, not complete, but as the author hopes, is sufficient to give the reader a fair grasp of realities of the Indian situation. "The only way really to understand is to try to see events as they present themselves to Indians." This is the key-note of the whole survey which brings the story of Indian constitutional reform up to the end of the second R.T.C. and the inauguration of the ordinance regime of last year.

The historical survey is followed by very instructive chapters on "The Indian States," "Indian Agriculture," "The Royal Commission on Agriculture and Labour," "Fiscal Policy," "Railways," "Mines," "Factories," "Trade Unions," "Factory Legislation and allied subjects." The author quotes profusely from eminent Indian and English publicists and his book is readable.

N. S. S.

THE GARDEN OF THE EAST. By N. V. THADANI. (Bharat Publishing House, Karachi.) 1932. 20cm. 127p.

SOME of the fine gems of the world's poetry are hidden in Persian literature which is receiving increasing attention all over the world, as shown by the large number of translations of Persian poets in all languages. The genius of every language differs, —and it is impossible for a translator to express in some other language the fragrant and informing subtleties and the sweet suggestiveness of Persian poetry. Mr. Thadani has attempted to introduce his readers to selected master-pieces from poets like Firdausi, Omar Khayyam, Sadi and Hafiz. He has not merely given a translation and a rendering, but has tried to recreate the spirit of each master in a new form. This is an exceedingly difficult task which Mr. Thadani has achieved with a good deal of success. Upon this he deserves to be congratulated. His volume is very interesting and enjoyable. He closely follows the thoughts of the poems to which he introduces his

readers. The book can be recommended to those who are interested in poetry and also to students of Persian literature who wish to see how the thoughts of Persian poets can be expressed in a poetical form in English.

M. AHMAD.

THE CROSS AND INDIAN THOUGHT. By V. CHAKKARAI. (Christian Literature Society, Madras.) 1932. 18cm. 292p. Re. 1/4.

WHETHER there is a doctrine of the Cross in Hinduism is a thing of which we are not certain. But the value of what Cross means in Christianity, what it means in human life, has its counterpart in Hindu thought and in the warp and woof of Indian life. With such a background Mr. Chakkarai very ably correlates the Cross with Indian thought. We strongly commend this book to thoughtful readers desiring riches of inner life.

G. Y. MARTYN, C. S. S.

RESULTS OF THE R. T. C.

MR. N. M. JOSHI'S STATEMENT.

Mr. N. M. Joshi, a delegate to the R. T. C., who arrived in Bombay on the 19th inst. has issued the following statement to the Press:

THE outstanding result of the Round Table Conference is that an All-India Federation has become a practical question. But unfortunately it is still uncertain when the Federation will come into existence, and what kind of Federation it will be. After having closely observed the work done at the R. T. C., my attitude towards its results and procedure has tended to be critical. There was more of speech-making there than of negotiation. It must be admitted that there was more concerted action in the Sapru group this year than before. But there was hardly any co-operation between this group and the Muslim group, and still less between the British Indian group and the Indian States' group.

Under these circumstances, it is natural that the British delegation, which has always worked together and still more so during this year's Conference, from which the Labour party was absent, should have won all along the line. Moreover, this year some important questions, which ought to have been discussed, remained undiscussed for want of time. I recognise that time was of great essence, and that there was an undoubted advantage in finishing the work before Christmas from the Parliamentary point of view.

QUESTIONS UNTOUCHED.

But the failure to discuss some important questions has left the picture incomplete. For example, questions like the relation of the Secretary of State for India with the future autonomous provinces and to the federal responsible government, and the desirability of abolishing or retaining the India Council, were not touched upon. As the special powers of the Governor-General and of the Governors are admittedly to last only during the transitional period, the question when the transitional period is to end, and the method by which it is to be terminated, ought to have been raised and settled.

The Montagu-Chelmsford constitution had at least provided for a re-examination of the position before a period of ten years by a Commission. But we did not discuss the question whether the transitional period should be ended automatically, or whether there should be a re-examination within a certain period, or the method by which re-exami-

nation should be made. The provision for re-examination before ten years had greatly influenced the Indian Moderates in accepting the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms. I myself would advocate an automatic expansion of the constitution; but to avoid even to discuss the question is to court difficulties.

STATES.

Another important question which was not discussed was the terms of the treaties which are to be entered into with the States to enable them to join the Federation. Fortunately, in reply to a question of mine whether the States will be at liberty to leave the Federation after notice, the Secretary of State assured us that that was not intended. It is intended that individual States will be at liberty to reserve to themselves the control of certain aspects of even federal subjects; but British India is not to have any voice in deciding whether States should be allowed to join the federation with the reservation they may propose. There may also be other terms in the treaties which may adversely affect the interests of the federation, but British India, which is after all the greater partner in the federation, is not to have a voice in settling these terms.

LATEST DATE.

Still one more question which should have been discussed is that of the latest date on which the federation must come into existence. It is true that the federation as contemplated at present depends upon the joining of the States. But, if we find after a year that the States do not join, British India is entitled to know to-day what is to be its future in that eventuality. I strongly feel that the picture has thus been left considerably incomplete.

