

The Servant of India

EDITOR : P. KODANDA RAO.

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

VOL. XVI, No. 50. } POONA—THURSDAY, DECEMBER 21, 1933.

{ INDIAN SUBSN. Rs.
FOREIGN 15s.

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK.	589
ARTICLES :—	
Congress and Government	591
A Pious Myth. By Observer	592
The New Germany. By Dr. D. D. Karve	594
Economic Possibilities of Czechoslovakia. By Raj Biharilal Mathur	595
OUR LONDON LETTER.	596
REVIEWS :—	
Problem of the Criminal. By B. B. Damle, B.A., LL.B.	598
Renaissance of Indian Women. By S. G. Sastry	599
Janjira Ruling Family. By D.	600
CORRESPONDENCE :—	
"Federation and Independence." By S. Satyamurti.	600

Topics of the Week.

Accept or Reject ?

MR. B. N. GOKHALE, one of the most promising of the younger men in the Liberal Party, delivered a lecture recently at a public meeting organised by the Western India National Liberal Association, a summary of which has been sent to us for notice. In this lecture Mr. Gokhale subjects the White Paper scheme to a devastating criticism, the soundness of which cannot be challenged. But it is not so much as a critique of the White Paper that it mainly interests us as because it raises the question once again whether the constitution, defective as it is, should be accepted or rejected. Mr. Gokhale's own answer is not given in terms, but it would appear from the general trend of his reasoning that he would rather not accept it. He begins by asking himself the question : "Is the White Paper Acceptable ?" and ends up by saying : "The country shall be justified in refusing to reconcile itself to the acceptance of such a scheme." If Mr. Gokhale will permit us to say so, this is not a clear enough answer. True, the country is entitled to refuse the constitution, but what will he advise the country actually to do ? A man in the responsible position of Mr. Gokhale will naturally find it difficult to be explicit on the matter without knowing what his party is going to do, but in order to facilitate a discussion of this subject, we would like to reiterate our considered opinion that even if the constitution is seriously unsatisfactory as it threatens to be, we cannot but accept it in the sense of being willing to work it, and work it not for wrecking purposes but for making it as successful as in the nature of things is possible.

The Unrepentant Viceroy.

NOW that the full report of Mr. Churchill's speech in the Commons on the motion for the re-

appointment of the Joint Select Committee is available, it can be seen that his quarrel with the Viceroy is due to the fact that Lord Willingdon was indiscreet enough to hold out to Indians the hope of attaining "absolute equality with the other Dominions." This particular phraseology is obnoxious to him for the reason that Dominion Status as defined in the Statute of Westminster carries with it the right to secede from the British Empire. Undaunted, however, by Mr. Churchill's frowns, Lord Willingdon has dared to repeat the same phraseology in one of his recent speeches in Madras. His sole aim had been, he declared, "to help forward India to her goal, that goal of absolute equality with other Dominions within the Empire." It is true that the controversy which his former utterances raised in England has shown him the desirability of being more guarded in the expression of his intentions with the result that he no longer voices his ambition to be the first constitutional Governor-General of India. Even so his reiteration of the goal of his constitutional ambitions in regard to India as being full dominionhood is an act for which praise is due to him. It shows how little he has allowed Mr. Churchill's censure to influence his course of action.

Some of the addresses presented to the Viceroy in Madras made a strong plea for the reduction of taxation, both direct and indirect. The Viceroy could not of course be expected to make an authoritative pronouncement on the subject beyond expressing a general hope that the burden may be lightened as soon as possible. But the demand pressed on the Viceroy from all classes of people, irrespective of race, for relief to the taxpayer shows how heavily he is at present burdened and emphasises the extreme urgency of some action designed to prevent his being ground down under its unbearable weight. We hope that the strength of public feeling on this point personally experienced by the Viceroy will not be altogether lost on the Government.

* * *

Loans to Indian States.

ACCORDING to information furnished to the Assembly a sum to the tune of Rs. 12½ crores has been advanced on loan to some of the States. Nearly Rs. 12 crores of this amount was due from Bahawalpur and included the interest due on the loan. The loan of Rs. 9 lakhs given to Khairpur was with a view to prevent an administrative breakdown, while that of Rs. 25 lakhs sanctioned for Alwar had also a like end in view. Rs. 25 lakhs was needed by Nawanagar for completing certain essential works started by the late Maharaja, while Dhrangadhra had applied for Rs. 45 lakhs partly to pay back an old debt and to meet expenditure on its alkali works. No serious objection can perhaps be taken to loans intended by the States for productive purposes, especially as the Assembly seems to have a voice in regard to them. But where, as in the case of Bahawalpur, there is some risk of the

