

The Servant of India

EDITOR : P. KODANDA RAO.

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

VOL. XVI, No. 8. } POONA--THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1933.

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

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK.	85
ARTICLES :—	
The Railway Budget.	87
Harijan Bills.	88
War Debts Problem.	90
Bombay Legislature's Doings.	91
Retrenchment in Bombay—A Suggestion. By Retrenchment-Axe.	93
OUR LONDON LETTER.	94
REVIEW :—	
Prevention of Future Wars. By M. S. Cheema.	95
SHORT NOTICES.	95
CORRESPONDENCE :—	
Weightage and Election. By Observer.	96
BOOKS RECEIVED.	96

Topics of the Week.

Gokhale Day.

GOKHALE DAY, being the 18th anniversary of the death of the late Mr. G. K. Gokhale, was celebrated in several parts of India on the 19th inst. In Poona the Deccan Sabha organised a public meeting at which the principal speaker was Prof. V. G. Kale, who knew Mr. Gokhale intimately and had collaborated with him for several years in various spheres of public work.

With the removal of untouchability so much to the fore at the moment, it is interesting to recall that as early as 1903 Mr. Gokhale moved a resolution on the subject at the Social Conference at Dharwar. The means of uplifting the Depressed Classes, the Resolution said with true insight, was by inculcating self-respect among the members of the community and by placing within their reach facilities for education and employment. In the course of his telling speech Mr. Gokhale pleaded earnestly for the uplift of the Depressed Classes on grounds of justice, humanity and national self-interest. In concluding his speech, Mr. Gokhale said :—

This work is bound to be slow and can only be achieved by strenuous exertions for giving them education and finding for them honourable employment in life. And, gentlemen, it seems to me that in the present state of India no work can be higher or holier than this. I think if there is one question of social reform more than another which should stir the enthusiasm of our educated young men and inspire them with an unselfish purpose, it is this question of the degraded condition of our low castes. Cannot a few men, five per cent, four per cent, three, two or

even one per cent, of the hundreds and hundreds of graduates that the University turns out every year, take it upon themselves to dedicate their lives to this sacred work of the elevation of the low castes?... What the country needs most at the present moment is a spirit of self-sacrifice on the part of our educated young men, and they may take it from me that they cannot spend their lives in a better cause than raising the moral and intellectual level of these unhappy low castes and promoting their general well-being.

* * *

Trickery.

IN the discussion on the release of Mahatma Gandhi in the Legislative Assembly the circumstances in which the civil disobedience movement came to be re-started were adverted to, non-official members making out that the refusal on the part of the Viceroy to see Mahatma Gandhi and discuss with him the need for the Ordinances that had been promulgated provoked the resumption of civil disobedience. One can understand the anxiety of Government to disown their own indirect connexion with and responsibility for the political upheaval that followed, but in doing so they need not have laid themselves open, as they have, to a distortion of facts. For they have issued a press *communiqué* in which they are at great pains to quote the portion of the Viceroy's telegram of 31st December 1931, in which the Viceroy responds to Mahatma Gandhi's request for an interview, but carefully omits to mention that in the very next sentence the Viceroy ruled out the only subject to discuss which Mahatma Gandhi could possibly have sought an interview.

It is necessary to reproduce here the relevant passages in order to bring out the sleight-of-hand and trickery of which Government are guilty :—

"His Excellency is unwilling to believe that you have personally any share in the responsibility for, or that you approve of, the recent activities of the Congress in the United Provinces and the North-West Frontier Province. If this is so, he is willing to see you and to give you his views as to the way in which you could best exert your influence to maintain the spirit of co-operation which animated the proceedings of the Round Table Conference."

This passage, being favourable to Government, is quoted in the *communiqué*, but the governing sentence, quoted below, being unfavourable, is omitted :—

"But His Excellency feels bound to emphasise that he will not be prepared to discuss with you measures which the Government of India, with the full approval of His Majesty's Government, have found it necessary to adopt in Bengal, the United Provinces and the North-West Frontier Province." (Italics ours.)

Mahatma Gandhi surely did not wish to pay a social visit to Lord Willingdon, and the latter, in asking

the former to keep out the one subject of concern to him, for all practical purposes declined to see him. The public somewhat carelessly lay at the door of Lord Willingdon the blame for refusing to see Mahatma Gandhi altogether. Actually he refused to discuss the Ordinances with him and the resolutions passed by public bodies make the distinction, however slight and unsubstantial it may be. The resolution of the Servants of India Society's Council, e. g., on this subject was as follows:—

The Council is of opinion that the Viceroy's refusal to allow Mahatma Gandhi to discuss the Ordinances with him was inadvisable and unjustified, as a personal interview might possibly have prevented the resumption of civil disobedience.

In so far as the Viceroy barred the way to a possible clearing up of the situation and the reaching of a mutual understanding, Government cannot escape their share of responsibility for the turn that events took subsequently. It is hardly necessary to reiterate our views on the subject, but our object in referring to the matter at all here is to show how, by resort to a *suppressio veri*, they have tried, to use a phrase of Sir John Simon's on a recent occasion in the League of Nations, to "paint everything black on the one side and to present it in spotless raiments of white on the other." This crude attempt at manipulation of the truth is utterly unworthy of Government, and we cannot condemn it too strongly.

* * *

Madras and the R. T. C. Scheme.

MADRAS has followed the lead given by Bombay in organising a large public meeting last week to express dissatisfaction with certain features of the R. T. C. scheme. The Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri presided over the meeting and the weighty resolution passed unanimously by the meeting was moved by Sir P. S. Sivaswami Aiyar and supported, among others, by Dewan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao and Mr. Yakub Hassan. The Resolution ran as follows:—

(a) In order to appease the political discontent in the country and secure a peaceful atmosphere for the consideration of the forthcoming reform proposals on their merits, this meeting urges the immediate release of Mahatma Gandhi and other political prisoners.

(b) This meeting expresses dissatisfaction at the reform proposals as they have emerged from the discussions of the recent Round Table Conference and considers that great improvements are required before they can be brought into accord either with the expectations of the people or with the pronouncements of the Viceroy made in 1929 with the authority of His Majesty's Government.

(c) To prepare for the complete transfer of the subject of Defence to Indian control, without which the attainment of Dominion Status as promised in 1917 and re-affirmed in 1929 would be impossible, this meeting considers among various measures that a definite period must be fixed for the nationalisation of the Army and that recruitment for all branches and ranks must be thrown open to all communities and provinces in the country.

(d) This meeting is of opinion that the time is come for the abolition of the office of the Secretary of State and of the India Council and that the functions of the Secretary of State in Council be entrusted to the Secretary of State for the Dominions.

