

The Servant of India

EDITOR : P. KODANDA RAO.

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

VOL. XVI, No. 24.}

POONA—THURSDAY, JUNE 22, 1933.

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

CONTENTS.

| | Page |
|--|------|
| TOPICS OF THE WEEK. | 277 |
| ARTICLES :— | |
| The Duty of the Congress | 279 |
| When will the Four-Power Pact be signed? By Madame L. Morin. | 280 |
| OUR LONDON LETTER. | 281 |
| OUR PARIS LETTER. | 284 |
| REVIEWS :— | |
| Gandhi Versus the Empire. By M. R. Ramaswami. | 285 |
| Contraceptive Methods. By R. D. Karve | 286 |
| Shakespeare and India. By P. P. P. | 287 |
| Problem of Disarmament By T. S. Ramanuja | 287 |
| SHORT NOTICE. | 288 |
| MISCELLANEOUS :— | |
| Mr. Kunzru on the Indian Political Situation | 288 |

Topics of the Week.

S. I. S.

THE annual session of the Servants of India Society commenced with the celebration of its 28th anniversary on the 12th June last and came to a close on the 20th June. Two members were unable to attend the session owing to their absence from India and four owing to ill-health. Among the latter was the President of the Society, Mr. Devadhar. His protracted illness gave rise to considerable anxiety but we are glad to be able to say that he is steadily improving. We hope that he will soon be restored to complete health. In one respect however we were more fortunate than usual. Mr. Sastri whom ill-health and public duties had prevented from attending our meetings for several years was able to join us this year. His participation in our deliberations enhanced their interest and value.

One of the most important items of business which engaged the attention of members was the election of the office-bearers. Mr. Devadhar was elected president and Mr. Kunzru, vice-president of the Society. Mr. P. Kodanda Rao was reappointed Secretary of the Society by the Council. As usual, the more important public problems of the day, among which may be mentioned the proposals for constitutional reform and the uplift of the untouchables,

came under discussion. Among subjects touching the work and efficiency of the Society which was placed before the members reference may be made to the training of new members, which is very imperfectly carried out at present. It is hoped that newly admitted members will in future be able to receive in some measure that training which is so vital to their future development and on which Mr. Gokhale laid so much stress.

The financial position of the Society as disclosed by the accounts for 1931-32 greatly exercised our minds last year and compelled us to reduce the allowances of our members. The year that has just closed has ended with a small surplus but the prospects for next year are again far from bright. We were therefore compelled to continue the cuts for a year and to exercise caution in adding to the membership of the Society. Two probationers, who were selected last year, will be admitted to the Society this year; but out of the 36 new applicants for membership only one person has been selected as a probationer.

* * *

World Economic Conference.

OUR criticism of the probable composition of the so-called Indian delegation to the World Economic Conference has been more than justified. The important points of our criticism were two: that the delegation from India are predominantly composed and are led by non-Indians; and that a sufficient number of non-official Indian experts are not included in the list of advisers. In selecting its delegation for the London Conference the Government have proved themselves even more reactionary and anti-national than on the occasion of Ottawa. After all the prolonged controversy over the fiscal independence of the Government of India from the leading strings of the Secretary of State it is nothing short of a deliberate exhibition of Tory reactionarism to put the present Secretary of State at the head of the Indian delegation. While non-officials like Sir C. P. Ramaswamy Aiyer, who could by no stretch of the imagination be pronounced as authorities on the subjects of commerce, currency and tariffs have been included in the delegation proper, Sir Purushottamdas Thakurdas than whom there are few better qualified authorities on these topics, has been relegated to the list of mere advisers. Both the delegation and the list of advisers is so heavily packed with non-Indian personnel that Sir Purushottamdas took the only course open for a patriotic and self-respecting Indian by refusing to serve as an adviser to the delegation. Mr. Rangaswamy Aiyangar, another eminent publicist who was offered an advisership, has also followed the example of Sir Purushottamdas.

These resignations have caused a mild stir among the official and semi-official circles. An attempt is being made to show that the action of the resigning Indians is based on an utter misconception of the position of Government. We are told that the official delegation to be sufficiently influential must be exclusively composed of responsible members of Government as is the British delegation, and that the Government of India has gone out of its way to placate Indian opinion by appointing two non-official Indians to the delegation itself. It must be pointed out that between a Government which being parliamentary is always representative of the nation and an irresponsible foreign administration there can be no significant parallel in this respect. Even granting the necessity of keeping the delegation as a substantially official body we are at a loss to understand why Sir Joseph Bore, the present Commerce Member of the Government of India, could not be selected to be a member, and in fact the leader of the Indian delegation. We are told in certain quarters that he could not be spared at this juncture from the country. The excuse is a bit too transparent to be taken seriously considering that tariffs, which are Sir Joseph's department, will loom large at London and that on similar occasions in the past important members of the Government of India have been selected for membership of international conferences.

Then it is said that the Indian delegation has been chosen from the point of view of ability and not from that of race. We consider that every delegation ought to be able to speak not only for the Government but also for the people of a country if the decisions of the World Conference are to be of a lasting character. For this reason, if not for the vindication of the national self-respect of this country, the so-called Indian delegation ought to be really Indian in composition. Secondly, we are not prepared to admit that in the ranks of the officials and the non-officials there are not enough Indians of the requisite ability to serve with credit at a Conference like this. Government selection of delegates and advisers is on the present occasion characterised by a spirit of considered hostility to legitimate Indian claims and we have no hesitation in declaring that Sir Purushottamdas and Mr. Aiyangar have rendered a distinct service to the nation by registering their protest in an unmistakable fashion.

Hunger strike in the Andamans.

A DEPUTATION under the leadership of Mr. B. Y. Jadhav recently waited upon the Home Member to the Government of India in order to impress upon him the need of gently and sympathetically handling the situation created by the hunger strike of as many as 50 political prisoners in the Andamans. The hurried organisation of the deputation is a measure of the extent to which public opinion is stirred by recent events there. But the Home Member's reply to the deputation was far from revealing and satisfactory. In his anxiety to put the hunger-strikers in the wrong he went the length of insinuating that the prisoners had hardly anything to complain of and if they had put forward certain grievances as the immediate cause of their desperate action, they were got hold of merely for the purpose of forcing their will on the Government and spoiling the prison discipline. The Home Member however conveniently forgot to specify the prisoners' grievances. If he had done so, public opinion would have been able to judge whether they afforded reasonable ground for the hunger-strike or whether they were of the kind referred to by him. He has to thank none but himself if

his failure to do so is interpreted to the detriment of the Government and costs them much public support.

Nor can we regard as convincing his reasons for refusing to publish the names of the strikers. Their publication may, as he pointed out, secure advertisement to the strike. But should this really be allowed to be the determining factor? The Government's first concern should be how to end this ugly situation and not how to prevent its being advertised. If the names are given out to the public and not merely to the relatives of the strikers as proposed by the Home Member, it may enable others besides the prisoners' relatives having any influence with them to induce them to give up the strike. It is surely the height of unwisdom to allow considerations of prestige to prevail over those of humanity in such a serious matter.

To the deputationists' request for a public inquiry into the circumstances of the strike the Home Member seems to have turned a blind eye and there appears to be nothing in his reply which would hold out any hope of such an investigation being set on foot in the near future, which is very deplorable. In the meanwhile an officer of the I. M. S. who has considerable experience in dealing with hunger-strikes has been deputed to the Andamans, as, according to the Government, there is no prospect of the strike coming to an end quickly. Which virtually means that the Government would rather see the strikers starve themselves to death than accede to their demands about whose nature the public is so far largely in the dark.

* * *

Castigation for Lord Lloyd.

