

The Servant of India

EDITOR : P. KODANDA RAO.

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

VOL. XVI, No. 49. } POONA—THURSDAY, DECEMBER 14, 1933. { INDIAN SUBSN. Rs.
FOREIGN SUBSN. 15s.

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK.	577
ARTICLES :—	
India's Case for Self-Government.	579
Social Justice and Land Reform.	580
"Whither Congress?"	581
Federation and Independence. By Observer.	583
OUR LONDON LETTER.	585
REVIEWS :—	
The Present Economic Crisis. By Prof. G. B. Jathar, L. E. S.	587
American Commercial Policy. By Prof. K. B. Madhava.	587
SHORT NOTICE.	588
CORRESPONDENCE :—	
"The Princes' Veto Power". By S. Satyamurti.	588
BOOKS RECEIVED.	588

Topics of the Week.

An Unintended Execution.

THE unintended execution of a condemned prisoner in Lahore proves the extreme urgency of filing any administrative lacunae that official inquiries now in progress may disclose. The man was sentenced to death by the Sessions Judge, against whose judgment he appealed to the High Court. But there his appeal was dismissed. His subsequent petition for mercy to the Governor and Governor-General too fared no better. An appeal to the Privy Council was then thought of as a last resort, of which the local Government was duly apprised. Timely orders directing postponement of the execution of the sentence seem to have emanated from the Secretariat and to have even reached the office of the Jail Superintendent a day earlier than that fixed for the execution. Only they were brought to his notice too late—after the man was hanged. This regrettable tragedy would have been averted if the officer issuing the stay order, instead of regarding his duty as fully discharged the moment the order had been delivered into the Jail Superintendent's office, had taken steps to assure himself that it had attracted the attention of some responsible person in the latter's office, especially because the stake was a human life. With telephones installed in the more important Government offices and with officers enjoying easy means of speedy transport, this could have been done without much trouble or loss of time. This is however not to absolve the Jail Superintendent and his staff from blame altogether. He too should not have carried out the sentence without getting a last-minute line-clear message from the head-quarters. This

presupposes action at both ends beyond the strict requirements of official routine; but is it not wise in such matters to err on the side of absolute safety? It is no doubt easy to be wise after the event; but this incident clearly establishes the need of closer touch between the head-quarters and the jail department. Incidentally it strengthens the case against the continuance of such an irrevocable and unmodifiable form of punishment as the death penalty.

* * *

Mr. Nariman's Move.

TO understand properly Mr. Nariman's ideas as to the future programme of the Congress, his book which is reviewed in another column needs to be read in conjunction with his letter to Congressmen. In this he suggests the convening of the All-India Congress Committee as the first step "to restore the authority of the Congress." With the letter are enclosed drafts of resolutions to be considered by the A. I. C. C. From these it is clear beyond doubt that what he wants the Committee to do is to revoke the resolution passed by the Working Committee in January 1932 by which the inauguration of mass civil disobedience was authorised. The cancellation of that resolution will automatically lead to the abandonment of the civil disobedience movement including the non-rent and no-tax campaigns. In short it will put a stop to all the emergency measures sanctioned by the Working Committee and make the Congress organisation function normally. Supposing that action as suggested by Mr. Nariman is taken by the A. I. C. C., Congress cannot be regarded as renouncing its freedom to resort to non-co-operation and civil disobedience as political weapons for all time. In fact it is proposed that the present campaign should be called off "in view of altered political conditions and as a matter of political expediency" and "regardless of the attitude of the Government" only after reiterating the faith of the Congress in those weapons.

What the official Congress programme is to be after the present campaign is formally declared to be at an end is a matter for the A. I. C. C. to decide. But if the Congress should decide again to play its proper role in politics as an organ of national opinion, Mr. Nariman would have it organise a national convention in order to work for the rejection of the White Paper and to bring about a communal settlement. Opinion in Congress circles on the points raised in Mr. Nariman's letter is being canvassed at present in different provinces and a meeting of the A. I. C. C. would be requisitioned, so we read his letter, only if a majority is found to support the proposed course of action. Mr. Nariman has been assured by Mahatma Gandhi that in case the majority of the A. I. C. C. members approved the principle underlying the suggested change in the Congress programme, he for one would not resist it. If, as seems clear, the main purpose of the contemplated A. I. C. C. meeting is to register the formal renuncia-

tion of the civil disobedience movement, Government would be committing a grave blunder if, as is reported, they are thinking of prohibiting the meeting. The mere fact of the convening of the A.I.C. C. is tantamount to a resolve on the part of a majority of responsible Congressmen to end the present impasse between the Congress and Government by stopping, so far as they are concerned, their non-violent war with the Government. The banning of such a meeting by Government is simply unthinkable.

* * *

Mr. Horniman's Advice to Congress.

Until not very long ago the Congress enjoyed the proud position of being the deliverer of goods. Since it has failed to deliver the goods, Mr. Horniman, editor of the *Bombay Sentinel*, contends that it is necessary for it "to change its whole strategy and tactics and adopt an entirely new programme." Failing this, he says it will get "no public support." In urging the desirability of the abandonment of civil disobedience, he says:

The only remedy for the present inert condition of the country is to get the Congress at work again as a living organisation. And that can only be done by frankly abandoning the inane and insane attempts to revivify a corpse and admitting that Civil Disobedience is "down and out" and setting about the preparation of a new programme and new methods.

Any attempt to compromise with the decision to abandon Civil Disobedience by the Congress Executive or the A. I. C. C. when it meets, will meet with no response from the country. It will mean that the Congress must lose the confidence of the country.

And, it is essential to remember, that in the past, the Congress has advanced on its glorious career, not only by the efforts of its own members, but because it has always had the backing of the country.

Without that sympathy and support of the vast mass of the people who are unable to participate in its activities, it would not, and will not make headway.

* * *

Reactionary and Unimpressive.

The transfer of law and order in Bengal is opposed generally on the ground that the Congress being in the ascendant would dominate the legislature, that the Ministry would consist of Congressmen who are in touch with the terrorists and that therefore the Minister concerned would very weakly handle the terrorist evil, if he did not encourage it. Such in fact was the line of reasoning followed by Mr. Mills, a retired Police Officer from Bengal, who gave evidence before the Joint Select Committee. But his basic assumption about the possible ascendancy of the Congress in the Bengal legislature was proved to be without foundation and the superstructure based on it naturally came down like a house of cards. Lord Zetland brought to his notice the fact that in a house of 250, there would be 119 Muslims, 25 Europeans and 4 Anglo-Indians, hardly any of whom could be suspected of pro-terrorist sympathies. Then there would 30 men belonging to the Depressed classes, most of them anti-Congress, so that the Hindu element which is credited with pro-terrorist sympathies would be in a minority. Even if Mr. Mills' contention that a sprinkling of Mahomedan and Depressed class members would be secretly sympathising with terrorist activities is accepted without question, the position is not materially altered. When thus confronted with the figures of the composition of the future Bengal legislature Mr. Mills was unable to justify his position to anybody's satisfaction; and the Committee had little difficulty in seeing that it was a weak case he was pleading.