An unfortunate and wholly regrettable impression was created by certain remarks of some speakers at

the public meeting in Bombay on the subject that the expression of dissatisfaction with the R. T. C. scheme implied a censure of the Indian members who participated in the Conference. Mr. Sastri, as President of the Madras meeting, did well to make it absolutely clear that no such censure was meant. On the other hand, the Indian nationalist members of the Conference had done their duty well and deserved the gratitude of the country. Censure was out of the question inasmuch as some of the most outstanding Indian members of the Conference were themselves dissatisfied with the scheme outlined by the Secretary of State and had suggested some essential improvements and had invited the country to support them in their endeavours. It was in response to their suggestion that these meetings were being held. Nobody has subjected the R. T. C. results to a more searching criticism or more relentlessly shown up its defects than Mr. Chintamani, the editor of the "Leader". But he has made it clear in a note in the "Leader" of the 20th inst. that criticism of the Secretary of State's proposals involved no criticism of the Indian nationalist members. "Let alone a very few differences on specific points, the nationalist members of the Conference exerted themselves to achieve results such as would have satisfied their compatriots. It was not their fault that they did not succeed."

* * *

Bombay Budget.

BOMBAY budgets have for so long been a series of deficit budgets that the man in the street has ceased to look for any provision in them for the development of nation-building activities. His only interest in them is with a view to finding out the extent of deficit and the amount of the additional burden which it may mean to him. The budget presented to the Bombay legislative council on Saturday last discloses a deficit of Rs. 35 lakhs for the next year, as against that of Rs. 27 lakhs for the current year, the estimated revenue receipts being Rs. 14.86 crores with a probable expenditure of Rs. 15.21 crores. The deficit has been calculated at Rs. 35 lakhs on the supposition that the legislature will not refuse to renew the emergency taxation measures approved by it last year. The duty on tobacco, the new financial measure proposed by Government this year, is expected to yield Rs. 4 lakhs, by which amount the deficit would be reduced were the tobacco duty allowed by the legislative council. It should be noted that the partial restoration of the cut in the salaries of Government servants has been responsible for swelling the deficit by about Rs. 14 lakhs. The deficit figure is not higher than it actually is owing to the fact that the next year's budget like its predecessor does not provide for the payment of the debt instalment to the Central Government. Had this payment not been postponed, the deficit would have been very nearly doubled.

The Finance Member's speech in introduction of the budget was largely an attempt to reply to the scathing criticism by the Thomas Committee of the Bombay Government's financial mismanagement and incompetence. Whether convincing or otherwise, it can bring nothing but cold comfort to those who have to pay through the nose to make the two ends of the budget meet. Profuse assurances about Government's intention to cut down expenditure were also forthcoming. But Government's intentions will be judged by the public not by such assurances but by the steps taken to translate them into action. And it must by now have become clear to them that to public opinion their actual performance is utterly disappointing in comparison to their promise.

* * *

Temple-Entry Bill.

WE hope the Temple-Entry Bill will not be pressed. But if it should be proceeded with, it is worth while to note certain of its provisions. For the purpose of the Bill the vote is given and limited to voters on the electoral roll of such local bodies as Municipalities, District or Taluka Boards or Panchayets within areas demarcated for such bodies. This seems a most unsatisfactory system, notwithstanding that some such method is now adopted to constitute temple boards under the Madras Religious Endowment Act. A temple may lie near the boundary of two such areas and the people on the other side of the boundary may be more interested in the temple than those in the area in which the temple is situated. But they will have no voice in determining if the temple should be thrown open to Harijans. Moreover, there are some big and famous temples which are visited by Hindus from all over India. But even the most devoted *Bhakta* of the temple will have no voice in the matter, if he resided in another district or province. Further, the electors of municipal and other local boards may consist of atheists, agnostics, free-thinkers and temple-haters, who, have no interest in the temple but will nevertheless be entitled to vote on the question of temple-entry, while devout worshippers and believers, who because they have not the necessary property qualifications for municipal franchise, will not be entitled to vote on the temple-entry question. Perhaps a better course will be to entitle all Hindus who choose to register their names on the roll to vote. All those who are interested in a particular temple, whether from far or near, whether they have property or not, should be given the right to register and vote.

Secular vs. Religious.

THE correspondence between Gandhiji and Malaviyaji raises an important question as to the advisability of religious questions being legislated upon by secular legislatures. The Untouchability Removal Bill provides for the non-co-operation of law with the custom of untouchability in any form and as such, will not give countenance to the bar against temple-entry by Harijans. But it does not touch the question whether temple-entry should be permitted or not. But the Temple-Entry Bill tackles directly the question of temple-entry and though action under it is optional, it nevertheless legislates on a "religious" question. Pandit Malaviyaji is opposed even to the indirect interference by the legislature in matters of religion, and temple-entry is a matter of religion and conscience. Gandhiji is also opposed to legislative interference in religious matters if it be of a compulsory character.

It seems right and desirable that in India, with many religions, the legislature consisting of representatives chosen from different religious communities should not legislate on religious dogma or practice. Such legislation should be left to religious synods and public opinion. It follows from it that religious disputes should not also be taken to the secular courts for adjudication. For instance, it should not be open to an orthodox person to apply to a secular court for an injunction against the entry of a temple by a Harijan. Gandhiji is right when he says that an existing legal bar can only be removed by legislation. But to remove the bar it is not necessary to pass the Temple-Entry Bill but it is quite sufficient to pass the Untouchability Removal Bill. The legal bar against temple-entry will be far more effectively removed by it than by the other bill, and it has the merit that it does not directly involve a religious issue and has support even from *sanatanists* like Panditji.

Articles.**THE RAILWAY BUDGET.**

THE Commerce Member's speech on the railway budget discloses no unusual or unexpected features this year. The depression, whose bottom it is confidently expected each year has been reached, continues in all its severity and receipts both from goods and passenger traffic show a steady decline. Though the year 1930-31 was already fairly bad it was from 1931-32 onwards that Indian railway finances were in really desperate straits. 1930-31 was the last year in which contributions to general revenues were made; since then such an allotment has naturally been impossible. The reserve fund built out of the profits of previous years was exhausted in 1931-32 and for the current year expenditure could be met only by borrowing from the depreciation fund and the same device is to be resorted to for the ensuing budget year. Both the Commerce Member in the Assembly and the Chief Commissioner for Railways in the Council of State were very anxious to impress on the minds of the legislators the inherent soundness of the financial position of Indian Railways. The Chief Commissioner indeed went so far as to conjure up a picture of an imaginary meeting of the shareholders and of the Board of Directors discussing whether 3 or 4 p. c. should be paid this year. It might be conceded that the present position of Indian Railway finances is fairly good as compared with that of some of the major systems of the world. But then these comparisons with private company finances are misleading; for they ignore the long history of state guarantee deficits that Indian public finances bore, especially during the last century. A relic of the last century goes by the board this year by the disappearance of the maintenance of separate accounts for the so-called strategic railways. The distinction between the strategic and commercial railways had now for some decades become indistinct and with the nationalisation of railways and their running as state departments this distinction had become entirely meaningless. This reform undoubtedly clears away an unnecessary complication which obstructed a right understanding of the railway accounts.

The revised estimates for the current year show a falling off of receipts below the budgeted figures. The expectation of a slight traffic recovery has not been fulfilled and the reduction in expenditure effected by the salary cut has also been overestimated. The result is that there will have to be a loan from the depreciation fund greater by nearly Rs. 1¼ crores than had been budgeted. In spite of this very recent experience it is surprising to see the Commerce Member estimating for an increase in his receipts in the ensuing year. And this increased estimate is put forward with no other justification than the bare statement that "there are legitimate grounds for hope that we have at last touched rock bottom." But we

suppose that the Commerce Member feels that it hardly matters if he overestimates. For it is only a question of an additional crore or two of borrowings from the depreciation fund.