LORD LLOYD recently made the astounding statement that "there is no municipality in India which has not crashed into bankruptcy again and again." After characterising the statement as "demonstrably untrue" the *Statesman* passes the following criticism on it:

"Were it true it would be a serious reflection on the provincial Governments concerned, for they have reserve powers which it is their duty to exercise before any such catastrophe takes place. That the statement should have been made at all is deplorable. It indicates a recklessness of temper which bodes ill. India is now the sport of party passion in England, and once party passion is aroused Truth is plunged back to the bottom of her well. Lord Lloyd has got a thesis, namely that "responsible self-government can never succeed in Eastern countries," and to support this assertion he makes reckless statements with complete indifference to any financial injury he may do to the credit of municipalities and to the holders of their loan stock. He and Mr. Churchill are providing the strongest argument for removing India from the control of the British Parliament, and ending the possibility of it being at the mercy of the now enormous electorate, which has no real interest in it but is prepared to believe any firebrand, either a Churchill or a Maxton, who tells it that only the English can govern the uncivilised natives or alternatively that the English officials are blood-suckers and blackmailers batten on a nation in bondage. There is nothing in Lord Lloyd's career to justify his certainty that he and he alone is right about Eastern peoples. ... He would do well to reflect that local self-government in England is nothing to write out from Home about, and that borough council finance is not entirely above reproach."

* * *

Education in the Punjab.

THE Report of the Punjab University Inquiry Committee published during the last few days recommends changes of a far-reaching character affecting education in that province. The more important of the recommendations are:—(1) The constitution of a separate board of higher secondary education for controlling education imparted through the existing Intermediate and the Matriculation Classes and its removal from the control of the University, the Chairman and Secretary of this board being appointed by Government. (2) The creation of a University board of affiliated Colleges to advise the Academic Council on all matters affecting the welfare of such Colleges and to advise the Syndicate in respect of applications for affiliation. (3) The introduction of communal representation in the constitution of the Senate. (4) The extension of the secondary course in vernacular schools by one year and the shortening of that in Anglo-vernacular schools by one year. (5) Improvement in the teaching of the vernaculars and making them the media of instruction of the higher secondary courses instead of English. (6) An increase in numbers and the quality of the industrial and craft schools. (7) The appointment of a full-time salaried Vice-Chancellor of the University; and (8) The creation of a separate Training College for women teachers. Two members of the Inquiry Committee append separate notes recommending a further extension of the principle of communal representation. It is feared that some of the recommendations of the Committee, if given effect to, will result in the introduction of the poison of communalism in the constitution of the University which was hitherto free from it, and that instead of making the University a purely academic body and free from Government control, they will increase opportunities for Government intervention in the affairs of the University.

Famine in Panch Mahals.

BHILS of Gujarat and Central India are a very large community of primitives who have left off their old predatory habits and settled down to agricultural pursuits in very recent times. Previous to the Rajput domination they were rulers of large areas in the country, and some of them are rulers of small areas even to this date. Ousted from their superior position, large numbers of them are reduced to a position of serfdom and of agricultural labourers. Ground down by exacting forest laws, usurious money-lenders and an unsympathetic community and state, they are dragging on their existence year in and year out on the verge of starvation. When, in addition to this, an unmerciful fate confronts them with inadequate rainfall, their condition becomes miserable beyond description.

Large tracts of British India and Indian States, peopled exclusively by Bhils, Bhillalas and similar other tribes, are now in the grip of a famine on account of irregular monsoons of last year. Government which in former times had a soft corner in their heart for such neglected classes seem now to have grown less sympathetic towards them. Local bodies, local associations and even the Mahajans of some towns are striving, with their very limited resources, to provide employment for thousands of men and women, whose wants are incredibly simple. Cases however of selling their bodies for a few pounds of maize have been brought to light. We wish to draw the attention of the Government and the public to the desperate straits to which the Bhils of Eastern Panch-Mahals, South Rajputana and Malwa States and of the Central India States have been reduced owing to these famine conditions. We hope that they will not wait for distributing relief on a liberal scale until the situation takes an ugly turn.

Articles.**THE DUTY OF THE CONGRESS.**

CIVIL disobedience has been under suspension for three weeks and the period of suspension has now been extended by a similar period under orders of the Working President of the Congress. The original suspension has not evoked a response from Government in the shape of releasing political prisoners and the extension of it is not likely to have that result. Apparently Government do not think much of the suspension; probably, according to them, it was due only to a desire on the part of the Congress leaders to enable Mahatma Gandhi to carry out his fast, undertaken by him with an object wholly unconnected with politics, in an atmosphere of peace and freedom from anxiety; that it did not betoken a change of attitude towards the authorities; and that unless some indication was given expressly in this behalf a brief respite, formally announced, from a movement which had practically died out, did not call for a change in the official policy towards the Congress. If civil disobedience was in abeyance for three months, repressive measures to be taken to cope with it would also be in abeyance for that period without any change in Government's policy. This was a gesture enough on Government's part; what more was needed? Sir Harry Haig and his colleagues are probably thinking of the situation in this way and are waiting to see what lead Mahatma Gandhi will give to the Congress. If he will call off civil disobedience or offer that advice to those who can do so, then probably Government will release political prisoners and even give the Congress an opportunity to take a hand in constitutional discussions. But they will not take this step unless there are clear signs that civil disobedience will not be renewed even when Congress workers are all free.

If this be the policy of Government it is manifest that they are not willing to take any risks or do anything which will make it easy for the Congress to retrace its steps. Government, it is true, do not want a formal undertaking from the Congress to abandon the movement. It would be enough if they were convinced in other ways that the movement would not be revived. But the sort of proof that they want is such that the Congress cannot give it without losing "face." It must declare for its own reasons its intention to abjure the method which it had been pursuing. Only then will Government graciously effect a gaol delivery and put away all its newly forged weapons of coercion. Is this the part of statesmanship? Should not peace be sought by a mighty Government without claiming victory? Is it not enough that leader after leader from the Congress camp comes out of gaol and gives himself up to non-political work without throwing himself into civil disobedience as he was pledged to do by the Working Committee's resolution which initiated the movement? Can there be a more eloquent proof of the Congress desiring to subside unobtrusively into a

non-militant and passive attitude? And even if this evidence belied the intentions of the Congress, would it really be difficult for Government to apply again all the repressive measures that they did at the beginning of last year? Would not this be the best means of putting the Congress in the wrong and detaching from it all the popular sympathy it commands? But Government *will* not take this path so obviously dictated by the needs of statesmanship. On the contrary, they will stand on prestige and demand complete surrender from their opponents.

This policy of Government stands condemned. But what next? How is the present deadlock to be broken? Will the Congress allow itself to be forced back into civil disobedience merely because, from a foolish desire to humiliate it, Government insists upon what is capable of being interpreted as an admission of defeat? Is not the Congress big enough to do what it honestly regards as its duty without minding any cheap sneers that may be hurled at it? There is hardly any other institution in the country which can afford, of its own accord, to close down its anti-governmental activities without coming under the suspicion of faint-heartedness and pusillanimity. But whatever else it may or may not have done, the Congress has established its reputation for its readiness to face repression and undergo sufferings firmly enough to take any step it may deem desirable without making itself liable to any such imputation. It is often a malicious design of officials to provoke politicians into violence so that they may freely use coercion thereafter. Such a situation demands from popular leaders a cool courage which will refuse to be jockeyed into violence. The Congress leaders have had many occasions in the past to show themselves possessed of this rare virtue. The present situation is a similar one. The Congress must not be deterred by any crowing over that Government may indulge in from putting a stop to civil disobedience. It takes supreme courage to do this, but we believe that Congress leaders are not unequal to it. All the greater will be the glory of the Congress because of the seeming humiliation involved in it.