Granting for argument's sake that the popular Minister would weaken in his handling of terrorism, how was it that, in spite of the fact that law and order is at present a reserved subject in charge of a Civilian, the evil had not yet been rooted out? Mr. Mills was asked to explain the phenomenon. The only light he could throw on the point was that the Government did not take sufficiently stringent powers for the purpose. To the question why this was so, he had no satisfactory answer to give. But perhaps Mr. Mills never bargained for being expected to support his statements by facts. His want of facts he made up by strength of language. Of the antiquated nature of his views his demand for the permanent retention on the statute book of the special ordinance laws dealing with terrorism and the addition too of "something on the lines of the Rowlatt Act" is a sufficiently convincing proof. We should not be surprised if the general impression of the Committee was that Mr. Mills had weakened an already weak case.

The other witness who accompanied him was Mr. French, a retired District Magistrate from Bengal. He was opposed to the very idea of planting parliamentary institutions in India, his view being that they can never succeed in Eastern lands. Unfortunately for him he cannot have it all his own way. Else he would have repealed even the 1919 Government of India Act, as he was frank enough to admit in his reply to Sir Samuel Hoare. How up to date and accurate is his knowledge about Indian conditions can be seen from the fact that he was consistently under the impression that the Calcutta Municipal Corporation was "superseded" or "suspended" till Sir Phiroze Sethna took an occasion to correct his belief.

* * *

Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer on University Education.

HAVE Indian Universities failed or succeeded? This question is very often asked and has a vital connection with the country's future. It was examined at some length by Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer in his thoughtful convocation address to the Lucknow University on Saturday last. Said he on the point:

While the research function of the university should be regarded as vital in the interests of the country, it is not possible to expect the generality of the graduates to devote themselves to research work in after-life. All that can be, and should be, expected is that they should acquire the elements of liberal culture, the desire and capacity to add to their stock of knowledge and a lively sense of their responsibilities as citizens. The traditional learning of the country in the ancient Sastras and literature was in times gone by sought after by our people from a love of knowledge for its own sake and for the distinction of scholarship. Economic conditions have undergone a great change and the poverty of our students and their struggle for existence prevent them from pursuing knowledge solely for its own sake and with the same disinterested ardour. There is no good in blaming them for having an eye on the worldly advantages of education. Nevertheless the love of knowledge must even in their own interests appeal to them and the success of the university must be judged by the extent to which it has succeeded in moulding the intellectual tastes and habits of its *alumni* and by their attainments, character and culture. That a large number of our graduates do attain to these standards I am ready to concede. But I have grave doubts whether this can be affirmed of the average products of our universities. Education implies not merely the reading or understanding of the prescribed text-books, but the habit of reading for oneself, the training of the intellect in reasoning and judgment and the possession of a certain store of knowledge and information on matters essential for the converse and conduct of life. It may be that the

acquisition of useful information and general knowledge is a process largely to be gone through in the secondary school stage — but it cannot be said that the university has no responsibility in the matter, or that it is creditable to a university to set its hall-mark upon graduates who are devoid of any information or knowledge upon matters of general interest ... Many of the students have not acquired even the habit of consulting a dictionary. The narrow range of their intellectual interests can be judged from the quality of the books and journals they read. A university education which has failed to kindle among its undergraduates a desire for wide reading and a thirst for knowledge has so far failed of its purpose. So also should I consider the university to have failed in the discharge of its functions if it has not imbued its students with the elements of liberal culture.

Articles.

INDIA'S CASE FOR SELF-GOVERNMENT.

THE memorandum submitted by Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru in conjunction with some other delegates to the Joint Select Committee when it adjourned in July last and the memorandum now submitted by practically the entire British Indian delegation have just been published. They may be said to present India's case for self-government to the British authorities. The case of course is unanswerable and has been very forcibly though moderately expressed. It was necessary to put in these memoranda, for the proceedings of the Round Table Conference and the Joint Select Committee have been so protracted and were at times marked by such internal differences among Indians themselves that they are likely to have left the British public, who are the final arbiters in this matter, somewhat confused and puzzled as to what exactly India wants. The abstention of nationalist politicians in a body from the Committee's examination and the predominance of reactionaries among the witnesses who appeared before it did not help forward the British public's political education on India either. It would therefore be well for such men in Great Britain as take an interest in Indian affairs to have a document or two handy to which they can turn for a succinct and clear exposition of India's case. When they will read the Committee's report, they will find missing from it a report of the Indian delegates who co-operated with the Committee. The two memoranda, and particularly the one submitted more recently, will for them take the place of the report of the Indian assessors. It would appear remarkable to the British people that, with the exception of the European delegates, the whole British Indian delegation should present one unanimous statement of views. To us in India this is by no means strange, for we all knew that when once the communal question was taken out of the political arena, all were agreed—Hindus and Muslims, Parsis and Sikhs, Labour and depressed class advocates—that as large a measure of self-government as was immediately practicable should be conferred upon India at the present moment, and the memorandum puts forth this demand cogently and forcefully.

It asks first of all that the Constitution Act itself

should make it clear that dominion status was the goal towards which India's constitution was to evolve. Everyone realises that this will not bring full responsible government any nearer, but if, as the memorandum argues, even solemn declarations by His Majesty the King Emperor and his representatives are treated as having no legal force, India must demand that the matter be put finally beyond dispute by providing for it in the preamble of a statute. Having thus settled the destination and the direction of India's constitutional advance, the memorandum proceeds to discuss the question of the inauguration of federation, on which the present scheme of reforms is based. Here it is manifest that the later memorandum exhibits much less apprehensiveness than the earlier, for by the flux of time some of the doubts that surrounded this question in the minds of Indian politicians are in the process of being dissipated. It may now be taken for granted that unless some unforeseen crisis makes its appearance, federation will come about and come about soon. At the third Round Table Conference two antecedent conditions were laid down by the British Government, upon the fulfilment of which the actual formation of federation was to depend. One of these was the establishment and successful functioning of a Reserve Bank. The setting up of the Bank is no longer in question; and we may all reasonably anticipate that the Bank, when it begins to operate, will work to the satisfaction of all. Subsidiary to this main condition, an improvement in the financial position was also required in two directions, viz. reduction of short term debt and rehabilitation of a normal export surplus on merchandise account. Happily, the country is well on the way towards the consummation of this result. This condition therefore need not hold for us the terrors that it did in July when the Sapru memorandum was submitted. The second condition governing the creation of a federal government was the accession of a sufficient number of Indian States. Even in July and still earlier we were really free from nervousness on this score. It is true that Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and Mr. Jayakar at the end of the third Round Table Conference saw fit to demand responsible government for British India alone in case Indian States were found unwilling to join the federation or unduly to procrastinate in the matter. But this demand was made at the time not so much because Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru really feared that the States might hang back, as because he desired to put his case for an early establishment of federation on a wholly unshakable basis in any conceivable contingencies and to leave no kind of excuse for the British Government to deny responsible government to British India. Federation is therefore no longer in any reasonable doubt; even so, following the suggestion of Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru's memorandum, the memorandum of the British Indian delegation asks that a date should be fixed by the Constitution Act for the inauguration of federation, giving power at the same time to the British Government to postpone the date if circumstances now not foreseeable should make it necessary.