With the budget thus being definitely a deficit budget, our attention naturally centres round what steps the Railway administration takes towards retrenchment and economy. There are no ways of increasing income. For already the fares and rates have been raised as high as they possibly can be and today with the low price level obtaining, transport charges bear more heavily on the agriculturist than ever before. Retrenchment, we are told, is being practised for some years past and there are now left really few new means of achieving it. Even so Mr. Pope whose services have been lent by Sir Josiah Stamp is analysing expenditure on various railway systems and examining further possibilities. The one heroic measure taken in this direction was the ten p. c. cut adopted by the Government of India last year. But as already the Central Government's finances are easier it has been decided to restore half of the cut and this decision is to apply to the salaries of railway officials also. In justifying this step Sir J. Bore maintained that no difference could be made between the railway and other employees of Government. We are not sure that this argument is perfectly sound. The separation of the railway budget, the insistence on the commercial character of their activity, the plea when it comes to a reduction of fares that railways must be looked upon by the legislators as shareholders would look upon a company, all these mark off the railways sharply from other departments. And if the Central Government restores half the cut because its finances are better, the railways need not follow the example when they cannot contribute anything to general revenues, cannot put a penny into the Reserve Fund and can balance the budget only by annually borrowing Rs. 14 to 15 crores from the depreciation fund. For ourselves, however, the restoration of the 5 p. c. is no great matter, believing as we do that only a really radical measure of salary

reform can ever help the finances of governments in India.

Capital expenditure on a large scale or new works are obviously under the circumstances impossible and Government are rightly cautious in embarking on large new programmes with borrowed capital. Railways to-day are obviously standing at an important turn in their career. The competition of road transport is being increasingly felt and no satisfactory means of co-ordinating these two transport agencies have yet been found. The Indian railways have perhaps felt the effects of this a little less yet than elsewhere; for motor-truck carriage of goods in this country has yet made little headway. But this only means evil deferred and sooner or later the shorthaul carriage of goods even is going to be lost to railways. Sir J. Bore was, therefore, right in suggesting the need for a thorough investigation before the lines of the new building programme for Indian railways could be laid down. We only hope that this means that Government is seriously thinking of such an investigation and not merely shelving the whole problem. We say this because we were not entirely satisfied with the very limited terms of reference given to the two officials recently appointed by Government to investigate one aspect of this problem and the methods of enquiry adopted by them. Neither is the amendment proposed to the Railway Act the best way of even immediately dealing with the problem. Sir J. Bore has made it clear that railways must try and adapt themselves to the new conditions and must prepare in these times of depression for taking their full share in the recovery when it comes. We suggest, therefore, that the present is the most suitable time for the appointment by Government of a representative Committee to go fully into the entire problem of rail and road transport co-ordination. As State control over both these can be greater in India than elsewhere, a solution of the problem could be more easily found with us, if only action is taken early and time is not given for vested interests to grow and entrench their position.

HARIJAN BILLS.

WITH characteristic zeal and energy Mahatma Gandhi has been leaving no stone unturned to secure the speedy passage of the Untouchability Removal and the Temple-Entry bills through the Indian central legislature and their translation to the statute book. He has been co-operating with anybody and everybody who could help: he has appealed to the Sanatanists, the reformers, and the Depressed Classes, the lawyers and the politicians, even the Government to expedite the enacting of the Bills, which is indicative of the great importance he attaches to the subject. One of the Bills is of a negative character and seeks expressly to withdraw the support that the current administration of law gives to untouchability: the law courts in British India may not be invoked in support of restrictions and disabili-

ties imposed and tolerated by force of custom. There is general support to this measure.

The other is the Temple-Entry Bill, which is a positive measure and seeks to provide machinery for the exercise of local option by caste-Hindus regarding the admission of Harijans to Hindu temples and for effect being given to a majority vote. This has evoked much controversy. It is however surprising that there should be any objection to the second bill from those who do not oppose the first. The first bill is all-comprehensive and in a sense includes the second. For the first bill provides that no discrimination of any kind, either sanctioned or tolerated by law or custom, shall be recognised by the law courts. Obviously, it covers the case of temple-entry by Harijans. If the first bill is enacted as it

is now drafted, there is no need for the second bill.

There is, on the other hand, from the point of view of the removal of untouchability a serious, almost fatal, weakness in the second bill. For, in the restricted sphere of temple-entry, the bill makes the removal of untouchability conditional on the majority vote of the caste-Hindus. If unfortunately the majority of caste-Hindus in any area continue to oppose temple-entry by Harijans, the ban remains; and in so far as the ban is a stigma of untouchability, it remains too. The first bill is comprehensive in scope and compulsory in effect, while the latter one is restricted in scope and optional in effect. Clearly, if the first bill passes, there is no need for the second.

Curiously enough, it is the second bill that has been the subject of controversy. Dr. B. R. Ambedkar has rejected it on the grounds that it does not stigmatise untouchability as "sin" which should under no circumstance be permitted or tolerated, that it makes temple-entry depend on the goodwill of the caste-Hindus, and that it is derogatory to the self-respect of Harijans to ask for temple-entry as a favour. He would not accord his support to the bill unless he is assured that it was a step leading to the goal of the elimination of the caste system altogether. Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, while cordially agreeing that civic and secular equality should be secured for Harijans by means of legislation where necessary, is opposed to legislative interference in a matter of religion and conscience, as in the case of temple-entry. This is not a matter for rule by majority vote, but for consent by peaceful persuasion. He draws a distinction between the two parts of the Bombay Resolution, and asserts that while the first part referring to civic rights is to be secured by legislation, the second referring to temple-entry is to be secured only by peaceful persuasion, and that resort to legislation to secure it is inadmissible under the Bombay Resolution. Gandhiji, on the other hand, disagrees with Panditji and holds that temple-entry forms part of the pledge that the Hindu Conference gave in Bombay and as such is binding on all Hindus; that legislation to secure the object is justified, specially as it is permissive and not mandatory. He would himself not wish the legislature to interfere with religious customs. He disagrees with Dr. Ambedkar also, inasmuch as he declines to join in doing away with the caste system altogether, while anxious to abolish untouchability.

It may be remarked in passing that there is some confusion as regards the Resolutions passed in Bombay. There was a meeting in Bombay on the 25th September last immediately after the Poona Pact was signed in Poona, which was attended by Hindu leaders from various parts of India, and another on the 30th September which was not so representative of Hindu India as the first was, for many up-country leaders had left Bombay before the second meeting. According to Mr. Pyarelal's "Epic Fast," which is the most authoritative account of the events which turned on the Fast, no reference was made at the first meeting to temple-entry. The text of the Resolution

as reproduced in the "Harijan" of the 18th inst., however, contains a reference to temple-entry. The discrepancy is surprising. Reference was made to temple-entry in the second Bombay meeting and formed part (b) of the second Resolution which constituted the All-India Anti-Untouchability League to carry on propaganda for securing civic rights as well as temple-entry to Harijans by peaceful persuasion, and no reference was made to legislation for civic rights, nor, as presumed by Pandit Malaviya, was a distinction made between legislation for civic rights and peaceful persuasion for temple-entry. Apparently both the Mahatma and the Pandit have mixed up the resolutions passed at the two meetings in Bombay.