And who can doubt that nothing less than a complete stoppage of the movement is now required in the country's interests? The movement was started in 1931 for a limited purpose, viz. to serve as a means of counteracting the Government's ordinances which were thought to be wholly devoid of justification. The ordinances which were then in force have now expired. The laws that have taken their place stand, constitutionally speaking, on a different footing, however similar be their content. There can be no point, therefore, in keeping the movement of civil disobedience alive in form, unless the object with which it was originally started is now extended. It is sometimes stated that the movement was organised with no less an aim than that of winning Swaraj. For such a statement there is no justification whatever. Whether Mahatma Gandhi came back from England with a favourable or unfavourable opinion of the results of the second Round

Table Conference in which he took part, there is no question that he did not embark upon civil disobedience from a sense of failure of the Conference. Mahatma Gandhi's writings at the time furnish testimony to this fact. Then would it be right now to extend the original object of the movement and keep it up till swaraj is attained? When Gandhiji returned from London, he evidently had still retained faith in the conference method. If Government had issued no ordinances in the meanwhile for reasons unconnected with constitutional reform, he would not have thought of resorting to civil disobedience to get the kind of reform he wanted; he would still have persisted in the conference method. There is nothing in all that happened then which points in the contrary direction. Ordinances now being out of the way, would it be at all desirable for the Congress to divert the civil disobedience movement from its original purpose and apply it for the achievement of Swaraj which it had sought to reach by other means? Nor is it at all necessary to do so. The conference method is still in operation, and the Congress can still bring its contribution to the discussions that are going forward. Perhaps even now it will be able to lift these discussions out of the doldrums into which, we are afraid, they will rapidly sink. Most people have grown despondent about the future of the reforms. May it not be that the Congress will be able to infuse life into the discussions and lead them into fruitful channels? Anyhow we feel that it is in that direction that the Congress should now turn its energies, and the first step towards it is to bring the civil disobedience movement formally to a termination.

WHEN WILL THE FOUR-POWER PACT BE SIGNED?

IT has often been said that each country must choose between a policy of isolation and that of collaboration. As a matter of fact, the attitude of each country is never the result of a choice, but of a compromise between these two principles, and the fact that they very often lead in practice to antagonistic conclusions, explains to a large extent the chaos of our present times and the difficulty to replace it by order. Decisions regarding its foreign policy are rendered more and more difficult to government nowadays; the economic depression, the state of affairs in Germany, the uncertainty of the monetary situation in other countries, among other factors, have sharpened the divergencies in public opinion, even inside each nation.

International agreement has never appeared so necessary, and yet so impossible to realise. The paradox does not lie so much in the words as in the facts themselves. It is more and more clearly felt by all those who are aware of the present state of things in the world that solutions to the political as well as to the economic problems, cannot be found outside international co-operation. Yet almost all countries show symptoms of repression in this respect. Tendencies to exclusive and exasperated national concentration, or to a selfish and one-sided

monetary policy, have aroused everywhere a super-sensitive national consciousness, and the belief in the necessity of economic self-sufficiency (at least as far as it is realisable), together with all the moral and practical consequences of such attitudes. And, of course, manifestations of that kind in one country tend to engender compensatory reactions in the others especially when they are excessive and sensational, and all the more when they are near neighbours. In that respect, it is remarkable that French opinion has on the whole remained so reasonable in the face of the rapid and menacing development of Hitlerism.

One of the most hopeful points on the political horizon of late has been the prospect of the Four-Power Pact. Up to quite recently the papers said that it was on the point of being concluded: now the news is that the signature of the Pact may be delayed for some time yet. It is to be hoped that the necessary agreement can soon be realised as it would no doubt enable the economic conference to open its deliberations in a more hopeful atmosphere.

The obstacles to the signatures are not clearly mentioned by the press. They are said to be merely formal, but supposed to be really of a more serious and fundamental character. What has been, on the whole, the attitude of France towards the scheme of a Four-Power Pact? In its initial form, it is fair to acknowledge that it has not been greeted by unreserved approbation in all circles. If part of the Press have from the very first given it enthusiastic support criticism has been drastic both on the extreme right, for nationalist reasons, and on the extreme left because of the distrust inspired by the Hitler regime, and, in a lesser measure, by the Italian Government.

Thus we read in *Le Peuple* :

"We shall make some reserves, and will feel compelled to maintain them, until the text is known, until it is possible to know how far the agreement really goes, and in what manner it can be conciliated with the League of Nations Pact."

Many papers of the right, like, for instance, *Le Temps*, put forward the question of Poland and warn against the possible reaction of that country. Others invoke the Little Entente.

La Liberte also fears that Belgium, as well as Poland, will feel frustrated.

"Even if their Governments agree, it shall only be through sheer resignation and it will change nothing to the real feeling of the people in these countries. They will turn away from France, as from a country which can no further be relied upon, and look towards Rome and Berlin from whom they will have henceforth everything to expect. The Four-Power Pact has been devised by Mr. Mussolini and Mr. MacDonald, only because we had a majority in Geneva, thanks to the small nations. We are on the point of giving up this majority."

While *L'Action Francaise* views the Pact as a defeat for the Democrats (it is a royalist paper), *La Volonte* considers it a success. "What! Italy and Germany, the two 'revisionist' states engage themselves for ten years in favour of peace such as it has been established in Versailles, Trianon and Saint Germain... and we should be discontented? Great Britain gives her guarantee to this contract, and we should say: 'beware!' All right, the possi-

miests will say, but wait till the ten years have elapsed.... After ten years? Is it not already an appreciable gain to be able to maintain the treaties without any more difficulty or expense for that lapse of time? One could hardly hope for more. The truth is that M. Daladier and M. Paul Boncour have realised an unexpected diplomatic success and their opponents cannot forgive them for it."

Excelsior uses more measured language to prove that the essential aim of the Four-Power Pact is psychological :

"The point is to appease the international atmosphere before the International Economic Conference meets in London. The programme will be heavy enough without loading it with additional misunderstandings between Paris, Berlin and Rome. Germany will have many demands to formulate in London concerning the lowering of tariffs, monetary assistance, etc. Her interest is therefore to show conciliatory dispositions as regards the Four-Power Pact, which after all does not engage her any further than the common obligations agreed upon by all the members of the League of Nations. This is enough to explain the acceptance of the German ambassador in Rome."

Papers indicating that the signature of the Four-Power Pact is left in suspense for the present, mentioned a few possible alternative schemes; either slightly modified, or complimentary. These are of course mere speculations. Nevertheless, two general trends are worthy of notice: (a) The pre-occupations regarding the Polish Question and the small nations. (b) The growing desire for a Franco-Italian agreement in responsible circles and the impression that Italian opinion is much more amenable to the idea than it was some time ago.

About the first point, it is significant to note that *Le Temps* has devoted an article to a scheme for a Seven-Power Pact which has been elaborated at the last conference of the Little Entente. This pact would be based on the situation of Poland between the Little Entente on the one hand, and the three Baltic States on the other. The subject deserves careful study and very tactful dealing from the French. It is natural that the small countries should not wish to be left out of any European scheme, even apart from any personal interest. Owing to her liberal traditions, France ought to favour any arrangements where countries, who are inferior in size, should nevertheless be the judicial equals of the others before a common law.

L. MORIN.

Our London Letter.

(BY AIR MAIL.)

(From Our Correspondent.)

LONDON, June 9.

"BRITISH INDIA IS OURS."