The memorandum devotes only two brief paragraphs to the clearing of ground in this way, and the rest of it concerns itself with making constructive suggestions as to the changes required in the White Paper proposals in order that the reservations accompanying the proposed transfer of power should in fact be such "as not to prejudice the advance of India through the new constitution to full responsibility for her own government," as declared by the Prime Minister. All the safeguards are then examined in detail, and suggestions made for their relaxation and for enlargement of the scope of transfer so that the scheme, thus altered, may "satisfy moderate public opinion in India." But the improvement that the memorandum suggests in regard to future constitutional growth surpasses in importance all these detailed suggestions. Premising that no Grand Inquests should hereafter be necessary, it suggests, first, that the Indian legislatures should be empowered to initiate proposals for constitutional changes, it being required by statute to place these proposals before Parliament, and, secondly, that, "except in a few strictly limited cases" Parliamentary legislation should be unnecessary to implement these proposals, certain changes being capable of effectuation by the Indian legislatures themselves. Indian opinion has always set a very great store upon this point, for it is obvious that our countrymen will be more easily reconciled to a constitution somewhat unsatisfactory in the initial stages, if they feel assured that future development will be easy, if not automatic. It is to be earnestly hoped that the British Parliament will understand Indian feeling in the matter in all its intensity and do all that is reasonably practicable to meet it satisfactorily.

The improvements suggested in the memorandum follow familiar lines; but in some places very shrewd observations are made which go to show how reactionary the Government's proposals are or how unreasonable their attitude is. For instance, while dealing with the Army, the memorandum points out that the Governor-General, assisted by a Counsellor appointed at his discretion, will be the sole authority exercising control over Army policy, and that this arrangement will in fact abolish even the small share that Indians now have in military control. For at present the Governor-General in Council is the body to which all matters connected with the Army are referred for final decision, and in these decisions this body containing at least three Indian Councillors take part. The change that is now contemplated will thus make the position worse, speaking constitutionally at any rate, for Indians. Having driven this point home, the Committee goes on to press for the selection of the Army Counsellor from among non-official Indians, so that the retrogression that is involved in the proposed arrangements may be counterbalanced. What the memorandum says in connexion with the Army holds good in fact for foreign affairs, the other important reserved department. There would be the same worsening of the constitutional position, though neither the British Indian delegation's memorandum nor the Sapru memorandum suggests that the Foreign

Affairs Counsellor should be chosen from the ranks of non-official Indians.

In discussing the financial safeguards, the British Indian delegation point out in their memorandum that "if India had utilised the money which she contributed towards the expenditure on the Great War to wipe out her sterling obligations, the sterling debt to-day would have been very small," and it is the sterling debt, in the interest of the security of which financial safeguards are chiefly formulated. If any argument can expose the unfairness of the financial safeguards which are proposed to be imposed upon India, the argument given above should do so, and if any appeal to the sense of honour of Great Britain can be successful, the following sentiment with which the argument is clinched ought to succeed: "Nothing would exasperate Indian public opinion more than the realisation of the fact that the enormous sacrifices that India had made have actually become the justification for impediments in the way of her constitutional advance." It would be superfluous for Indian readers to be informed in detail of the specific amendments which the memorandum suggests, for they are being repeated almost daily in every newspaper in India, but we would instance only two in order to show how thoroughly acceptable to Indian opinion these amendments would be. It says, in respect to the fiscal convention, that it is necessary "to recognise by statute India's freedom to regulate her fiscal policy without any reservations or qualifications." In respect to commercial discrimination, it says that prohibition of discrimination should not be provided for in the constitution, but that the commercial interests of India and England should be left to evolve a friendly settlement by negotiation, or if that is not possible, it might be provided that discriminatory legislation should require the previous assent of the Governor-General, it being laid down however "that the assent should not be refused unless the object of the legislation is 'not so much to promote Indian commerce as to injure British commerce,'" the criterion employed by the Simon Commission in order to determine whether any particular application of discrimination was just or not. The authors of the British Indian delegation's memorandum and Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru have indeed done a good piece of work redounding to their own credit and to the country's profit.

SOCIAL JUSTICE AND LAND REFORM.

THE points raised in the letter of Mr. T. R. Venkatarama Sastri published in the last issue of the SERVANT OF INDIA deserve the most respectful and careful consideration. In the third part of his letter he gave us a most pleasing picture of the happy and cordial relations which have subsisted for five generations between his family as landowners and three or four families of hereditary tenants. It is most gratifying that he and his ancestors delighted to walk the "more ancient way" which imbued "the owner of property with a sense of his duty." Indeed, it would be an unforgivable piece of vandalism to

rudely disturb the even tenor of the well-established and cordial inter-relations between the benevolent landlord and the loyal tenant, both bent on following the ancient path of duty. Alas! all landlords are not Venkatarama Sastris, nor all tenants like his own. "Western" individualism has, as Mr. Sastri ruefully admits, made great inroads on the "ancient socialism" of India. It has hence become necessary to check its uncontrolled and therefore harmful effects by legislative action intended to save, restore and sustain as much of the ancient socialistic texture of Indian life as possible. Law need come into operation only when custom fails to sustain a good tradition. It is, of course, best to educate property in its duty; it will never be superfluous. Duty will then be rendered willingly and cheerfully. But law must be in the background as a standby.

As regards the effect of the recent land legislation in Madras, Mr. Sastri corrected us by stating that it did touch rents and gave the tenant the right to "fair rents." But his further statement that the courts were directed to presume the current rents, admittedly competitive rents, as "fair", robs the right of almost all its value. The courts are not free to determine fair rents; they are obliged more or less to stabilise the current competitive rents. Judicial rents will not be fair rents.

We would like to believe that people invest their moneys in land more for the revenue it gives them than for the pure love of the soil or for just the privilege of being landowners, though stray exceptions may certainly be found. Occupancy right is valuable to the tenant inasmuch as it automatically stabilises rent and prevents the arbitrary enhancement thereof. With fixity of tenure is inextricably linked fixity of rent, though not fair rent. If fixity of tenure halves the value of land, as Mr. Sastri contends, it is the most damaging and conclusive evidence of the unconscionable and arbitrary use of the landlord's superior power to screw up rents. The "prospective right to further rackrent" is anti-social and should be eliminated.

The real and the most difficult problem is to devise measures by which the landlords, while retaining to themselves all legitimate rights in their lands, shall, at the same time, be not free to rackrent the tenants. The owner shall not forfeit the right to resume his land for *bona fide* cultivation by himself or for other legitimate purposes. At the same time, the tenant shall not be compelled to pay more than fair rent. Mr. Sastri is right when he says that all attempts to abolish competitive rents have been in vain. We would fain believe that the failure was due to the fact that such attempts in the past were directed towards limiting the power of the landlords and not towards ensuring the benefit of it to the actual cultivator. What the landlord was deprived of did not accrue to the benefit of the cultivator but of the middleman. We would venture to suggest that the problem should be tackled at the other end, as it were. *Fixity of tenure and fair rent should be made the invariable incidents of all leases*, subject to resumption of the land by the superior constructive

holder under certain legitimate and defined conditions, as, for instance, *bona fide* cultivation or house construction or working of minerals. A person is either a cultivator or a rentier. If the latter, he shall receive fair rents and not competitive rents: if the former, he will take the risks of cultivation. As an owner-cultivator, he shall receive what would correspond to the dividend which a share-holder in an industrial concern will get and which varies with the fortunes of the business; as a rentier, he shall get what would correspond to the fixed interest on preference shares or debentures. The owner may be a cultivator getting dividend, or a rentier getting interest. An owner-rentier may convert himself into an owner-cultivator by resuming the land. If subsequently he wishes to relinquish the responsibilities and risks of cultivation he should be free to become a rentier. All that he should be prevented from doing is to take unfair advantage of the un-equal competition between himself and his tenant to exact competitive rents.