While every move to abolish untouchability must receive the cordial and enthusiastic support of social reformers, we confess we are unable to enthuse over the question of temple-entry. There is so much superstition and irreligion encrusting the Hindu temples that it is a questionable benefit that Mahatma Gandhi is rendering to Harijans by fighting with his life for their admission into these temples. It seems a pity that such a magnificent campaign sponsored by as great a force as Mahatma Gandhi and with such grim determination, should be directed towards a purely sentimental and unsubstantial objective. Others, with Dr. Ambedkar, will wish that all this drive was directed towards more fruitful channels as, for instance, the action recently taken by the Bombay Government regarding the admission of Harijans to all public places and conveniences. Dr. Ambedkar does not want temple-entry and Malaviyaji opposes it. Social reformers do not think much of it.

Supposing the temple-entry bill was passed, and temples thrown open to Harijans by a majority vote of the caste-Hindus, will that abolish untouchability? The orthodox minority will continue to treat Harijans as depressed classes and perhaps abandon the temples "polluted" by them. Untouchability will not be mitigated if Harijans enter and the orthodox leave the temples. Those who are opposed to untouchability can give other evidences, of a more useful and substantial character than temple-entry, of their faith, such as social intercourse and civic comradeship.

Moreover, opening a temple to Harijans at the instance of a majority of Hindus and in the teeth of opposition by a minority, in a matter where "religion" and "conscience" are involved, might lead to breaches of the peace, and what the referendum permits the exigencies of law and order policy may be obliged to deny.

It will be by far the best course to drop the temple-entry question and the temple-entry bill and concentrate with the goodwill and support of Harijans, Sanatanists and reformers, on the far more useful and desired objective of enabling Harijans to share with the rest of the taxpayers the common amenities and rights to which all communities contribute and to which all are equally entitled.

WAR DEBTS PROBLEM.

IT is all to the good that the discussion that is to take place early in March between the British Government's representative and the President-elect of the United States will not be confined to the problem of war debts but will extend to "world economic problems" which will presumably include the raising of the price level, lowering of tariffs, restoration of the gold standard by countries which are now off gold, and, possibly, reduction of military expenditure by debtor countries. To invoke U.S.A.'s pity and commiseration will obviously be of no avail when the economic conditions in that country itself have become more unsatisfactory than in Great Britain. The distress and destitution that prevail in New York were recently described in the *Times* as follows: "Over a million of the city's inhabitants, representing one-third of the normal working population, are unemployed and dependent, where means have come to an end, upon public and private charity. Including dependents something like one-third of the entire populace is in the shadow of unemployment." "Other great American cities are in a similar plight. The rural areas are possibly still worse off, for the whole farming population has been reduced to despair, in many parts to actual ruin, by the long-continued fall of commodity prices." Such being the state of misery in the United States, an appeal to her charity can possibly bring no relief and must therefore be definitely abandoned. On the contrary it should be frankly admitted that any remissions that she might be persuaded to make to her debtors would necessarily increase her own liabilities. Making such an admission, the debtor countries may make an attempt to convince the United States that adjustment of the war debts downwards will benefit her in the long run as much as themselves. Great Britain should be able to produce this conviction in the mind of Mr. Roosevelt as she herself has proceeded on this basis in dealing with her debtors. In 1922 she made it clear that she would not exact from her debtors a larger sum than was required to pay her own creditors and in pursuing this policy she agreed to renounce a sum calculated at £2,550 millions from the debt owing to her. The war debts due to the United States are not larger in amount; they are calculated at £2,400 millions. Great Britain agreed to the remission because she hoped that she would ultimately derive a larger benefit from keeping her customers to whom she exported her goods solvent than by insisting upon her pound of flesh. And this hope has been realised. Similarly would the United States gain if, by a drastic reduction of her debtors' liabilities, she increased their purchasing power. This is the only approach that can possibly be successful with U. S. A.

The United States desires Britain to return to gold; also to reduce her expenditure on armaments. Suggestions are therefore sure to be made, in negotiating a revision of the war debts, in these directions. It is best therefore that all these questions are dis-

cussed together. The idea prevails in many influential American quarters that if Great Britain is to be excused her debts or let off with a much larger sum than she owes, it must be done at any rate on condition that she will effect a sweeping reduction in her military expenditure. It would no doubt be desirable to apply all possible pressure to Great Britain and other countries to cut down their expenditure on armaments but to make such reduction a *sine qua non* of the scaling down of the war debts is really to miss the whole point in the arguments of those who ask for cancellation or readjustment of war debts. Payment of war debts to America is mainly a transfer problem, which is not involved at all in military expenditure of the debtor countries. Mr. Brailsford shows in the *World Tomorrow* of 14th December 1932 how even if Great Britain stopped all her expenditure on armaments she would not be more able to pay off her American debts than if she continued to waste her substance on them. To think otherwise is "a plausible but most misleading fallacy." He says:

"Of course we are all wasting, criminally and stupidly, on warships and armaments, resources which ought to go to schools and workers' housing. Of course if we would first liberate India and reshape the Versailles Treaty, we could cut our fleets and armies to the mere proportions of a police force. But this would not touch our problem of international debt. The fallacy, like so many others, lies in supposing that one can reason from the experiences of private life to the relations of States. If a private debtor spends his income on champagne and race horses, one may fairly say that he is squandering what belongs to his creditor: if he stopped this extravagance he could pay. Well then, are armaments any better than champagne? Morally they are incomparably worse; but economically there is no analogy. We do not dissipate our income. It remains intact within our island, however ill we distribute it. We are, as a nation, no poorer after we have built our warships than we were before. All that has happened is that the State has taken many pounds in taxes out of my pocket and put them into the safe of Armstrong-Vickers, the great armament firm. I am less able to pay you, if you look at my unfortunate case, but Lord Armstrong is as solvent as you could desire. The whole trouble is that it is not easy to transfer his gains across the Atlantic. He could pay you in ships, which he builds well and cheaply (including impeccably pacific vessels), in locomotives and all manner of machinery, or he could exchange these things for other English wares better suited to your needs, and send you these. You (the Americans) will not take them: Messrs. Hawley and Smoot have seen to that."

Similarly the suggestion that the United States should lend enough gold to Britain to enable the latter to resume gold payments is equally futile. Assuming that Britain is willing to re-anchor her currency to gold the moment she has enough gold reserves, without inquiring as to whether the conditions necessary to a successful working of the gold standard have been established or not, the question that she will have to consider is how she is to pay back the money. There would remain an impassable barrier so long as the United States continued her present policy in regard to foreign trade.