LORD ROTHERMERE seems to imagine that because he is the principal proprietor of a string of popular newspapers, including the *Daily Mail* and the *Evening News* he is entitled to form British opinion on Indian affairs. He has a colleague named Lord Beaverbrook who claims to be, through the columns of the *Daily Express* and the *Evening*

Standard an Empire-builder. Lord Rothermere does not go so far as this. He is apparently content to have himself described as an Empire-holder. He belongs to the gallant band of those whose slogan runs "what I have I hold". It is a watchword of all who depend upon vested interest and are energetic in its defence. Lord Rothermere is quite certain that "British India is ours". He says so with emphasis at the very beginning of a special article appearing in to-day's *Daily Mail*. He appeals to young Britain to fight manfully to retain the preserves in India won for them by generations of valiant ancestors. He does not beat about the bush, for excellent reasons. To him it seems an anachronism that Indians should want to sell to their own countrymen cotton goods of Indian manufacture. Do not Portugal and Belgium, whose administration of their Colonial possessions has not been above criticism for many years past, insist upon their Colonial subjects buying cotton goods of Portuguese or Belgian manufacture? It happens that most of these colonists are African Negroes, and that for the present they show no signs of industrial organisation of their own. Indeed their great value to their overlords is that they are hard-working producers of tropical products for consumption in temperate countries. It does not occur to Lord Rothermere and the people who think with him, that India is quite a different kind of country from Tropical Africa, and that Indians were engaged in the weaving of fine cotton goods for centuries before Lancashire knew anything about the art. But what do such things as this matter to our Imperialists, old and young? The following paragraph is really most precious and should be very carefully considered:

"Britain is the most dangerously overpopulated country in the world. This overpopulation would not have been possible except for our association with India and our other Eastern possessions. They brought great wealth to us to the extent, so it is computed, of more than one-fifth of our national income and wealth. When we lose them a crisis of almost unparalleled gravity will occur and the young men and women of the country will know that all that lies ahead for them is a life of searching and immeasurable poverty."

The deduction is therefore drawn, though it is not explicitly stated, that an end should be put to all this talk of political reform, and the British people should resume, with the necessary firmness of purpose and strength of hand, the government of India. It should not be allowed to fall into the hands of the disreputable Indian politicians and agitators (who have contributed nothing to the creation of modern India, which, on the contrary, is "entirely the creation of British enterprise") and of greedy Indian industrialists, in whom the immense agricultural population of India have no confidence and from whom only the worst is to be expected. As for the present Government, it is being obsessed by the insensate demands of the Indian politicians and industrialists, whilst the European community in India is intimidated by threats of violence and otherwise into support of the White Paper proposals. Two things alone it is perhaps permitted to say; one is that the Lancashire cotton industry is hardly likely to be encouraged and stimulated by arguments of this kind; the other is that hardly any of the Indian politicians and industrialists has a good word to say for the White Paper proposals as they are.

INDIA IN THE BYE-ELECTIONS.

Feeling himself reasonably sure of election to Parliament for the Hitchin constituency, Sir Arnold Wilson has been prompted, in one of his last speeches to the local electors, under the Chairman-

ship of Lord Salisbury, to say "Those who like myself oppose the Government (White Paper) proposals in their present form are more careful of the honour of this country than of the interests of the people of India than those who seek to impose on them, at the Centre and in the Provinces simultaneously, a system that is foreign to Indian tradition and opposed to all experience elsewhere. To the proposals in their present shape I am quite definitely opposed." Lord Salisbury, somewhat surprisingly, had rather airily waved aside the pledges and obligations and undertakings of honour made to India on the ground that nothing should be allowed to stand in the way of India's true welfare, of which the British people are the only and final judges, a dangerous doctrine that is flatly contradicted in an important special article in the *Observer* on Sunday from the eloquent pen of Mr. J. L. Garvin, and in an editorial appearing in yesterday's *Times* of the very highest significance. Sir Arnold Wilson's mature expression of opinion has naturally won the high encomiums of the *Evening News*, which clamours for a large increase in the number of Sir Arnolds in the House (his election for the Hitchin division by a reduced majority has just been announced), and for less of "obedient Whip fodder". It sounds almost Hitlerian.

On the other hand, the *Daily Mail*, turning to the Altrincham bye-election, allows Lord Rothermere to describe Sir Edward Grigg as "the candidate of apostate conservatism," and to proceed as follows: "Bludgeoned by young Randolph Churchill, he found at the eleventh hour that he is not in favour of handing Indian police over to the native politician. A vote for Sir Edward Grigg is a vote for the ruin of Lancashire and the loss of India." "The native politician" will have noted with amusement what Lord Rothermere in his excitement has omitted to observe, namely, that the only alternatives to the Altrincham elector would be to vote either for the Liberal or for the Labour candidate, and how would that benefit the cause that Lord Rothermere has so dearly at heart? He is really far safer with Sir Edward Grigg than with either of his rival candidates.

A SIGNIFICANT TELEGRAM.

It would be difficult, if not indeed impossible, for the Cabinet to fail to take into consideration this important question in view of the telegram addressed to the Prime Minister and to the Viceroy, among others, and of which a copy has been received by at least one prominent member of the British Indian delegation, urging on behalf of Dr. Tagore and some seventy co-signatories of the highest distinction and eminence in public life, including non-politicians no less than politicians, and men and women prominent in the political, social, economic, and moral life of the country, the release of political prisoners not convicted of acts of violence, the removal from the Statute Book of the special legislation, and the provision of facilities to enable the Congress, if it so chooses, to participate in the present phase of constitution-making, in order to establish the requisite atmosphere in which an adequate scheme of reforms can be effectively worked.

It is hardly to be believed that of the daily Press only the *Morning Post* and the *Daily Herald* (extremes for once have met), in each case publishing only three or four names of signatories, referred to the telegram at all. Reuter appears to have neglected it, and even the *Times* correspondent ignored it. One would suppose that an attempt to establish a conspiracy of silence had been made in official quarters at Simla, though doubtless this would be denied. Doubtless other prominent men and women in India

would have been prepared and willing to sign the appeal had it been confined strictly to the question of the release of political prisoners, and for many reasons it is a pity that the signatories did not confine themselves to that one single feature as the inclusion of other matters that are rather more controversial may make it more difficult for friendly collaborators here to pool their resources. *The Spectator* and *the New Statesman* to-day, in general terms, support the appeal for the release of political prisoners. The Indian Conciliation Group is giving wide circulation to the full text of the appeal, together with a complete list of the signatories and their general description, in order to indicate their widely varied character, standing, and experience.

It ought, however, to be borne in mind that very little is likely to be done by the Cabinet, at the present moment, even if otherwise well disposed to respond to the appeal for the liberation of prisoners, until after the great domestic battle within the Tory Party on the India question is fought out on the 28th instant. It is believed, notwithstanding the ranting and the rampaging of the right-wing Tory Press and its followers and supporters, that Mr. Baldwin will be able to retain control of the meeting and obtain its general support for the policy and procedure already outlined. It is very likely, however, that a favourable decision will be obtained, not so much on the merits of the policy, or the constitutional proposals that may emerge from the present examination, as upon a strong unwillingness to weaken the National Government at a period of crisis. Whilst the question is undecided the utmost that could be expected of the Cabinet is a private recommendation to the Government of India not to queer the pitch, as they have done on more than one previous occasion, by precipitate action. Whether, after the end of the month, the Cabinet would be willing to take a strong stand in the matter, will to a large extent depend upon the events of the next three weeks and the news from India. Much, too, will depend upon the line taken by the Congress leaders when they meet together shortly to determine upon their future course of action in regard to civil disobedience in consultation with Mr. Gandhi. In the meanwhile, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru has addressed a characteristic letter to the *Manchester Guardian* urging with strong conviction both the release of prisoners and the provision of facilities for the Congress, if they so desire to participate in the Select Committee scheme, which is to be resumed next Tuesday.

REACTION RAISES ITS HEAD.