By linking occupancy right and fair rent with all leases, the tenant gets substantial security of tenure and judicial rents, freedom to make the most of the soil, freedom to let out land temporarily and resume it again when required for cultivation by himself. The land-holder will retain the status which ownership confers, the right to fair rent and the right to resume the land for certain *bona fide* purposes.

It will be much like the ryotwari system, where the assessment is not based on competition but on principles approximating to the living wage and fair rent and the *pattadars* need pay no more than that. At present the *pattadars* are not invariably the cultivators. Many of them sublet their lands on competitive rents, which system benefits neither the State nor the cultivators. If, however, every lease carries with it fixity of tenure and fair rent the *pattadar* will be a cultivator.

It may be that competitive rents will somehow reassert themselves in spite of the best efforts to abolish them; what the lessor is prevented from taking as competitive rent he may attempt to take as premium when the lease is granted. The ideal may never be reached. But all reform should tend towards that end.

"WHITHER CONGRESS?"

THOSE who have followed Mr. Nariman's doings since his release a few weeks ago must not have failed to note that though a Congressman to the core, he is by no means a blind follower of Mahatma Gandhi or even of his political philosophy. A perusal of his recent publication* confirms that impression. Whereas to the Mahatma religion and politics are inseparable, Mr. Nariman vehemently pleads for the one being divorced from the other. But he is not alone in thus differing from the Mahatma on the fundamentals of Congress policy. He tells us that "the inevitable conflict between two fundamentally different idealogies, the spiritual idealism vs. political realism" has existed between Mahatma Gandhi

* "WHITHER CONGRESS?" By K. F. NARIMAN. (Bombay Book Depot, Girgaon, Bombay.) 1933. 20cm. 145p. As. 12.

and his followers for over twelve years. That this combination of dissimilar forces should have so long subsisted without any open revolt against the leadership of the Mahatma who, we are told, is more indulgent to his foes than he is "ruthless, unbending and adamant towards his devoted and faithful followers" bears eloquent testimony to the sense of unquestioned loyalty of the latter. But even their attachment to their leader was put to a severe strain by the decisions of the Poona Conference of July last. Anyhow they have made Mr. Nariman give unreserved expression to his keen dissatisfaction with the Mahatma's recent leadership. It is indeed too true that good sometimes comes out of evil.

For the present standstill in Congress activities Mr. Nariman holds the Poona Conference largely responsible. Its authorisation of the Mahatma to ask for an interview with the Viceroy was, in his opinion, "a colossal blunder." The Mahatma's anxiety to interview Lord Willingdon would have been understandable if it was expected to lead to any constitutional settlement. Of this however there was not the ghost of a chance. In fact the Mahatma himself seemed to have been under no illusion on the point and had expressly disclaimed any idea of discussing constitutional issues with Lord Willingdon should he have an opportunity of meeting him face to face; but he somehow expected peace to result from it, even "though the Congress political goal is not satisfied." Mr. Nariman rightly fastens upon this statement of the Mahatma to prove that when people talk about the fight restarted on August 1st last being intended for the attainment of Swaraj or even some political advance they talk without the book. That fight was really for the vindication of what the Mahatma chose to call the "national right" of an unconditional interview. Mr. Nariman's disapproval of the Poona Conference's action cannot however be interpreted as signifying his approval of Lord Willingdon's refusal to see the Mahatma. In fact he takes the Government severely to task for their failure to appease what he terms the Mahatma's "harmless, though rather silly, whim or fantasy for an interview." But what is even more galling to Mr. Nariman is the "spineless lip-sealing" of those assembled at Poona. If only they had firmly stuck to their guns and had fearlessly opposed the Mahatma's proposal to seek the interview to the extent, if need be, of practising satyagraha against him, the subsequent humiliation to the nation would have been saved. He therefore puts his finger on the right chord when he says that the banishment of this kind of "cringing, craving herd-mentality" is the first essential for the re-instatement of the Congress in public estimation.

For the campaign of individual civil disobedience which, as Mr. Nariman will not have failed to note, was started in defiance of the decision of the Poona Conference and which is now supposed to be an important item of the Congress programme, Mr. Nariman has not a good word to say. There is nothing surprising in this. He is no believer in the principle of a "change of heart" in the rulers which so much sways the Mahatma. If such a thing were possible, Irish troubles, Mr. Nariman argues, should have been over with the death of Mr. MacSwiney as a result of his prolonged hunger-strike and Indian political prisoners should have had no room whatever to complain as regards the treatment meted out to them in jails, in protest against which Jatin Das laid down his life. But such a thing has not come to pass and it is a sheer futility to pin one's faith on isolated personal suffering inducing in the rulers a kinder and a more sympathetic frame of mind towards the ruled. Mr. Nariman however does not taboo direct action altogether. He and those whom he represents believe

that "direct action of whatever form, violent or non-violent, must be effective, potential, powerful, obtrusive enough to create sufficient impression on the opponents and to serve as an irresistible, strong, driving force to achieve the object." It was because the 1930 civil disobedience campaign satisfied all these attributes that he claims that it culminated in the Gandhi-Irwin pact followed by Mahatma Gandhi's participation in the R. T. C. When direct action ceases for any reason whatever to be the political weapon it is intended to be, there is no justification "for its continuance for a day longer for any other consideration." On the contrary, "a weak, ineffective, impotent, ridiculous form of "Direct Action" is more harmful and worse", in Mr. Nariman's opinion, "than no Direct Action at all." While Mr. Nariman and those of his way of thinking would not hesitate to undergo any sacrifices if the civil disobedience campaign on the 1930 scale was to be revived, they would "grudge to waste a brass farthing for this 1933 lifeless affair," which strikes him as nothing better than "an impotent, fruitless fiasco. At the same time he makes no secret of the fact that a renewal of the mass movement is impossible, at any rate for some time to come.

It will be seen from what has been said above that Mr. Nariman is positive that the civil disobedience movement must be unconditionally called off and that this action should be taken without regard to the attitude of the Government. An abandonment of the movement is all that the Government expect of the Congress, as authoritative utterances have made clear, in order to enable them to stop the enforcement of their repressive policy. When this is done, the war between the Government and the Congress will have come to an end and with it too "the deplorable Gandhi-Willingdon political stalemate." This will ensure the Congress coming into its own and once again occupying in national affairs its former rank of the premier political organisation. What programme of work it should then chalk out for itself, whether it should encourage council-entry or persist in the boycott of the councils, are matters which may be decided by itself, perhaps at a special session; but Mr. Nariman is anxious that they should not be mixed up with the main question of the withdrawal of civil disobedience. He suggests that the first task to which the revived Congress may set its hand should be a considered pronouncement on the constitutional issue and the achievement of "complete national unity" so as to present a united front to the British Government on it. The outlook for this consummation may appear to some to be far from bright; but Mr. Nariman is sanguine enough to believe that an agreement on the "main fundamental political principles" between different political parties and communities may be possible. The success of the Congress in securing the co-operation of various parties in the preparation of the Nehru report in 1928 leads Mr. Nariman to entertain this hope; but he must not lose sight of the fact that the situation at the present day presents more numerous difficulties in the way of the repetition of the marvel and in any case the communal award introduces a complication which makes one almost despair of bringing all parties and communities on a common platform. But an attempt in that direction is certainly worth making.