As to the work done at the three sessions of the R. T. C. my general criticism of the part played by the British Indian delegation is that we unwarily, tacitly or expressly accepted certain general propositions, and then tried to qualify the acceptance by reservations when the general acceptance was found to go too far. I think it would have been a wiser policy to refuse to accept general propositions from the beginning, and only to agree to make concessions to the other side, where concession was desirable.

UNWISE TACTICS.

We tacitly seemed to agree to the proposition that responsible government at the centre could only

be established, if the States joined the federation. But when we were faced with the insistence on the part of the Government that half the number of the States, with half of their total population, must agree to join as an essential condition, we on our part claimed that the federation of British Indian provinces shall come into existence if the States do not join in adequate strength or even if they do not join at all.

We should have remembered that the preamble to the Montagu-Chelmsford constitution did not insist upon the joining of the Princes for the establishment of responsible government for British India. The claim of the Princes to be the sole arbiters of the methods of selection of their representatives was generally accepted. But this creates a difficulty in the establishment of a popular chamber, if the Princes do not choose to make their representation popular.

ANOTHER BLUNDER.

We tacitly or expressly accepted the general proposition that for the transfer of control over currency and exchange the establishment of a Reserve Bank was essential, but when we found that on account of the world economic depression, an early establishment of the Bank was problematical, we were faced with the difficulty of getting responsibility in finance diminished almost to vanishing point. If the present Government can control currency and exchange without a Reserve Bank, there is no reason why the future responsible government could not carry on similarly till the Bank is established.

If we agree to the general proposition that a creditor country has a right to control the finances of the debtor country, at least to the extent of securing that the security on which the loans were given was not impaired, we are not likely to get full financial responsibility within a measurable period of time. There is no reason why India, a country within the British Commonwealth, should accept such a principle when we know that Great Britain has advanced equally large sums to the Argentine and other foreign countries without insisting upon any control over their finances.

DISCRIMINATION.

If we accept a general proposition that there shall not be racial discrimination in commerce, trade and industry we shall certainly find it difficult to keep the key industries in Indian hands, and to prevent the interference of the Governor-General and of the Governors in the day-to-day administration of these matters on the ground of discrimination.

As regards defence, there is no provision for adequate influence of the legislature, or of the steps by which the control will ultimately come into the hands of the Indians. In addition to the constitutional proposals, Government must accept a policy of more rapid Indianisation of the officer ranks of the Indian Army and the gradual withdrawal of the British troops. Unless the proposals of the Conference or of Government on all these subjects are substantially modified they cannot be regarded as satisfactory.

My special criticism as a representative of Indian Labour is that the three sessions of the R. T. C. have resulted in creating an impression that India is divided into various communities only according to race, religion or caste; that what matters most to the people is the maintenance of racial, religious, cultural, lingual angularities so that, not even by mistake will India ever become one country; and

that if besides these anything else is to be protected it is the vested interests of the propertied classes.

HILL TRIBES IGNORED.

The question of protecting the interests of the masses and of the working classes has completely been lost sight of. At this year's Conference, the right of labour representation was only tardily recognised. While small communities like the Sikhs, Europeans and Anglo-Indians were represented, nobody thought of securing the representation of more than ten millions of aboriginal and hill tribes. Labour has been given some but inadequate special representation in the Assembly and in the provincial legislatures, but in the Upper Chamber labour will find it extremely difficult to get any representation.

The representation given to the aboriginal and hill tribes even in the provincial legislatures is, in some cases, very negligible. In C. P., where they form one-fifth of the population, they are given only one seat out of 112. In the Central Legislature, their right for representation is not recognised. As property still remains the main basis of franchise, the chances of these classes securing any representation through the general constituencies are practically none.

Protective labour legislation cannot make much progress through the future legislatures, unless a way is found for having common labour legislation for the whole of India. There is also a danger of the disappearance of the influence of the I. L. O. on the future labour legislation of India. Moreover, as the federation will not have expanding and direct sources of revenue the federal Government will not have money for undertaking schemes for social insurance and for other social services.

THE RIGHT TO LIVE.

Although fundamental rights for the protection of religion and language are thought of, the simple right to work and live is ignored. The condition of the masses in India has remained the same under the Moghuls, the Marathas and the British, and to them self-government will have no meaning unless they are given a constitutional weapon by which it could be improved.

There is very hard work before the Indian politicians within the next few months. If the constitution is to be made satisfactory to us, a negative attitude of silence will be ruinous. When the White Paper will be published, Indians of various schools of thought, and belonging to different communities and representing various interests, will have to cooperate in examining the document with care, and if they can press for amendments with the united strength their influence is bound to be felt.

I hope Government will have the wisdom to set the Congressmen free, and give them another opportunity to pull their weight together with the representatives of other schools of thought.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- LIFE-HISTORIES OF INDIAN MICROLEPIDOPTERA
By T. BAINBRIDGE FLETCHER. (Government of India Central Publication Branch, Calcutta.) 1932. 25cm. 58p. Rs. 3-4.
- THE PUBLIC GENERAL ACTS AND MEASURES
22 & 23 Geo. V. 1931-32. 1932. 25cm.
- HISTORY OF INDIAN PHILOSOPHY. Vol. 7. By S. K. BELVALKAR and R. D. RANADE. (Aryabhushan Press Poona 2.) 1933. 25cm. 494p. Rs. 15.