There is no doubt whatever that an increasingly serious situation is developing within the Conservative Party. The rebels are taking heart of grace, and they are causing considerable anxiety to the Party leaders. At the two bye-elections now pending, India has been put right in the forefront and there was until last night the chance that Mr. Randolph Churchill, the son and heir of the celebrated father, would stand as an Independent Conservative candidate in opposition to Sir Edward Grigg, at Altrincham. As a matter of fact it is doubtful whether a Churchill candidature in a Lancashire constituency would be welcome, notwithstanding the recent campaign in which Churchill Senior and his colleague and companion Lord Lloyd engaged recently at Manchester beating the patriotic drum with great fervour and appealing to the cupidity, if not to the statesmanship, of Lancashire cotton manufacturers. Nevertheless the attack made by the Tory rebels has been of such a character that they have obliged Sir Edward Grigg, the official candidate of the Party, to wobble on India, and to declare that he is not in favour of handing over the administration of police in the Provinces to Indian Ministers. In this he will have great dif-

ficulty in reconciling himself to the express recommendations contained in the Report of the Statutory Commission. So far as Sir Arnold Wilson at Hitchin is concerned, he still holds himself free to vote against his Party Leader on the question of India should he be returned to Parliament.

In reply to the new organisation recently established by Sir John Thompson, Mr. Edward Villiers, and some colleagues, with the object of fighting the Tory rebels in support of the White Paper, it is announced to-day that the India Defence League has been formed by the reactionaries, with the support of a large number of old friends like Viscount Sumner, Lord Lloyd, Mr. Winston Churchill and Sir Henry Page-Croft, with their henchman Sir Michael O'Dwyer, and with the addition of Viscount Fitz-Allen, Earl Howe, Lord Carson, the Duke of Westminster, Lord Amphill, Lord Banbury, Lord Halsbury, Lord Kenmare, Lord Lawrence, Lord Melchett, and several Members of Parliament including Viscount Wolmer, the heir to the Selbourne Earldom. They are opposed to "the surrender policy" in India, and they state in a manifesto: "The establishment of so-called democratic institutions in the Provinces at the same time as responsible government is set up at the centre would, whatever the 'safeguards' in the existing state of Indian society, hazard the lives, the liberties, and the fortunes of 350,000,000 of our fellow-subjects.

"In particular the transference of the judiciary and the police is a step fraught with grave danger to all concerned. No representative body of Indians accepts or can undertake to work such a constitution.

"To imperil the peace of India, to jeopardise the vast trade that has brought so much benefit and employment to both communities, to strike at the main and central strength of the British Empire by such an experiment would be, in our judgment, a fatal dereliction of duty."

MR. BALDWIN STANDS FIRM.

It is thus clear that the forces of reaction are organising themselves with much thoroughness and ample funds behind them. How far they are likely to be able to attract greater Parliamentary strength to themselves than they now possess is a matter of anxious speculation. I was talking this week with a very prominent political personage, who is fairly closely in touch with the situation in Parliament, and who held the view that, notwithstanding this noisy beating of drums and the dressing up of the same old opponents in new uniforms, the maximum vote against the official proposals in the House, if they were backed substantially, as was very probable by the Joint Select Committee, would probably not exceed one hundred, whilst the fact that an overwhelming Tory vote was cast in a preponderantly Tory House, upon the recommendations of a Government, which, though nominally National, was strongly Conservative in its complexion, would be the strongest possible inducement to the House of Lords to pass the India Bill.

Nevertheless, in order to achieve this result, or anything like it, the Government will have to make a special effort. This morning's papers intimate that Mr. Baldwin, at the meeting of the Central Council of Conservative Associations to be held in London on the 28th June, has notified his intention of addressing the members on the Government's India policy, and that he will there answer the challenge to his leadership. It is a courageous but a very necessary stand for Mr. Baldwin to take. Not very long ago, it will be remembered, it was at a meeting of this very body that Mr. Winston Churchill delivered his sensational attack upon the Government, who were saved, on a resolution condemning its India policy, by

twenty-four votes out of three hundred and fifty-four cast. Mr. Baldwin's task will therefore be of no little difficulty, and if he should be defeated he may well resign his leadership of the Party into other hands. It would also compel the Cabinet to reconsider its policy and the effect upon the Tory members of the Joint Parliamentary Committee would certainly be very great. During the coming month, therefore, there will be much coming and going at Party Headquarters, much intrigue behind the scenes, and still more verbal fireworks in the Press and on the platform.

Our Paris Letter.

(BY AIR MAIL.)

(From Our Correspondent.)

PARIS, June 10.

FOREIGN POLICY.

THE debate on Foreign Policy which began in Parliament here several weeks ago, has been concluded yesterday night by a vote relative to the World-Conference and the Four-Power Pact. M. Daladier secured the confidence of the Chambre by 406 votes against 185.

This means that the republican majority trusts the present Government to conduct the delicate negotiations in London with the necessary tact and wisdom. The vote also indicates that since authorisation has been given to sign the Pact in Rome the latter has every chance to be subsequently ratified by Parliament.

The fact that the principle of the Pact has thus been accepted cannot but have favourable international repercussions. "It is unquestionable," says *La République*, "that the approval of the Pact is likely to change the international 'climate' just on the eve of the London Conference." France will have an important part to play in its deliberations, particularly as regards monetary questions and the problem of commercial exchanges. The country has entrusted M. Daladier with its confidence; now it rests with him to honour it and to justify the hopes of so many of our people especially those of the working class who are suffering so cruelly from the present chaos.

The discussions in Parliament had started about the London Conference. But it was evident that official French circles did not seem to attach a very great importance to the subject. Neither was public opinion really stirred. This seems somewhat surprising owing to the extreme importance of the questions to be discussed in London, and to the growing and urgent necessity of an international agreement on those points. It is no use denying that people have grown more and more weary and sceptical regarding international conferences; these are considered as so many "Babel Towers," where people talk a great deal but cannot manage to understand one another and pretend to do some work, but all to no purpose. This attitude is no doubt regrettable, but—unfortunately—not wholly unjustified. In almost any circle, whatever its political tendencies may be, if international conferences or institutions are mentioned, faces light up with a smile, in which one can read irony and contempt, mixed with disappointment and bitterness. All along these last years, a great deal of confident hope has gradually been destroyed, and international concerns have slowly won the

reputation of being as powerless as they are pretentious, all the while costing a good deal of money to many candid and over-confident people. However false and deplorable it may be, this point of view is getting too widely prevalent to remain blissfully ignored by the very people who could help to change it. Needless to say, a change can only be brought about by obtaining more substantial results in the international field.

It is very noticeable that public opinion, which remains indifferent to international talks, is very prompt to react as soon as facts come into play. Thus the Four-Power Pact has given rise to much lively comment in the Press and to passionate discussions in Parliament. Opinion is sharply divided as regards the Rome agreement, but all parties are alive to its vital importance. Let us hope that M. Daladier will justify his own saying that France must have a "positive and constructive" policy.

DISARMAMENT.

The special commission on disarmament has adjourned till the 3rd of July, both to allow concentration on the opening of the London conference, and to enable the Bureau to prepare a new text for the second reading of the British Plan. The first reading has revealed more divergencies than points of agreement. After the initial enthusiasm which greeted the Norman Davis proposals, the same old difficulties arose again.

France is ready to reduce her armaments, particularly the "heavy material," but not unless some counter-part is granted. America is doing what she can, if the present state of public opinion in that country is duly taken into account; yet her assurances are too vague for France to dispense with the necessity of seeking for complementary guarantees in Europe. England however will hear nothing of those guarantees. She argues about the definition of the aggressor, and she refuses to take up any new engagements as regards mutual assistance. Italy and Germany seem to agree with England on that point and they are also opposed to all the measures of control without which any theoretical disarmament is likely to be a mere delusive appearance.

These divergencies have not yet created a deadlock, because no definitive decisions have been reached up to now, but when the time actually comes when each nation will have to take precise responsibilities and express them by a vote, the disarmament conference might come very near failure again.