In spite of his differences, which appear really to be irreconcilable, with the Mahatma, Mr. Nariman is unable to contemplate his deposition from the leadership of the Congress—at any rate not until another Mahatma "is discovered who can have the same hold on the masses as he has." That does not mean that he would hereafter allow Mahatma Gandhi uncontrolled sway over the national organisation. In this connection he sighs for the days when Pandit Motilal Nehru

acted as the political task-master for the Mahatma, the combination of the two being "more than a match for a dozen couples such as Willingdon and Hoare." But since it would be long before we set our eyes on the like of the late Pandit, Mr. Nariman would have a Political Board of Control over the Mahatma to prevent, we suppose, the latter from making a mess of national politics by giving it too deep a spiritual or religious tinge. Whether the Mahatma will consent to work in the leading-strings of such a body is another matter. Anyhow his past discourages such a hope.

The abdication by the Congress of its proper function of political leadership is harmful from more than one point of view. But its chief injury lies in the encouragement such a state of affairs affords to "contemptible little traders" to come out in the open and compete with "the principal central firm." It needs no very deep knowledge of contemporary

events to divine to whom Mr. Nariman refers so disparagingly; the reference is obviously to the Congress Democratic Party in Bombay and the new Swaraj party started in Madras under Mr. Satya-murti's leadership.

What has been said above will, it is hoped, give the reader an idea as to the line of thought generally followed in Mr. Nariman's book. He represents a large volume of opinion in Congress circles which favours a new orientation of its programme with a view to preventing the present deadlock in Congress affairs doing irreparable national injury, which will be the case if it is allowed to continue for any length of time. He has not minced matters and has at the same time not imported any kind of bitterness into his discussion of the situation. There is no doubt he has done a distinct national service in thus pleading for a change in the Congress programme—a plea which deserves to evoke sympathetic response from all Congressmen.

FEDERATION AND INDEPENDENCE.

I HAVE tried to show in previous articles that the federation that is proposed to be established in India is, both in fact and intent, a forced one to which the people in British India and Indian States may possibly submit involuntarily, but to which they have not given the willing consent that is held everywhere to be an indispensable pre-requisite to the formation of a federal union, not to be dissolved in any circumstances at any future time. Our federation will, like other federations, be incapable of being cancelled in future; but, unlike them, it will also be incapable of being modified even by a rigid amendment procedure such as is thought appropriate to federal constitutions. Impossible to overthrow, and impossible to alter, the federation which is being imposed upon India is one which all Indian politicians of whatever persuasion ought to resist at all costs.

But there is a special reason which makes such resistance particularly incumbent upon Congressmen, pledged as they are to secure *purna swarajya* or complete independence. It may be open to them, intent though they be upon severance of the British tie, to hammer out a constitution in conjunction with others who insist upon maintaining the tie, provided however that the constitution so framed leaves the door open to eventual secession. It would only mean that the establishment of a sovereign independent state which is their ultimate goal being impossible of achievement in the immediate future, they are willing to consider in the interim period schemes of political development of a lower order. But no such scheme would merit their attention or enlist their support if it should prejudice the question of secession in the negative and make it impossible for India to step out of the Empire when she attains the necessary strength to do so. In fact, they would be bound by their principles first to thwart the formulation and then to wreck the functioning of such a scheme.

Pandit Motilal Nehru and other leaders of the Congress movement joined with other parties in the All-Parties Conference in 1928 and produced a joint report outlining a dominion constitution acceptable to all. But there was still a difference in the

attitude of different parties to it. While other parties gave in their adhesion to the constitution as a final arrangement and as the culmination of their political ambitions, Congressmen could accept it only provisionally, as one falling short of their aspirations but yet fit to work for the time being. Pandit Nehru deemed it necessary to make clear beyond doubt the conditions on which he had given his co-operation to the Committee and accepted its recommendations. It would be well to refresh our memory with the cautionary words he used at the time. The Committee's report has this paragraph:

"Our desiding, as a Committee, in favour of such a Constitution simply means that the maximum degree of agreement was only obtainable on this basis. It does not mean that any individual Congressman, much less the Congress itself, has given up or toned down the goal of complete independence. Those who believe in this goal retain the fullest right to work for it. But the maximum agreement thus reached will, we trust, serve as a satisfactory basis for a constitution which all parties can unite to work without prejudice to the right of any party or individual to go further ahead."

For Congressmen dominion status was only a stepping-stone to independence, which they felt compelled by the basic principles of their party to work up to when time for it was ripe. But it is obvious that no constitution would receive their support even as a transitional arrangement which did not leave the question of severance of the British connection at least open for future decision. If it closed the door on separation, it would be the religious duty of the Congress to obstruct its inauguration by every means open to it.

The federation now being forged is such a constitution; whether it will facilitate our advance to dominion status or not may be open to question, but that the maximum constitutional development attainable within its ambit is represented by dominion status and that it rules out, permanently and irrevocably, attainment of the status of an independent state is beyond a shadow of doubt. The federation will be between British India and the Indian States. To the former it is possible to make a bid for independence; it is only a question of expediency, feasibility and pra-

tical wisdom with it. But to the latter it is not open to contemplate such a step. His Highness the Maharaja of Bikaner, who has thought out these problems more carefully than any of the ruling Princes, made the States' position clear at one of the earliest meetings of the Round Table Conference. He said that the Princes were willing to consider the proposition of federation put before the Conference by Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru on behalf of India; but he added: "Our willingness to consider federation is subject to two essential and broad conditions," the first of which is "that India retains the British connexion as an equal partner in the British Commonwealth of Nations." The difference in the attitude of the non-Congress politicians who sat on the All-Parties Committee in 1928 on the one hand and that of the Princes at the R. T. C. in 1930 and later on the other should be noted. The former agreed to leave the final destination of India's political advance deliberately undecided in order that the Congress whose views on the subject were different from theirs might be enabled to co-operate with them. The latter have made it a condition precedent to their entering on constitutional parleys that the constitution framed thereat shall have for its basis the maintenance of the British connexion.

Nor is this maintenance of the British connexion a matter of temporary expediency with the Princes, which is liable to undergo a change with changed circumstances. The adherence to the British connexion which they profess certainly results from inner conviction in the case of all the Princes, but even if they did not believe in it they would still be under an obligation, moral and legal, to maintain the British connexion. For their treaties require it, and these treaties they cannot set aside at any time in future. As the Maharaja of Bikaner himself said, the Indian States are "linked with the Crown by means of treaties (i capital) of 'perpetual alliance and friendship.'" The treaties are perpetual; or at any rate "they are binding until they may be amended, and they can only be amended by negotiation and honourable agreement on both sides." In other words, independence will be possible under federation only when the power from whom independence is sought allows it. The Congress party joined the All-Parties Committee only because it was represented to it that dominion status in fact conferred a plenitude of power in no way inferior to independence and that its inferiority consisted only in juridical form, and, what is more, that even this notional inferiority consisting in allegiance to the Crown can be cured by a dominion at its own will, without reference to the British Government, inasmuch as dominion status implies the right of secession from the Empire, as can be proved by many authoritative pronouncements of British statesmen. That this interpretation of the rights of a dominion was correct is strikingly proved by what has transpired between the Governments of the United Kingdom and of the Irish Free State in connexion with the dispute about three bills amending the Free State's constitution. In this dispute all that

the British Government says is that the Irish bills evidently seek "to eliminate the Crown from the constitution of the Irish Free State" and that as allegiance to the Crown lies at the basis of membership of the Empire, the Free State cannot have such a republican constitution and yet remain within the Empire. The very objection that the British Government takes to the action of the Free State Government implies: "The Free State may either stay in the Empire or walk out. That is a decision entirely for the Free State to take. If it chooses the former course it will share in the privileges and advantages open to a member of the Empire. If it chooses the latter it will forfeit them. Let it make its choice." The dispute is complicated by the fact that Mr. de Valera does not yet want to go out of the Empire; he is proposing a sort of in and out membership, which naturally the British Government is unwilling to allow. That is why Mr. Thomas ended his long statement in the Commons on November 14 by saying that the Free State must accept the responsibilities incidental to the membership of the Empire, if she cared for its privileges; that "if she renounce the one, she cannot hope to enjoy the other." But throughout this statement he meant as much as to say: whether to be within the Empire or without was a matter exclusively for the Free State to decide.