For a foreign payment to be made it is not enough that the debtor country should have the resources to pay; it is equally necessary that the creditor country should so organise her economic system as to permit the debtor nation to make payment by the importation of goods (or by the discharge of services). The United States, however, being a creditor country, has still retained her pre-war foreign trade economy of a debtor country. Before the war she owed large sums in foreign lands and in order to discharge these obligations she encouraged exports all she could and discouraged imports by clapping on heavy import duties. It was the correct fiscal policy for her then; but, with the reversal of her financial position, she has obstinately refused to make the necessary adjustment in her trade policy. She has in fact gone on raising her tariff higher and higher till it has now become practically prohibitive. It is this failure to recognise what Mr. Goodenough, chairman of the Barclays Bank, described at the Bank's general meeting on 19th January, as "the fundamental principle," viz. "that a creditor nation must permit its debtors reasonable facilities to discharge their liabilities" that makes it impossible for Great Britain to meet the service of her debts. This can be done either by supplying goods or rendering services or remitting gold. The last mentioned means of making payment will be available to Great Britain only for a short time (she has £120 millions in the Bank of England at present), but even while it lasts it will not benefit but only injure the United States. She has already 35 per cent of the world's stock of monetary gold, and this is far more than she has any use for. Any addition to it will bring her no advantage. As the Rt. Hon'ble H. A. L. Fisher says in the January number of the Lloyds Bank Monthly Review, "Ordinarily speaking, when in the national operation of commerce, gold flows into a country it tends to send up a compensatory action by raising prices and stimulating imports. No such compensatory action is set up by these consignments of gold to the Federal Reserve Banks. The gold is sterilized. It has no action on prices. It is not the slightest good to any human soul in the United States." On the contrary, the depletion of Great Britain's reserves of gold will only adjourn indefinitely the return to the gold standard not merely by her but by other countries which are included in the sterling group. This result would be regarded by the United States, to use Mr. Goodenough's words, "as an international disaster of the first magnitude." Payment in gold must therefore be ruled out.

Payment in services is equally out of the question. Before the war the greater part of the American carrying trade was in British hands, but by giving large subsidies to her mercantile marine she has robbed Britain of the means of paying her in shipping services. Sir Alan Anderson, chairman of the Orient Steam Navigation Co., said recently that the United States subsidised her mercantile marine to the extent of £600 millions at par in meeting the operating losses and in paying the laying up

expenses of merchant ships from 1920 to 1932. This figure, he said, exceeds by some £50 millions the total payments for war debts made to U. S. A. by all her debtors up to last year. This means too is no longer available. The only other way in which U. S. A. can receive payment is in the form of goods. She has effectually blocked this way too. She is continually expanding her export trade and restricting her import trade, thus enlarging her export surplus, which is fatal to her new role as a creditor nation. The aggregate favourable balance of U. S. A. for 1921-31 (including both visible and invisible items) was \$4,878 millions. Her trade policy is thus in conflict with her financial position. She must make sweeping modifications in this policy if she wishes to be paid even for her commercial dues; but if she wishes repayment of her war loans then, as Mr. Goodenough said, "something approaching a Free Trade policy will be required." This will be a painful adjustment, involving temporarily further increases in unemployment, and yet she must agree to the readjustment of tariffs in order to make payment possible. Mr. Fisher has put it exceedingly well:—

"The idea of a self-sufficient United States of America possesses attractions so natural that we cannot be surprised if it is widely entertained, but a country cannot be self-sufficient and at the same time expect to receive vast payments over a long period of years from foreign debtors. If it is to be self-sufficient, it must write off its foreign claims. If it insists upon its foreign claims, it must make arrangements whereby these claims can be met. The gateway must be open for the reception of foreign goods or foreign services. If it is not found convenient so to open it, then the stream of foreign payments must, from the inner necessity of things, dry up altogether."

Lowering of tariffs is therefore a prime necessity for U. S. A. if she wishes to receive payment at all from the debtor countries; but she can do one of two things: either she can adopt a clean slate policy and cancel the war debts altogether, in which case she may perhaps maintain for some time the existing tariffs; or she can reduce her war debts and also lower tariffs at the same time. Which of these two alternatives would the debtor countries like to see adopted and which would contribute most to the economic recovery of the world? This is a most interesting question, which Mr. Fisher in the article referred to above answers as follows:—"Cancellation would have the most immediate, the most spectacular effect; but it is likely that the other policy would prove to be of more enduring value, a policy of freer trade and of debts scaled down in a proportion comparable to the reductions agreed to at Lausanne."

BOMBAY LEGISLATURE'S DOINGS.

DURING the fortnight or so that the Bombay Legislative Council has been in session it has been responsible for some noteworthy doings to which brief reference is intended here. The session opened with a speech by the Governor which was virtually a plea for the support of non-official members to measures of additional taxation. Sir Frederick Sykes took the occasion to assure the

Council about the earnestness of his Government in cutting down its expenditure. In that connection he made prominent mention of the labours of the Administrative Reorganisation Committee. The general feeling about the Committee's work seems to be that it discharged its duty, beset as it was with extraordinarily arduous difficulties, as satisfactorily as the circumstances in which it found itself permitted. At the same time it is no use concealing the fact that public opinion is far from endorsing the Committee's recommendations in so far as they involve a curtailment of the nation-building activities carried on by the local Government. This is clear from the strong public agitation aroused by the Committee's recommendations relating, e. g., to the abolition of the Industries Department, the closing down of the College of Agriculture and the School of Art and the partial withdrawal of Government assistance from the co-operative movement. The public protests against the Committee's suggestions of this nature did not altogether fall on deaf ears. For, as the statement of action proposed to be taken by Government on the Committee's suggestions which was supplied to the Council showed, the Industries Department, the School of Art and the College of Agriculture have for the time being at any rate been saved from extinction. The Deccan College, the costliest College in the Presidency, will, it has been decided, be closed next year which will not cause very widespread regret. On several of the Committee's recommendations the Government have been unable to make up their mind owing to the shortness of time at their disposal for the purpose. But it is to be hoped that in doing so they will do their best to meet, wherever possible, the wishes of the Committee to the general relief of the taxpayer.

The sounding of this note of caution is not altogether superfluous, having regard to the fact that the Government do not appear to be too ready to accept its suggestions. While the Committee recommended a reduction in public expenditure to the tune of Rs. 180 lakhs, the Government have seen fit so far to carry into effect only one-tenth of it. This is surely not to show proper respect to the advice of their own experts purchased at the heavy price of Rs. 85,000. Nor is it the best way of convincing public opinion that in the matter of retrenchment Government have gone as far as they could. This is necessary before it can be induced to accept any responsibility for additional taxation which is contemplated by Government. Indeed the Non-Brahmans cannot lend their support to any proposals of fresh taxation without being false to the mandate of their constituents as expressed in their Conference recently held in Poona. Other popular representatives too are similarly bound to resist the efforts of Government to impose additional burdens on the taxpayer. In these circumstances it seems a matter of doubt if Government could carry through their taxation measures. In any event they would do well not to relax their efforts at reduction of their expenditure by exploring all possible avenues of retrenchment and to see that this is done as

expeditiously as possible. If even the present financial crisis cannot spur them on to speedy action, nothing can.

Among the legislative measures considered by the Council so far may be mentioned the Village Panchayats Bill designed to increase the utility of these bodies by enhancing their powers and extending their rights. The Council spent the best part of five days in discussing the measure without however getting even half way through it. It will be convenient to notice the Bill in the form in which it finally emerges from the Council and no further reference need be made to it here beyond stating that some of its provisions were the subject of keen communal controversy on the floor of the House.