It is with a view of easing the situation in that respect that conversations on disarmament have been organised these days in Paris between representatives of the British, French and United States Governments, especially—it is believed here—at the instigation of Mr. Norman Davis. "These restricted conferences," says *Paris-Midi*, "have rarely been favourable to our country. Yet, this time, if we are to judge by the very brief declarations of the interested parties, M. Daladier and M. Paul-Boncour have remained firm." "Our government has got a programme and a doctrine," declared M. Daladier. Let us hope that France will uphold this programme and this doctrine in the future negotiations which are bound to take place in London, side by side with the Economic Conference. If the Four-Power Pact brings an important contribution to European understanding it can in no way replace security, and until the latter has been provided for, no further concessions can be justified.

Reviews.

GANDHI VERSUS THE EMPIRE.

GANDHI VERSUS THE EMPIRE. By HARIDAS T. MUZUMDAR. (Universal Publishing Co., New York.) 1932. 24cm. 452p. \$3.50.

MAHATMAJI'S wonderful performance at 'Parnakuti' has again shown to a sceptical world the supremacy of the spiritual over material strength. The battle is, in a sense, as old as the world. But India today is the scene of a particularly keen and poignant conflict between the two forces and the real miracle of Mahatmaji's life, the greatest miracle of history, will be achieved only when he succeeds through soul force in overthrowing the octopus of Imperialism that is striding the land in the supreme arrogance of militarist might. The fight is steadily heading to a crisis when none can afford to stand aloof, if only because the intensity of the struggle, on the one hand, and the imperative claims of Truth and Justice, on the other, will hardly leave any room for neutrals to stand on. The organic structure of humanity is also such that no nation or individual can for long enjoy real freedom or happiness by the side of another sunk in slavery or sorrow. This justifies the hope that the conscience of the world will ultimately respond to the wail of the weak and come to the rescue of those who are struggling to regain their liberty.

Dr. Muzumdar's book is born of this faith. He is also a believer in the tenet that Truth has only to be known to be embraced. He is an ardent votary of the Gandhian gospel and came all the way from America to take part in Mahatmaji's campaign. He was one of those that followed the great leader in his political march to Dandi and remained with him till the time of his arrest. Subsequently, he was instructed by Pandit Motilal, then Acting Congress President, to go back to America to tell the people of the world "the inside story of India's struggle." This book is the outcome of the above commission. Its artless title bluntly brings out the scheme. Dr. Muzumdar does not attempt to depict the whole of this mighty drama of non-violent revolution, but only the 'high lights' of the fourth act following the first campaign of non-co-operation conducted by Mahatmaji in 1920-24. According to the author's reading, the fourth act has three scenes: one, the period of Gandhi's retirement from active politics (1925-29), and the obstructionist tactics of the Congress Party in the legislatures a la Erfa; two, the vaudeville performances at St. James's Palace in London; three, the Civil Disobedience campaign in the wake of India's Declaration of Independence in January 1930. "This fourth act," the author writes in his preface, dated May 1932, "with sufficient pauses for the performances at St. James is now going on with striking dramatic verve. In sheer poetic justice the last act with its denouement shall be played not to the end of effecting a reconciliation between the estranged people of India and the British Crown, but to the end of enabling India to be mistress in her own house and enabling England to be rid of the incubus of the Empire system."

The anatomy of the book is as follows: Part I styled 'The British Raj' gives an outline of the whole story of the campaign up to Gandhiji's last arrest on his return from London. Here the author clearly states the issues involved in the struggle and gives brief, but impressive, sketches of Mahatmaji's life, including his historic trial in March 1922 when "the British Raj was being pilloried, not the leader of

the non-violent campaign." The section under the head-line "The Empire Abdicates" combines deep political interest with sublime human interest and touching pathos. The author describes with rare literary skill, with the aid of personal notes taken on the spot, the highly dramatic scene of Gandhiji's arrest in the midnight of May 5, 1930, at the Satyagraha Camp at Karadi. He explains the head-line in the following words (p. 33): "The swift, sudden, secret, dramatic arrest of Mahatma Gandhi in the dead of night is the frankest confession of the importance of the British Raj. The setting aside of the right of Habeas Corpus, sacred in English tradition, the denial of trial to the accused, the arrest and imprisonment of the greatest man of our times under an irrelevant hundred year old ordinance—such lawlessness on the part of a Government is the surest sign of its abdication."

Part II on the Congress, consisting of six chapters, describes the new life that has entered that organisation, and through that, the country. Here we find the Congress Declaration of Independence, an exposition of the general plan and tactics of the non-violent campaign, and the rules of conduct and discipline of the Satyagraha force supported by abstracts of important statements and interviews given by Mahatmaji in the course of the struggle. Part III bears the descriptive line "Gandhi comes to grip with the British Raj" and begins with the text of the ultimatum that Gandhiji gave to the Viceroy. In the section 'How the British Raj Governs' the author exposes the police excesses and the repressive methods adopted by the Government to terrorise the nation. The story of the peace negotiations conducted within prison walls by Mr. Slocombe of *The Daily Herald* and the redoubtable patriots, Sapru and Jayakar, is given at some length. The author has done them grave injustice by describing them as "the errand-boys of the alien government." But, later on, he makes amends by acknowledging in handsome terms their undaunted efforts and the strong position taken up by the Moderates at the first R. T. C. which, he admits, helped towards the success of the subsequent negotiations and the settlement of the truce. Part IV aptly describes "Gandhi invades England" and details the signal triumphs won by Mahatmaji over the hearts of English men, women and children in general, and the chief cultural and religious centres in particular—not as an invader with a sword of steel, as John Haynes Holmes puts it, but as an apostle with the sword of the spirit. The chapter under the heading "The saint and the sinner" is, in many respects, the most interesting and, especially to westerners, the most instructive and illuminating as it is here that Dr. Muzumdar exposes the British statecraft and diplomacy as manifested at the Round Table. The straight and sharp answers that the author gives to some of the critics of Gandhi in the west as well as his suggestions for the proper understanding of Gandhi will also be valued by the reader. The soul-stirring speeches delivered by the Mahatma at the R.T.C. are also included in extenso in this part.

The fifth and the last part consists of the appeal made by the author to the American nation for sympathy and support for the starving millions dying to regain their liberty in India. The appeal is in the form of an open letter to the American people issued on the occasion of the celebration of the 2nd Indian Independence Day in Philadelphia and Washington by the author and his friends, Indian and American. The letter sets forth the situation in India after the failure of the 2nd R. T. C. and the imprisonment of Gandhiji and details the gruesome features of the repressive regime. The author recalls the cultural affinity and close kinship of the Gandhian Gospel

with the teachings of Washington, Lincoln and Thoreau—not to speak of Christ's sermon on the Mount. "Gandhi is to-day, giving back to America what he received from her by way of Thoreau" observes the author, and adds, "The American people can best show their esteem for Gandhi by enshrining Thoreau in their hearts." America can best help India, as Mahatmaji observed, by having an intelligent understanding of the situation.

For the promotion of this Indo-American understanding the book under review is a timely and useful contribution. Dr. Muzumdar, as an Indian and a satyagrahi, evidently, has only done his duty. All the same, he deserves the thanks and congratulations of his countrymen for presenting the nation's case before the world with such ability, courage and candour. With characteristic humility, he has kept himself largely in the background and presented his case, as far as possible, in Mahatmaji's own words, not hesitating to embody in the book full texts of Mahatmaji's important statements, speeches and interviews bearing on the questions dealt with in the different sections. This method of treatment has only added dignity, weight and authenticity to the author's original contentions in the book. Dr. Muzumdar has no doubt in his mind as to the ultimate outcome of the Indian struggle. In Chapter XIV (p. 144), after giving briefly the proceedings of the second R. T. C. and referring to its after-math of repression in India, he says:

"It is my deliberate judgment that the more repressive the British Government becomes the more soundly will the cause of India's freedom prosper. I predict the holding of a final Round Table Conference to solve the Indo-British problem—but at that Conference there shall not be 108 'delegates', nor will it be in London. The final Round Table—or, rather, the square table—will be in India, most probably behind prison bars, between Mahatma Gandhi and the highest representatives of the British Raj. The negotiations next time will not be spread over a protracted period of five weeks, as on the occasion of the Gandhi-Irwin Truce. When the British Raj is good and ready to surrender to Gandhi's ultimatum and to accept the principle of the All-India National Congress becoming the future de jure and de facto Government of India, within six hours the terms of the final settlement will be signed. The recasting of the map of India at the present rate of progress should not take more than five years."