This lengthy (perhaps too lengthy) elaboration of the implications of dominion status is attempted here only to show how seriously worsened the position will become for Congressmen in respect to their attachment to independence by the proposed federation. If they objected to dominion status when dominion status impliedly conferred the right to secession and to independence, how much more vigorously must they object to a federation which will, at its very inception, effectually shut out all possibilities of such secession and independence for all time to come? Indeed, there is much more to be said to reinforce this point. The Princes will be subject to the exercise of the rights of paramountcy by the Crown and these rights, it is obvious, will not drop off even when the federal India attains to the position of a dominion. It is obvious that a federation, part of which is tied to the Crown, not merely theoretically but in practical subserviency, cannot hope to be independent of the Crown. The States cannot at the same time hold a position of independence and subordination, and British India too, if it throws in her lot with federation, will necessarily be disabled, along with the States from achieving independence. It is not my purpose here to argue in favour of independence. I am only concerned to show that those who are wedded to it must oppose federation, if for nothing else, for the reason that federation, in itself a permanent organisation, permanently blots out all possible chances of independence from the outset.

There is one objection that must be met, viz., that Mahatma Gandhi supported the federal plan at the R. T. C. It is true he did so, but it is only because he really does not favour independence. Look at the way in which he watered down the idea of independence at the Conference. He interpreted it to

mean a partnership capable of dissolution at will on either side. This is precisely what independence does not mean and cannot mean. It can only mean, not a possible, but an actual, dissolution of partnership. If Mahatma Gandhi did not want the partnership dissolved, but only wanted to have the potential strength to dissolve it if necessary, he need not have rejected the idea of dominion status, as he is understood by the average Congressman to have done, and raised the standard of independence. In effect he rejected independence at the Round Table Conference and reverted to dominion status. It appears to me that the true inwardness of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's reiteration, in his correspondence with Mahatma Gandhi, of unqualified independence as the goal of Congress activities consists in his realisation that Mahatma Gandhi had already given independence the go-by and in his determination not to allow such a thing to happen again. I am personally not a devotee of independence, but still I cannot relish the idea of Mahatma Gandhi bringing the Congress back to dominion status by a sleight of hand as it were.

But even this underinterpreted independence is impossible of attainment under federation. Secession from the British Empire is, as said above, not a course open to the States under federation, and if British India joins the States in order to form a federal government it will be closed to her too. Dominion status, in its full significance, will on the federal basis be an impossibility for our country, both in theory and in fact. In view of this constitutional position the demand made in the memorandum of the British Indian delegation that the Constitution Act itself should mention dominion status in its preamble can only excite ridicule. It is not a question merely of the British Government being unwilling, but a question fundamentally of their being powerless, to do it. They promised dominion status to British India; they cannot promise it however to a United India, for over part of this United India they hold rights of suzerainty and are under a pledge to exercise the duties of suzerainty. If British India chooses to become organically united to this part, she forfeits by that very act her right to dominion status in the sense of freedom to secede at will. Whether therefore independence or dominion status, our political ambitions are bound to remain unfulfilled for all time under federation, unless we resort to revolution.

This discussion leads to the inescapable conclusion that politicians belonging to all parties in India, whether their ultimate aim be a potentiality or actuality of secession, must resist the federal constitution, but, as I have said above, it is even a more compelling duty for Congressmen, both because they put their political ambitions higher and because it is now clear that non-Congressmen will not bestir themselves about it at all. These non-Congressmen too — some of them at any rate — would like to see the constitution set aside, but they are too conscious of their impotence to make even a faint attempt in this direction. They are low in their minds and

have lost all hope of redeeming the situation. If Congressmen take the initiative, however, it will be possible to enlist the active support of other progressive groups. But in order to do so, they must abandon their present attitude of lordly indifference to the White Paper. For, as Mr. Nariman reminded Pandit Jawaharlal, the White Paper is not dead, and, if ignored, it will be imposed as well upon those who are contemptuous of it as upon those who are fearful of it. Will they take the lead in hamstringing the threatening constitution?

OBSERVER.

Our London Letter.

(BY AIR MAIL.)

(From Our Correspondent.)

LONDON, December 1.

C. F. A. RETURNS HOME.

THE best news that I have this week is that of Brother Andrews' return to his native land. He has now reached the age of indiscretion, when his innumerable friends affectionately and anxiously await the conclusion of his latest adventure in the knowledge that in his native land there are still some formidable tyrants, who, in the exercise of their powers, are able by the moral compulsion of their very deep affection for him, to oblige him to take rest and submit to being looked after. This modern St. Francis, like his spiritual ancestor, is never happy save when running to do good. C. F. A.'s rapid step, his flowing beard, his streaming garments, deserve to be belovedly perpetuated in happy character, even as Low has been doing some others of our distinguished in a masterly series appearing in *The New Statesman*. It is a great pity that in all the ages the saints and sages of the race have rarely had the good fortune to be delineated by some sure and sympathetic pen, touched with a keen sense of humanity, of humour, and may it even be said just that slight touch of the ridiculous that helps to preserve the human perspective whilst its insight is none the less deep for all that.

C. F. A. has not yet reached London. He was to have arrived at Tilbury to-day, but decided instead to land yesterday at Plymouth, in order to spend a long week-end with the sisters living at Paignton, to whom he has always been so deeply attached. I learn that he has fundamentally changed his plans and that instead of proceeding, as he had intended, to South Africa at the end of January, he has decided, for special reasons, to stay here as long as possible, and to endeavour to move Church circles to a keener realisation of the immense difficulties and dangers surrounding the relations of Britain and India. It is a huge task, but one in which I am confident that he will have the active help of the two Archbishops, and naturally the Nonconformist leaders. I am not letting out a secret when I say that the Archbishop of Canterbury has won the unanimous admiration of the Indian delegates to the Joint Select Committee for his consistently sympathetic and progressive attitude to the Indian point of view.

Whilst I am on the subject of Mr. Andrews, it is interesting to recall that his very close friend, Mr. Amiya C. Chakravarty, is to be one of the two guests of honour on Tuesday next at the dinner of the P. E. N., which is a world association of poets, playwrights, authors, essayists, and novelists. The President of

the Society is Mr. H. G. Wells, and a national branch is to be founded in many countries. The German P. E. N. has broken away from the international society on account of the fundamental difference of attitude of the Nazi Committees.

IS THE WORLD GOING MAD?