The Bill intended to control betting in connection with horse-racing has been, despite Government opposition, referred to a Select Committee. The Bill represents the view of a considerable section of the public which, while looking upon betting as a necessary evil which is past eradication by legislation, would favour action designed to restrict it only to those whose economic condition will enable them to bear racing losses without much inconvenience or discomfort. To this end it seeks to provide that none but members of recognised racing clubs may bet. The measure is thus intended to benefit the poor and people of limited means; and yet, for a wonder it experienced a good deal of difficulty from the Government, the so-called custodians of the poor, in reaching even the Select Committee stage. But its reference to a Select Committee hardly assures its safe passage in its later stages and for our part we should not be surprised if when it comes up for further consideration it is turned down by the votes of the official bloc assisted by the reactionary elements in the Council.

Mr. Bakhale's Bill to raise the upper age-limit in the case of children of compulsory school age from 11 to 12 was not allowed even to be introduced. Unless we are greatly mistaken, this is opposed to convention by which it is generally agreed that no measure should be opposed at its introductory stage. In seeking to add one year to the period which a child must compulsorily spend in school, Mr. Bakhale was only trying to give effect to the wishes of the Royal Commission on Labour which had in the clearest terms possible drawn attention to "the desirability of bringing the upper age-limit for compulsory education at least up to 12 years, the minimum age of factory employment." The Commission emphasised the point thus: "The present system in Bombay, under which compulsory education stops at 11, involves the loss of a valuable year and jeopardises the results already achieved." Even so, the Bill encountered opposition not only from the Government but, strangely enough, also from non-officials who are never tired of blaming Government for their remissness in promoting literacy. Mr. Bakhale's proposal was surely not too revolutionary, seeing that the age-limit in some foreign countries is as high as 13 and 14.

Leave was however granted to Mr. Bakhale to introduce his other Bill to regulate house-rents in

Bombay. The necessity for the measure is to be found in the prevalent economic depression which has greatly added to the difficulties of people of moderate means, especially in Bombay City. While the prices of the other necessaries of life have fallen, rents in Bombay stand practically as high as they have done since the Rent Act ceased to be operative, and do not even yet show any tendency to decrease. By his Bill Mr. Bakhale wishes to bring these down so as to bring them in closer relation "to the economic position of the people."

Another Bill which has aroused considerable public interest is what is known as the Whipping Bill. This, it is claimed, has been framed in response to a public demand during the last communal riots in Bombay for some ready means of punishing rowdies and hooligans with a view to suppress rioting quickly and effectively. The prescribed judicial procedure involving long delays and allowing scope for dilatory tactics was, it was contended, quite unsuited to such cases. Flogging was said at the time to be the only form of punishment which the mischievous elements in Bombay mind and understand. It appears however that with the passing away of the immediate danger and the opportunity for cool thinking which the interval has since provided, public opinion has not been slow to realise that whipping is after all a relic of less civilized times, besides being dehumanising in its effects. This feeling found strong and unequivocal expression in the debate on the measure last week.

RETRENCHMENT IN BOMBAY —A SUGGESTION.

LAST WEEK'S discussion in the Bombay Legislative Council on the action which Government intend to take on the recommendations of the Administrative Reorganisation Committee, commonly known as the Thomas Committee, though inconclusive, has served to focus public attention once again on the important problem of reduction in the provincial Government's expenditure. To judge from speeches made by non-official members in the course of the debate, it appears that the Committee's proposals designed to effect retrenchment in public expenditure have the general support of public opinion except in so far as they relate to what are known as the nation-building departments. These have never suffered from a super-abundance of funds and anything having the effect of curtailing their activities, as will be the case if the Thomas Committee's recommendations are accepted in toto, is bound to meet with strong public disapproval. Thus the debate referred to above may be said to have proceeded on the expected lines.

But the question of the salaries of the future provincial services with which the problem of retrenchment is inextricably bound up did not unfortunately receive from the legislature the attention which its importance deserved. As will be remembered, the Committee was debarred by its terms of reference from considering the question in so far as

it affected the all-India services. This took away greatly from the value of its labours. But it must be said to the credit of the Committee that within the limited field open to it it has tried to do its work in as satisfactory a manner as the circumstances permitted. To those who cannot persuade themselves to pay Indian public servants more than Rs. 500 a month at the outside, the Committee's proposals in this behalf may appear as erring on the side of liberality, while to others not-so thorough-going the proposed scales of pay might appear to be susceptible of still further reduction. Be that as it may, there can be no gainsaying the fact that the scales suggested by it bear a closer relation to the standard of living in India than any other attempt on the same lines so far. And to this extent the Committee doubtless deserves heart-felt thanks of the public.

It is possible, however, as will be shown presently, to reduce the expenditure on this head still further without in any way altering the proposed scales. But before doing so, it is necessary to bear in mind what in broad outline the Committee's suggestions in regard to the reorganisation of the services are. In the first place, it recommends the abolition of all distinction between class I and class II services which have been in existence in the different departments in this presidency, the former corresponding to the all-India services and the latter to the provincial services. With the abolition of this distinction it wants one single service constituted for each department with a junior and senior scale, transfer from the lower to the higher scale depending solely on merit and being possible at any time after the first three years of service. According to it, the disadvantage of the existing arrangement is that the recruit to the class II service has little incentive to do more than the bare amount of work intended to maintain his position. No doubt promotion to the other class is open to him; but the chance can come to but a very small proportion of those in class II service. The reasons which weighed with the Committee in replacing the bifurcation of the provincial service into two sections by its formation into one single service are thus set forth by it:

"All recruits would then join the service with an equal chance of rising to the top; some would of course fail but it would not be because the opportunity had been denied to them. The decision as to who should rise to the senior and who should remain in the junior scale would be made by Government after several years' experience of the capacity of the various officers."

It may be mentioned that the starting salary intended to be applicable to five different groups of departments varies between Rs. 200 and 250, while the maximum varies between Rs. 700 and Rs. 1200, according to the responsible nature of the work turned out by them.

Having given the reader a rough idea as to what it is that the Committee has suggested, let us explain how with the new scales in force it is possible to cut down the local Government's expenditure still further. It may be mentioned that in this article we propose to concern ourselves mainly with

the Public Works Department about the organisation and working of which we claim to know something. But that is only by way of illustration so that retrenchment on similar lines may be attempted even in other departments not only in this but in other provinces as well. The idea, in short, is that as many of class I officers in any department as are found to be in excess of strict needs should be compulsorily retired, which will correspondingly reduce the cadre of class I officers. Such a proposal can no longer be brushed aside as utterly impracticable, in view of the fact that the Secretary of State himself has recently promulgated rules facilitating the compulsory retirement of superior officers. The rules do not seem to be designed to meet some contingency which may arise in the distant future but are intended to be set in motion in the present financially difficult position of the Government. For it is clearly laid down therein that the selection of officers for compulsory discharge before the age of superannuation will be made "with a view to securing a reduction on purely financial grounds in the cadres of their respective services." All that the Government have to do, if they are really anxious to explore all avenues of retrenchment, is to make unsparing use of these rules in order to get rid of the unwanted officers whose fat salaries constitute an unconscionable burden on the long-suffering taxpayer. The rules are to remain in force till the end of the current year which appears to be a needlessly short time-limit. It is therefore to be hoped that they will be allowed a longer lease of life, so that their provisions may be fully availed of.