The great daring, optimism and spirit of self-confidence breathed in the above are very striking. But prophesying is no easy game in politics. With due respect for the fiery spirit and nationalist fervour of the youthful author, we would caution him, in the interests of Truth, to be more sober and playless with his reputation as a prophet.

Extravagances of this type are the natural off-shoots of the war-mentality, though out of place in the ethics of satyagraha. They do not affect the general merit and value of the book as an eye-opener to the western world, the soundness of its advocacy of India's cause or the thoroughness of its exposure of Britain's claims. The author has spared no pains to rouse up the conscience of humanity to a full realisation of the gravity and moral import of the Indian struggle.

M. R. RAMASWAMI.

CONTRACEPTIVE METHODS.

MODERN BIRTH CONTROL METHODS OR HOW TO AVOID PREGNANCY. By GEORGE RELEY SCOTT. (John Bale & Sons, London.) 1933. 20cm. 209p. 7/6.

As Sir W. Arbuthnot Lane points out in his fore-

word, the study of birth control and the innumerable vital issues associated with it have been ignored by the medical curriculum. "Indeed it has been left to the members of the lay public to interest and later to instruct the medical fraternity in this most important subject."

Though there is nothing absolutely new in the book, the author passes in review all the known methods of contraception and stresses one or two important points. For instance, he lays emphasis on the fact that there is no single method which will be successful in every case and that a suitable combination of methods has to be selected by an expert for any particular case, it being generally agreed that a combination of methods is required for perfect safety.

On one or two points, however, exception may be taken to the author's views. Of course there is bound to be considerable difference of opinion as regards details of methods. But there are important points which have to be considered seriously. About *coitus interruptus* I quite agree that it is a very popular method because it requires no preparation or interruption of any kind, except at the end, when the coitus itself is interrupted, and it may be the only available method under certain circumstances. The author admits that it is a very unreliable method as some men are incapable of it, others forget all about it and still others think that they can do it when really they do not do it effectively. But apart from this, he sees no harm in it for normal people, though "there are no doubt cases where indulgence in *coitus interruptus* develops dormant neuroses or aggravates existing ones." The trouble is that it is impossible to know dormant neuroses so long as they are dormant and the author is hardly justified in saying: "Indeed it would appear that those who catalogue so terrifying a list of evils resulting from its practice are in error in diagnosing the root cause of these evils." In any given case, the author would say that there were dormant neuroses, while a sexologist would attribute the results to *coitus interruptus*. Under the circumstances, I prefer to take the opinion of medical experts. For instance, Dr. Robinson, the well-known sexologist of New York, says:

"Some men have such tremendous will-power that though it is as difficult and as painfully disagreeable for them to withdraw as for people of the preceding class (those who find it impossible), they do succeed in withdrawing; but it gives them such a 'wrench,' their nervous system is so shaken that after a while the disastrous results of the practice are unmistakable. It is people of this class who become neurotic, irritable and sometimes profoundly neurasthenic. The pernicious effects on the sexual system may be: a congested prostate, premature ejaculation (very frequent), weakened erections and loss of or diminished libido."

I shall quote another medical writer, a lady, Dr. Antoinette F. Konikow, M. D.:

"I consider *coitus interruptus* unreliable, abnormal and detrimental to health, and would advise its use only in exceptional circumstances and then only in combination with other methods..."

Another disputed point is about Dr. Grafenberg's ring, in recommending which the author has the support of Dr. Norman Haire. The objections to it will be seen from Dr. Robinson's remarks on it:

"He admits that the ring must be introduced and removed by a skilled gynecologist (not even an ordinary physician but a gynecologist)! He admits that the presence of the silk-silver ring induces pathologic changes in the endometrium, bloody discharges, premenstrual hemorrhage, menorrhagia, etc., and yet the method is recommended as an advance! It was an insult to the medical audience, that report of Dr. Grafenberg. Why, any foreign body

introduced high up into the uterus will produce the same effects: if it will not prevent conception, it will surely keep on producing abortions, and cause inflammations and infections in the woman's adnexa."

Apart from these debatable points, the book is full of solid information. The author gives a chapter on "Illegal Methods," meaning abortion, and appendices on "Facilitation of Conception," lists of Birth Control Clinics and Societies and a selected bibliography.

R. D. KARVE.

SHAKESPEARE AND INDIA.

SHAKESPEARE THROUGH EASTERN EYES.

By RANJEE G. SHAHANI. (Herbert Joseph, London.) 21cm. 190p. 6/-

THIS is a highly entertaining little volume, if only for the series of shocks it gives to the fervent votaries of the great dramatist. The author sets out to show that Shakespeare is a much over-rated writer, and that to the Indian reading and theatre-going public, at least, he is like the Curate's egg—excellent in parts. The title chosen for the book is a trifle too comprehensive, for the subject dealt with is Shakespeare as seen through *Indian* and not "Eastern" eyes; and even in this restricted ambit, we can accept the author's criticism only as personal and individual, and not as representative. For which are the classes on whose behalf he claims to speak? In his chapter "The Sowing of the Seed," Dr. Shahani deals with one class of Shakespeare readers in this country, the unfortunate wights whose first and last acquaintance with Shakespeare is as one of the hurdles to be jumped over in the race for a university degree. It would be impossible not to sympathise with these Shakespeare conscripts, who, once they have been liberated from the examination obsession, become conscientious objectors to all things Shakespearean. But surely, they represent an abnormal type, a type in which literary judgment is either insufficiently developed, or else completely perverted through the influence of the unimaginative teacher, who looks upon the great poet as a subject for examination and not as the creator of new imaginative forms and ideals. The other class as whose *porte-parole* Dr. Sahani appears, is the theatre-going class. Of this class, it is enough to say, first, that theatre-going has not yet become sufficiently popular in this country to enable us to postulate literary tendencies from the likes or dislikes of the audience, and secondly, that it is but very rarely that translations or adaptations (the latter is commoner of Shakespeare plays) are put on the stage here. What Dr. Shahani does attempt to interpret is the opinion held by those who have now and again essayed to adapt Shakespeare to the Indian stage. These amateur playwrights are men steeped in the Indian dramatic tradition, and swayed by this innate bias, they attempt to make their adaptations of Shakespeare conform to their own literary standards. It is thus that, in keeping with the ancient Sanskrit laws of stage aesthetics, tragedies are taboo and representations of such things as war, death, etc., are kept away from the Indian stage. The reactions of this class of Shakespeare readers to the English dramatist are therefore coloured by their own literary traditions and conventions; in effect, then, they attempt to measure Shakespeare by the canons of Sanskritic dramaturgy. What, one may well exclaim, is the earthly use of evaluating Elizabethan drama in terms of the aesthetic and literary canons which prevailed in India before the Christian era?

Having said this much to indicate our emphatic dissent from the main propositions which Dr. Shahani wants to establish, it is now open to us to confess

that on a great many subsidiary points it is possible for modern literary opinion in India to agree with him. These for the most part have no direct bearing on Dr. Shahani's argument, but are nevertheless valuable as indicating the effect produced by certain parts of Shakespeare's writings on the small class of Indian public which is at all able to read and appreciate the dramatist in his own language. In dealing with these aspects of Shakespeare's writings, the author shows real literary acumen; and as regards the entire book it may be said that the verve and zeal displayed by him in his iconoclastic effort are sure to bring him plenty of amused, if unconvinced, readers.