What's wrong with the world? is a question that has been put in a variety of ways by large numbers of thoughtful people from time immemorial. There have been times when it was distinctly dangerous for the questioner to pose this conundrum. He was naturally regarded as an attacker of vested interests, sound money, the gods, the kings, the law, and all those engaged in the ritual appropriate to them. Such querists might consider themselves fortunate if they escaped alive out of the dilemma with which they had faced their contemporaries. The only difference between modern times and ancient days is that, generally speaking, our world is a larger and more fully populated one than that of our ancestors. A part of its facts is more easily ascertained than was formerly the case, in spite of the newspaper publicity that so often results in obscuring the real issues, and the world itself to-day is in other ways much more easily get-at-table and therefore, in becoming larger, it has got smaller at the same time. Achieving this paradox through our ability to see things in a wider perspective yet really as one looks about him across land and sea to-day the question must constantly recur, Is mankind taking leave of its senses, has it begun to lose its bearings? None but a profound believer in the permanent existence of a great moral plan for the universe can hope to answer the problem with any degree of enthusiasm or hopefulness. It used to be said that when things went wrong it was the masses of the people, by whom one meant the ignorant and poverty-stricken folk, that had temporarily reverted to the barbarism from which, notwithstanding the antiquity of mankind, they had so slowly emerged. Yet one wonders, for example, whether the horrors of the French Revolution should not more properly be attributed to the intelligentsia rather than to the proletariat, who received most of the blame. The hideous cruelties associated with the treatment of the Russian Socialists, not only by the Czarist, but still more by the Bolshevik regime, was deliberately designed by educated and so-called religious people, and later by educated and avowedly irreligious people. The prisons and the islands of exile in which the Italian liberals who did not succeed in making their escape in time under the Fascist regime is another case in point. If the story of every other dictatorship in Europe and South America were to be followed, it would be found that the brains of the intelligentsia were behind every atrocity committed, or supposed to be committed, by the underlings. It is no better in Germany, with Herr Hitler. Savage torture, inhuman cruelty, these have been the lot, as unexceptionable evidence from many independent sources shows, of the miserable creatures that have become the victims of this so-called Aryan blood-lust, but it is a thing of the intelligentsia. Young Germany which is the raw material of the Nazi bands of ruffians, to whom the care of these unfortunates has been confided, is, in a literate sense, the best educated in Europe. If, as is suggested in one of the papers to-day, a military and naval dictatorship is to be set up shortly in Germany, we may expect very much the same kind of thing to develop in that most advanced of the Eastern lands. Already many politicians have met a fatal end, or at least been confronted with it, at the hands of fanatical officers. What is to be the end of it all?

And now comes the news that America is likely to be swamped with an orgy of lynching, conducted

by educated people, at the instigation, and even the encouragement, of still more educated people who feel that the noble white race in the West is insecure unless those who may, whether guilty or not, be even suspected of the commission of certain crimes are taken out of the hands of justice by the operation of mob violence, and savagely lynched in order to prove beyond dispute the impeccable superiority in virtue of the lynchers over the lynched. To-day, comes the news (let us hope that it is exaggerated) that in large parts of the Southern States, especially where it may be deemed desirable to screen some white criminal, the Negro population is fleeing into the hills, or cowering in its hovels in panic for its lost security. What must the shade of Abraham Lincoln think, if it does think, of the state of the Land of Liberty seventy years from the beginning of the war of Negro emancipation? Yet, presumably this has in one degree or another been the history of mankind from time immemorial, and in spite of it, and notwithstanding all we can quote or say to the contrary, mankind, as a whole, has succeeded in raising its consciousness in attaining in a larger degree to an apprehension of its true inner nature, and to the very threshold of powers that, if wisely used, may indeed raise it to divine heights. If this be the true interpretation of history, then God works in mysterious ways his wonder to perform, and even out of evil he can bring forth good.

BIRTH-CONTROL AND ASIA.

A conference of unusual importance was held at the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine on Friday and Saturday last. The conference was held under the auspices of the Birth Control International Centre and dealt with the question of population and birth control in Asia.

The president, Lord Horder, in opening the proceedings, dealt generally with the problems of population, both in the West and the East, and struck the central note voiced by all the following speakers of the need for the intelligent and wise control of the birth rate in any country or state. Conscious birth control, he said, was the only method of dealing with it, for where Nature was left alone, she dealt out life lavishly but dealt out death with an equally lavish hand.

Mr. Harold Cox, a veteran social reformer, who spoke next, said that India's most urgent need was that of birth control. He gave figures of the tremendous unnecessary suffering to children and sickly mothers, and the mortality rate of the babies so born. That population cannot be left to chance he was convinced, and the only means to deal with it was to give to the women of India the knowledge of preventing the conception of children that they did not want.

Dr. Drysdale commenced his speech by saying that one of the most important matters in dealing with the present question was one that had never been properly defined; What constitutes over-population? He defined it as a much greater yearly addition to the people than the state was ready or able to provide for. In India, he considered the situation desperate. The population figures, notwithstanding the terrible toll that disease, privation and other so-called natural factors, took of life, were up by thirty millions during the last ten years. The test of a nation's place in civilisation, he stated, was the length of the life of its people. In India the average length of life was 35 years against 65 in New Zealand and 60 in England. Wherever there was a high birth-rate, it was followed by a high death-rate, for there were of necessity countless numbers living on the borders of starvation, and therefore their forces of resistance were too low to maintain life.

The Japanese delegate, in his speech, made a special plea for the understanding by the West of Japan's problem. While believing in birth control as an essential piece of educational work for Japan to undertake, he did not think birth control would solve Japan's problem, for she could produce such enormous quantities of goods and certain articles of food that she must have markets for them outside of Japan.

Unfortunately Dr. R. K. Das was detained at Geneva and he was unable to be present but he sent a very valuable paper which was read by one of the other speakers. In this paper Dr. Das drew attention to the rate of increase of the population in India. He suggested other ways, as well as birth control, for dealing with India's teeming millions, a greater productivity and emigration. Generations, he wrote, would have to pass ere the present increase in India's population could be dealt with, and in the meantime the increase again develops and so the country keeps over-populated. The only remedy for India's poverty and low life-record was efficient birth-control.

Miss Rathbone also spoke at the first session on the need for enlightening the women of India, and giving them greater freedom to deal with their own problems. The second day's meetings dealt with other aspects of the population question, the standards of living in India and China, and the practical problem of contraception in the East. Among the speakers was Dr. V. K. Krishna Menon.

The conference was well attended and considerable discussion took place. The resolution which was passed unanimously was: "That this Conference expresses its deep interest in Birth Control now being carried on in India, China and Japan and other parts of Asia and pledges itself to co-operate in every practical way with the movement for Birth Control in the East."

Reviews.

THE PRESENT ECONOMIC CRISIS.

RECOVERY: THE SECOND EFFORT. By ARTHUR SALTER. (Bell.) 1933. 22cm. 306p. 5/—

IN this cheap popular edition of his world-famous book, Sir Arthur Salter repeats substantially from the earlier edition his diagnosis of the present economic crisis and he still retains faith in the remedies he has already suggested. Sir Arthur Salter is not of those who believe that our existing economic system is so hopelessly obsolete that it must be scrapped altogether and replaced by something fundamentally different. He is however convinced that while leaving room for political liberty and private enterprise and thus ruling out anything like Bolshevik regime, it must undergo drastic alterations if it is to cope with the present situation. He repeats his faith that deliberate collective planning affords the only solution of our difficulties, and that such planning is entirely consistent with the essence of freedom.