After the class I cadre is thus reduced, the deficiency may be made good either by the promotion of class II officers to the senior scale proposed by the Thomas Committee or by the recruitment of fresh men at the bottom in the junior scale. The financial effect of this arrangement will not be obvious without reference to a few figures. Careful calculations show that the average cost of the officer thus singled out for compulsory discharge is about Rs. 1,750 a month, while the average cost of a class II officer posted in his place comes to Rs. 700, to which may be added Rs. 225 being the starting salary of the new recruit under the proposed scale and another Rs. 450 on account of pension to the displaced class I officer. These three items total Rs. 1,375 as against Rs. 1,750, which, as already stated, is the average cost of the displaced officer. This means a saving of Rs. 375 per month or Rs. 4,500 for a whole year in the case of every officer so selected for retirement before his due date. At least 10 out of the 21 administrative officers belonging to this class in the Bombay Presidency can, in the opinion of those who are conversant with the P.W.D. organisation, be dealt with under the Compulsory Retirement rules without any loss of efficiency. Lest the estimated savings should be regarded as unwarrantedly large, it may be explained that the figures have been worked out on a conservative basis so that the actual results may be relied upon to be more promising than are indicated by

these figures.

From what has been said above, it will be seen that on the basis suggested above the annual reduction in one department alone, viz. the Public Works, will amount to Rs. 45,000, which amount, in the Government's present financial condition, cannot by any means be said to be negligible. It is believed that retrenchment on a similar, if not a higher, scale may be possible in some other departments as well. It is difficult to arrive at even a rough estimate of the possible reduction that may be thus effected without a first-hand knowledge of the organisation of the other departments. Till such a study becomes possible, the suggestions put forth above might serve as an indication of the direction in which a Government hard pressed for funds such as the Bombay Government undoubtedly is might turn in its hour of need.

RETRENCHMENT-AXE.

Our London Letter.

(BY AIR MAIL.)

(From Our Correspondent.)

LONDON, February 10.

INDIA IN PARLIAMENT.

SIR SAMUEL HOARE was outwardly sanguine as ever that the policy that has been going on in India under Lord Willingdon's regime was a right and successful one. In so far as his aim has been to create the impression in this country that the Congress movement has been crushed, it must be acknowledged that he has scored. Most of the Members of Parliament are satisfied at the effective way in which Lord Willingdon has dealt with the Civil Disobedience campaign and restored what has been called law and order to a country that was in a state of turmoil and upheaval.

When it is suggested to the complacent optimists that there are fifteen thousand people still in jail and that if law and order are established in India why keep them there? the answer that follows is, "Yes, it is quiet now, but the release of all these people at the present moment would almost certainly produce a fresh outbreak of disorder, and this we wish to avoid." Sir Samuel does not seem moved by the fact that great numbers of normally law-abiding people in India are embittered against British rule and the British connection by what has been taking place during the last eighteen months. Nevertheless, he is apparently quite sincere in his belief that the Congress only represents a limited section of the Indian population, and that they can only be considered as a part of the whole, which is a much larger question.

In answer to a question put by Mr. Grenfell as to the present state of affairs in India, Sir Samuel replied that during December and January there were occasional outbursts of Congress activity, accompanied in some cases by disturbances, but, he said, "the situation remains well in hand." The interest of many Congress workers has been diverted to Mr. Gandhi's campaign against untouchability."

It seems a pity that the Government does not make better use of the position and encourage this diversion by allowing the leader of the movement full freedom to develop it. One would have thought

They would grasp at the opportunity of finding a way to release Mahatma Gandhi without a loss of prestige on either side, but there was no sign given that such an action was in contemplation.

It is an open secret that other members of the Cabinet who have their finger on the pulse of India are much more concerned about the future outlook than Sir Samuel Hoare seems to be. It is true that Lord Irwin speaks in a doubtful voice about the wisdom of releasing Mr. Gandhi without some guarantee as to his political activities. Nevertheless one is given to understand that he is not alone in thinking that facilities should be given for some new approach which would enable the prisoner of Yeravada himself to propose an acceptable truce.

Friends of peace are increasingly convinced of the desirability of securing freedom of access to Mr. Gandhi, so that he may confer with his own Congress colleagues as well as with other representative Indians. The present deadlock cannot be resolved until Mahatmaji is free. Steps will be taken in the near future, by means of a deputation or otherwise, to impress these considerations on the mind of Sir Samuel Hoare, and we can only hope that developments in India will be favourable to such a move.

DIEHARDS GET BUSY.

The diehards never weary. They are gathering their forces again to make a determined, and if possible, effective stand. Sir Henry Page Croft intends to raise a debate on the whole policy of the reforms next Wednesday. The debate may be useful unless it is made an opportunity of so worrying the Secretary of State that, as a result, he may be likely to attempt to whittle down further the Government's proposals. Although the Minister has this week reiterated the intention of the Government to submit "full proposals for a federal constitution" in the coming White Paper, the phrase is capable of a construction different from what India may be willing to accept. In this respect a good deal will depend upon India and the response she makes to events from this side during the next few months.

Probably the most important trial of strength will take place in the debate on the White Paper which is now expected to appear before next month. It is suggested that the India Bill is going to be made a question of confidence in the Government. If such an event arose there is no doubt that it will secure a sufficient majority in both Houses. Even the Lords will pause before they reject a scheme expressly designed to establish a stable constitution in India under conditions which will probably never again be more favourable for them. Nor will the Tory block in either House be too eager to aim a deadly blow at the present Government, the only alternative to which would be an administration of a complexion they would probably regard as revolutionary.

Review.

PREVENTION OF FUTURE WARS

THE NATIONAL DEFENCE. By KIRBY PAGE.
(Farrar & Renshart Inc., New York.) 1931. 22cm.
403p. \$ 3-00.

THE book under review tries to give a true interpretation of events that led to the great war. But, what is even more important, it tries to suggest remedies for the prevention of future wars.

To begin with, the author has traced the general tendencies of the modern times which led and are

bound to lead to a war. Nationalism which means national egoism in its worst form based on the exaggerated notions of rights, sovereignty, honour and patriotism is the product of the last century. This highly developed nationalism led to political and economic imperialism. The nations possessing a national solidarity at home vied with one another in securing control of the undeveloped regions of the world. This in turn led to the desire for a place in the sun and to the "white man's burden." Naturally this rivalry for colonies supplied a strong potential cause of the wars. Every country therefore thought it only prudent to be prepared for any conflict and militarism came to be the creed of many nations. Race for armaments was the consequence. Intensive propaganda to rouse patriotism combined with militarism led to chauvinism. The press was employed by the States to puff up national pride, which created a desire to dominate others. The result was a constant fear and distrust of each other. This led to alliances between different groups of powers.