P. P. P.

PROBLEM OF DISARMAMENT.

DISARMAMENT: A DISCUSSION. By ARTHUR PONSONBY. (Hogarth Press, London.) 1932. 18cm. 45p. 1/6.

THERE is no topic concerning the League of Nations which is more misunderstood and less understood by the Indian public than Disarmament. "Disarmament means the elimination of all future wars and how can that be possible so long as the inequalities—political, economic and social—between the white and the black races of the world continue to exist?" exclaims one Indian. Europe must disarm and Asia must arm. Otherwise the League of Nations deserves to be branded as a clique of European Imperialistic Powers eager to substitute the method of co-operation for that of competition in exploiting the backward peoples of the world, such is the considered view of another Indian. "India is the land of pacific ideals and traditions and her sons and daughters will always feel proud of associating themselves with any movement for world peace and fellowship. But so long as Europe believes in brute force and creates every day new engines of destruction, India will and must refuse to place herself alone "at the wrong end of the gun", that is the conviction of a third Indian. Criticisms of this type show clearly that there is a real necessity to inform public opinion in India about the basic facts of Disarmament—facts which are well brought out in Lord Ponsonby's pamphlet in the interesting form of a discussion between an Advocate, an Officer and a Layman.

The Advocate, as his profession would require him to be, is always very keen in making hair-splitting distinctions between facts in issue or relevant to the issue and facts which may by themselves be interesting but are irrelevant to the issue. He also tries his best to compose the differences which naturally arise between the Officer and Layman. For instance, he would not allow the controversy on Disarmament to begin until a definition of war, as understood by the Governments of the world and the Peoples' Associations which clamour for peace, has been formulated and accepted by all the three persons involved in that controversy. His caution and moderation clinch the issues at every stage and act as good corrective to both the ignorance of the idealistic Layman and the narrow-mindedness of the expert Officer. All the problems confronting the Disarmament Conference of a technical as well as of a diplomatic nature are discussed in this pamphlet with a lucidity of argument which is only to be expected from such an able Parliamentarian and master of international affairs as Lord Ponsonby. "By war is meant organised international war and not any other type of conflict involving the use of force, like robbery or civil war. Disarmament means not the elimination of war as such—for we can always fight whether we have weapons of a particular type or not—but simply the limitation and reduction of certain engines of destruction which have made

modern scientific warfare more terrible and contagious than ever before. Security as a means of disarmament, disarmament as a means of security, the creation of an international army, the definition of an aggressor and the control of the traffic in arms—all these problems should be properly dealt with in any disarmament programme." These are some of basic facts of disarmaments which are sifted and explored in the controversy. I sincerely commend to the careful attention of my uninformed but idealistic compatriots the quite convincing case of the sober and pragmatic Advocate.

T. S. RAMANUJAM.

SHORT NOTICE

THE MESSAGE OF THE SAT TAL ASHRAM
1931. (Association Press, Calcutta.) 1932. 20cm.
300p. Rs. 2/4.

THE MESSAGE OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD.
(Association Press, Calcutta.) 1932. 452p.
Rs. 4-4-0.

DR. STANLEY JONES needs no introduction in India: he is well-known as a fervent preacher, a writer and an Evangelist. These two books contain selected papers read during the years 1931 and 1932 at the summer "Ashram," run by him for missionaries and others in the Himalayas. The aims and ideals of the Ashram are set forth briefly by Dr. Jones in the respective forewords, and he also contributes to each collection a paper in his characteristic vigorous style. Some of the papers are of purely religious interest, but many of them are challenging to all who are interested in the religious future of India: we would recommend to all such, in the first series the papers by the Rev. E. C. Dewick, Rev. Gordon Halstead, and Rev. H. A. Popley, while in the second series the Rev. E. L. King's brilliant study of Christian education, the Rev. T. R. Milford's lucid survey of the relations of Religion and Science, Dr. Asirvatham's exhaustive political paper and those by the Rev. John de Boer, and Dr. Murray Titus will all be of great interest to the general reader, Christian and non-Christian. We recommend these books to all who have to do with contemporary Christian thought in this country, especially to those critics of Christianity whose criticisms by reason of their obsolescence so frequently fail to go home. Here is a chance for them to study contemporary Christian thought conveniently. The books are both illustrated, and well bound and printed.

R. F.

Miscellaneous.

INDIAN POLITICAL SITUATION.

MR. H. N. KUNZRU'S REVIEW.

IN the course of his address to the Servants of India Society on June 12 last, Mr. H. N. Kunzru, the Vice-President of the Society, passed under review the political situation in India. He voiced at the outset the keen regret which all of them felt at the absence of Mr. Devadhar owing to illness. His continued ill-health was causing them great anxiety and they all earnestly hoped that he would recover very soon. He then referred to other members whom urgent duty or ill-health had prevented from attending the session. He was glad that Mr. Sastri's health had permitted him to join them. His presence

was a source of great pleasure and strength to them. Briefly referring to the work of the Society, Mr. Kunzru drew attention to the useful part which, in conformity with the general policy of the Mahatma, the members were taking in the anti-untouchability movement.

The position of Indians in South Africa was still causing them anxiety and demanded continued vigilance on the part of the Government of India. They had no doubt that Sir Maharaj Singh would do his utmost to protect Indian interests.

Dealing with the political situation, Mr. Kunzru after expressing the thankfulness of the Society at the happy termination of Mahatma Gandhi's fast, appreciated his courage in suspending civil disobedience. This action was believed to have been actuated by a genuine desire for peace not merely by Indians but also by some representatives of European opinion. Mr. Kunzru had been reliably informed that Simla itself took the same view at first, but unfortunately it soon changed its mind and refused to make it easy for things to return to the normal. He thought that, left to themselves, the Government of Great Britain would more than once during the last few months have been prepared to adopt a conciliatory policy, but the men on the spot, dominated by considerations of prestige, made a generous gesture on their part impossible. The recent appeal by constitutionalists for a change of policy had apparently left Government unmoved. The Ordinance Acts seemed to have turned the Government's mind away from thoughts of peace. The Chittagong order showed on what lines they were thinking.

Coming to constitutional reform, Mr. Kunzru dwelt on the utter inadequacy of the White Paper proposals to satisfy any political party in India: The substance of power was being withheld from Indians. In spite of the reliance placed on the Princes for the maintenance of stability and pursuit of moderate policies and the unfortunate inclusion of a nominated element from Indian States in the Indian Legislature, crippling restrictions had been insisted on in the White Paper. Notwithstanding internal obstacles to the free play of democracy, the external checks were manifold. The financial limitations reduced the power of the Indian Finance Minister to a shadow. The policy laid down with regard to the army was unsatisfactory. The scheme for the Indianization of the higher grades showed no real desire to advance and no decision had been arrived at with regard to the elimination of the British Army. There was to be no further Indianization of the Indian civil and police services for at least five years, and even after that, progress would depend not as hitherto on executive action but on parliamentary action. In the police department the Minister will count for as little as possible. He would have no power over the superior or subordinate personnel. The provisions relating to the recruitment of these services and the extension of their rights were the most indefensible features of the White Paper and deserved the severest condemnation.

The reform proposals were based on distrust and a desire to concede the minimum possible in the existing circumstances. The spirit in which they are conceived must change before they can provide a reasonably stable solution of the Indo-British problem. Unity among us is indispensable for the achievement of our freedom. The Hindus and Muslims have the fate of the country in their hands. A heavy responsibility rests on the Princes too, who, having been conceded all that they demanded, should join others in achieving freedom for their country.