Sir Arthur finds the picture of the world to be the same in main outline as when he first wrote his book, with the important qualification that the original depression has been followed by a financial crisis of the first magnitude. The result was a further fall of commodity prices, more business pessimism and increased unemployment. The situation was further worsened because national policy in most countries during this period has been inspired,

in debtor as well as creditor countries, by a desire to secure a 'positive' balance of trade. Every country is trying to sell more than it buys—or to buy less than it can sell. While increased freedom of international trade is universally admitted to be necessary for remedying the present situation, impediments to trade in the form of increased tariffs, quotas, prohibitions and exchange restrictions are multiplying. Finally, the general political condition on which the growth of confidence and the resumption of international trade and investment depend, has become more grave.

The general gloom, however, is pierced by some rays of light. In the first place the natural forces, which in time bring a turn for the better to the usual trade cycle, have begun to operate. But unfortunately these by themselves cannot be relied upon to bring reasonably speedy relief, since at the back of the depression there are certain very special and unusual causes, which require to be tackled by competent initiative and bold national and international policy. Sir Arthur refers with satisfaction to three important instances of such wise leadership and deliberate action viz.

(i) The American monetary policy designed to counteract deflation and arrest the fall in prices.

(ii) The Lausanne Agreement which has brought a real settlement of the reparation problem; and

(iii) The great conversion operation in Great Britain (followed on a smaller scale by a similar operation in France), by which nearly £2000 millions of British indebtedness was put, by a single act, on a 3½ per cent. basis to the relief of the taxpayer. Sir Arthur pleads powerfully for more of such action and for constructive reform by those who organise and direct policy through every important sphere of economic activity and he is not without hope that, given the right spirit and determination, man can yet be master of his fate and overcome the more numerous and formidable obstacles that still remain.

The number of books that have recently appeared on the subject of the present economic crisis is legion, and several of them can be recommended to the average intelligent reader who wishes to understand the present economic muddle. But the book under review has a charm all its own, thanks to the brilliant pen and deftness of touch of its author.

G. B. JATHAR.

AMERICAN COMMERCIAL POLICY.

SOME PHASES OF FAIR VALUE AND INTER-STATE RATES. By JAMES BARCLAY SMITH. (Louisiana State University Press.) 1931. 22cm. 101p. \$ 3.00.

IT is a well-known fact that the commerce of a nation, or even its general industrial enterprise, is very closely intertwined with the facilities that exist for communication and transportation, and the freedom, safety and relative cost with which they can be used, and the degree of protection or encouragement enjoyed by competitive agencies among them such as railways, roadways, waterways and airways (all of which are necessarily public in some sense or degree). That there would exist room for confusion or complication leading even to bitterness and retaliation is easily recognised, and all of them have necessarily manifested themselves at this

period of time when continued depression has necessitated undermaintenance programmes, inability to meet fixed charges, and reduced, or disappearing, dividends in nearly all countries. It is no wonder that in a land like the U. S. A. acute differences are always present and many crises have led to important Supreme Court decisions, and to inter-state legislation for the purposes of valuation and rate-making. The extent of confusion and controversy that exists in that country can be gathered from the following extract from the opening sentences in the book under review :

"If a number of persons are participating in a discussion and each has in mind a different object, or if each has in mind a different characteristic of the same object, no expression is necessarily contradictory of any one expression by a different person. It is only where all have in mind the same characteristic of the same subject that it is possible to determine whether the opinions in regard thereto are in accord. Thus it is with the problem of valuation. Value is not a physical characteristic nor is it a word of definite content. It is as variable as the use to which it is applied and the extent to which it is used on any particular occasion."

This book which forms one in the series of Louisiana State University Studies, and is written by a Professor of Law in that University, is a somewhat technical book abounding in details and exploring the common ground entrenched between politics, jurisprudence, economics and the common greed that is euphemistically called commercial policy. The solutions, or solution, of the problem made known are "state ownership," "consolidation" and "equality among competing systems." To the student of economics this book, we fancy, will serve as a "refresher course" for the clarification of ideas of valuation—as original cost or historic cost, or prudent investment cost, as exchange value or reproduction cost of either capital or service, and as present value or final value—and of the problems of the fixation of terms which shall secure a reasonable return. To the legislators and administrators in this country who are also faced with problems of like description and probably of like magnitude also, this book would, we fancy, be a model of documentation and argumentation.

K. B. MADHAVA.

SHORT NOTICE.

HAMMER AND SICKLE. By MARK PATRICK.
(Elkin Mathews, London.) 1933. 22cm. 243p.
7/6.

"HAMMER and Sickle" is a "Panorama of Bolshevism" and traces the history of Russia from the aggressive monarchism of the Tsars down to the present Communist regime. This book, as stated by Sir Austen Chamberlain in his foreword, "bears evidence of long and careful study and personal acquaintance" of the author. Apart from being a mere history this book is full of human interest. The author, while describing the series of Revolutions to which that country is peculiarly subjected, gives a short history of the life of its leaders such as Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin. In spite of the extreme secrecy of the machinery of the Soviet Government and its aloofness from the rest of the

world, the author vividly describes the danger of the Communist menace. The horror, the reckless lawlessness and the selfishness of the G. P. U. brought to light in a few instances such as the Metropolitan-Vickers trial, the Lena Gold-field affair, indicate that the control of the Supreme Court over the G. P. U. is only a nominal affair, and that no man's life is safe in Russia under this system. The five-year plan in spite of its advantages is obviously a precipitous step towards the industrial and economic advancement of the country ventured upon in a fit of ambitious enthusiasm. "The Marxian principle of smoothing the way for the village idiot and ne'er-do-well is only to skim off the cream of the race and throw it away."

The personal life of the Russian, so vividly described by the author, is amusing indeed and is an example to the modern world of Darwinism in the retrograde measure—I refer to the Russian social life. It is evident that the "half-educated Hindu"—to use the contemptuous words of the west—is infinitely superior to the Russians.

The book concludes with a comparison of Russia with the rest of the world and what a reader has to learn from Russia.

S. VENKATESAN.

Correspondence.

"THE PRINCES' VETO POWER."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SERVANT OF INDIA.

SIR,—I agree with the contention of "Observer" in the article "The Princes' veto power": "The consent of all the States, big or small, federating or non-federating, will be required in addition to the consent of Parliament before defence can be transferred." This does make popular military control impossible in practice.

I also agree with him that the democratisation of the federal constitution is made practically impossible, under the provisions as contemplated. I, therefore, agree with him that the constitution that is being made is a forced one and must be condemned.—Yours, etc.

S. SATYAMURTI.

Madras,
December 8.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- LOCAL GOVERNMENT FACE TO FACE. By A. C. STEWART. (Ivor Nicholson & Watson.) 1933. 22cm. 48p.
CO-OPERATION AND CHARLES GIDE. Ed. By CARL WALTER. (King.) 1933. 21cm. 178p. 8/6.
MONETARY THEORY AND THE TRADE CYCLE. By FRIEDRICH A. HAYEK. (Cape.) 1933. 20cm. 244p. 6/-.
THE NATIONAL AT SCHOOL. By F. S. MORVIN. (Oxford University Press.) 1933. 20cm. 172p. 5/-