Towards the beginning of this century Europe was divided into two distinct camps. On the one side we had Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy formed into a triple alliance. On the other, the triple entente was composed of Russia, France and Great Britain. How this grouping of powers was brought about is very lucidly explained by the author. A general war seemed inevitable under these circumstances. But the immediate cause was the murder at Serajevo of Archduke Franz Ferdinand, heir-presumptive to the throne of Austria, on the 28th of June 1914. Germany has been generally accused of having carefully planned and deliberately brought about the war. But the author tries his best to apportion the blame judiciously. Before doing so he tried to ascertain public opinion on the question of the war guilt. He sent out a questionnaire to one hundred professors of history of Austria, asking their opinion, particularly, as to whether Germany and her allies were solely responsible for the war. The answers that he got are Yes 3, No 95, Doubtful 1, No answer 1.

In his last chapters the author shows how America, with her vast resources, huge man power and the biggest navy, is a menace to the peace of the world. The race for armaments has started again. Half of the supply of gold of the world has found its way into the vaults only of two countries. Is another war coming? The author answers this question affirmatively.

M. S. CHEEMA.

SHORT NOTICES.

GANDHI THE MAHATMA. By J. G. ROWE.

(Epworth Press, London.) 1931. 20cm. 120p. 2/6

THIS is one of those numerous books on Mr. Gandhi which try to present the story of his life in as impartial and colourless language as possible. This attitude is in a sense more commendable than the frankly hostile one but it is certainly not very much calculated to make the narrative attractive. The author deserves credit for having attempted to retell the life of Mr. Gandhi but in the absence of suitable background, the attempt has not been quite successful. The author seems to be but superficially acquainted with Indian affairs. His 'A Mr. Srinivasa Sastri' and 'A Mrs. Sarojini Naidu' are sufficient to condemn him in the eyes of Indian readers. He does not know that there are two Patels and consequently "Mr. Vallabhai G. Patel" has the career of the Ex-President Patel forced upon him. No good student of Indian affairs would commit such unpardonable spelling mistakes as 'Mohandas Ganjhi' and 'Lala Rajpat Rai,' nor would he say that "the amiable

attitude (of the Bombay Legislative Council in co-operating with the Simon Commission) was owing to Mr. Gandhi, who strongly urged it as the only ostensible means to obtain *Swaraj*."

A.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SEXUAL IMPULSES. By R. E. MONEY-KYRLE. (Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, London.) 1932. 23cm. 219p. 10/6.

A VERY readable book which traces, with the aid of psycho-analysis, the development of the various normal and abnormal sexual impulses including homosexuality and other perversions in the individual and the race. The author, although not belonging to the group of individuals who swear by Freud, still believes in tracing most of the impulses (oral, anal, urethral etc.) to the sex instinct. However, the original standpoint of Freud of tracing everything in human life to the sex-instinct (in its most general sense) has apparently been given up and other motives accepted as being as important in certain spheres of activity. A chapter on the Value of Psycho-analysis considerably enhances the value of the book.

D. D. KARVE.

Correspondence.

WEIGHTAGE AND ELECTION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SERVANT OF INDIA.

SIR,—It makes most nationalists smile when they hear Muslims, who claim a large weightage for their own community in both provincial and central legislatures, refuse any such weightage to the States' representatives in the federal legislature. This refusal is generally attributed to a secret opposition on the part of Mahomedans to the federation itself. It is widely believed that they wish somehow to keep the States out of the constitution, and that with this object in view they oppose the demand for more than proportionate representation to the States, not minding how inconsistent such an attitude is with their insistence upon excessive representation for themselves. So far they did not assign any particular reason for their refusal of weightage to the States. But now they have done so. The reason that they now give is that the States' representatives will not be elected by popular vote but will be nominated by the Princes. At a meeting of the Executive Board of the All-India Muslim Conference held in New Delhi on Sunday last the following resolution was passed:—

"The Board is strongly of the opinion that Indian States should be given no weightage in the Federal Legislature, either in the lower or in the upper house, in view of the fact that it is contemplated that the States' representatives should be nominated by rulers and not elected by the public. The meeting is unable to agree to the States joining in the Federation unless it is known beforehand as to how far States' representatives will be able to affect matters concerning British India and vice versa."

It does seem at first sight that there is no inherent connection between election and weightage, and one is inclined to think that the reason given in this resolution is not tenable and is put forward by Mahomedans only to cloak their hostility to federation. It may be so, but the validity of the reason for

refusing weightage will have to be conceded, seeing that Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru advanced it at the first R. T. C. He was agreeable to give weightage to the States in the upper chamber on the ground that in federal constitutions units of federation are generally given equal representation, irrespective of their area or population, but refused to recognise the need or propriety of weightage in the lower chamber. On the 22nd December, 1930, he said in the Federal Structure Committee of the first Conference:—

"I think that those considerations (in favour of giving weightage to the States) really do not apply to the case of the Lower House. The Lower House, so far as British India is concerned, will be a popular House. Nobody can overlook the fact that in that popular House will come an element from the Indian States which cannot be treated as a popular element. The representatives of the Indian States will, so far as one can foresee, for some time at any rate, be the nominees of Indian States. It may be that from some States representatives may eventually come through the open door of election. This is a circumstance to my mind which affects the whole question a great deal so far as the Lower House is concerned. Speaking frankly, I am very much affected in my view by the difference that I propose to make so far as the method of election is concerned between the Upper House and the Lower House. I am mentioning this only incidentally. I am in favour of indirect election so far as the Upper House is concerned. I would not do the same in the case of the Lower House, and for that reason, and particularly because the representatives of the Indian States will not come through the open door of election, I would not allow any weightage in the Lower House.

Sir Mirza Ismail: They may eventually.

Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru: When they do we may revise the whole thing, but until that time arrives I cannot forget that in the Lower House, which is a popular House, your representation will be not through the open door of election, but through nomination. Therefore I would say that we have to make a distinction between the two Houses. While I should be prepared to go up to 40 per cent. in the case of the Federal House, I should not be prepared to agree to any weightage in case of the Lower House. That is my view."

It may be that the All-India Muslim Conference's opposition to weightage really springs from the source which is popularly believed to be true, viz. its antipathy to federation, but it cannot be denied that it has now been able to put a good face on it.—Yours, etc.

OBSERVER.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

I. L. O. STUDIES AND REPORTS.

- Industrial Relations in Great Britain. By J. H. Richardson. (A. 36.) 1933. 25cm. 272p. 3/6.
 Unemployment and Public Works. (C. 15.) 1931. 24cm. 186p. 4/-.
 Women's Work under Labour Law. (I. 2.) 1932. 24cm. 264p. 6/-.
 Collective Agreements in Agriculture. (K. 11.) 1933. 24cm. 122p. 3/-.
 Non-Contributory Pensions. (M. 9.) 1933. 24cm. 140p. 3/-.
 Pneumoconiosis. A List of References. (N. 15.) 1932. 24cm. 76p. 2/-.
 Unemployment Insurance and Various Forms of Relief for the Unemployed and Supplementary Report. 17th Session. 1933. 24cm. 299p.
 Methods of Providing Rest and Alternation of Shifts in Automatic Sheet-Glass Works. 1933. 24cm. 67p.