whole loan not being returned, no remission should be allowed behind the back of the legislature. This is imperatively necessary in order to assure the overburdened taxpayer that his hard-earned money is not squandered away for the satisfaction of the personal whims or fads of any State ruler. In the case of Bahawalpur such a consultation with popular representatives was in fact promised by the Finance Member last week; but even in the case of the loans to other States, the legislature should be kept continuously in touch with the manner in which they are utilised. Perhaps the institution of a small committee of the members of the Assembly to supervise the advance of the loans would be a suitable means of ensuring the fulfilment of this object. It cannot be denied that this will constitute some interference, though of an indirect nature, by British India in States' affairs; but if the latter want British Indian money to be loaned to them, it stands to reason that British India should be curious to know how it is spent. And be it also noted that this inquisitiveness will not extend to the entire State administration but only to the use to which the loans are put. Surely British India is not asking for too much in demanding information as to the ultimate destination of funds taken from her by borrowing States. If the amounts of these loans had been advanced by the Crown, with whom and not with the British Indian Government the Princes wish to have direct relations, from the British exchequer, British India would have nothing to say to it. But if the money is to come from the Indian treasury, the interests of the taxpayer require that he should be allowed suitable voice in ensuring its utilisation for the purpose for which it is advanced.

* * *

Rural Education in Madras.

IT is seen from the report on the working of local boards in the Madras Presidency for 1931-32 that in spite of the prevailing economic depression education was not only not allowed to suffer a setback but actually took a forward step, very small though it may be. The number of elementary schools for boys rose from 13,981 to 14,029 while that for those for girls decreased from 3,396 to 3,339. The strength in both kinds of schools however went up by nearly 24,000 to 9,58,000, girls' schools sharing in the increase to the extent of nearly 5,000. Secondary schools maintained by local boards numbered 202 as against 195 in the previous year with a total strength of 49,870 as compared to 48,411 of the previous year. To the report is appended an interesting statement which helps one to form an idea as to the adequacy—or inadequacy, shall we say?—of the provision for elementary education in rural areas. We are not sure that such a table forms part of the other provincial reports on local boards and would earnestly press for its inclusion. This statement shows that more than half the number of eligible boys—56.4—yet remain unprovided for, the corresponding proportion in the case of girls being 84.2. These figures are eloquent as indicating how much leeway still remains to be made even in a presidency which is universally regarded as the most go-ahead educationally. The extent of inadequacy, so far as boys were concerned, was the smallest in Kistna with its 13.7 per cent. boys to be provided for and largest in Salem with 82.2. From the point of view of female education, Malabar ranks first, though as much as 54 per cent. of its eligible girl population lacks educational facilities, and Salem, as in the case of boys, last with only 5 per cent. of its girls provided for. In view of the general awakening of public interest in the well-being of backward and depressed classes, similar information with regard to their educational condi-

tion would have been much appreciated. But we are told that it is not furnished by them in a complete form. It is to be hoped that every endeavour will be made to impress upon them the desirability of compiling the necessary statistics with a view to their being exhibited in the consolidated report for public information. But it is observed from the report of the Director of Public Instruction that while elementary schools reserved for Mohamedans who are included among the backward classes numbered 1,761 with a total strength of over 96,000, the number of those for Adi-Dravidas and depressed classes stood at 931 with a total enrolment of nearly 35,000. In view of the imperative necessity of universal educational expansion for national progress, it behoves local bodies to promote the spread of education specially among the backward and depressed classes to the uttermost limit of their proverbially limited resources.

* * *

India in 1931-32.

AS its name indicates, this Government publication reviews Indian conditions, as seen through official eyes, during the period to which it relates. But it is generally brought out so long after that period that it practically ceases to excite any interest in the general public. If it is intended to serve as food for the historical researcher, then of course it is another matter. But one doubts if beyond that limited circle it makes any appeal to anybody. If the publication is to have any interest for the observer of contemporary events, the first essential is to arrange for its publication very soon after the expiry of the period covered by it.

Unlike its predecessors, the present one does not stop with the end of the official year but traverses wider ground. In fact it takes us to the end of the last calendar year. Even this fact does little to arouse the reader's interest in its contents and the kaleidoscopic developments in the situation during the last twelve months make the description given therein out of date. Economic considerations have led to a reduction in the publication's size, which, we think, will not be generally regretted. As for its contents, the narrative takes the Gandhi-Irwin pact as the starting point. Political happenings since that historic agreement including Mahatma Gandhi's participation in the second R. T. C., his fast culminating in the Poona Pact, the inauguration of his anti-untouchability campaign, Sir Samuel Hoare's attempt to scrap the R. T. C. followed by his subsequent climb-down, and the session of the third R. T. C. are described with as much freedom from bias as one may reasonably expect in a Government publication. The elaborate defence of the Ordinance regime given in the volume strikes the reader as puerile and unconvincing; and much capital is, as expected, made of the fact that the Central Legislature, which as at present constituted is hardly better than a handmaid of the Government, helped to give legislative shape to these executive laws. The puzzle involved in the Government preventing the session of the Congress without declaring the Congress itself an unlawful association is thus explained:

"Government's policy was directed against the civil disobedience movement. Congress however has a large membership, and many of its members, while supporting its general political aims and activities, were not in active sympathy with the revival of civil disobedience. The declaration of Congress as an unlawful body would have made all its members liable to prosecution, whether maintaining neutrality or not, and would have been in excess of the action required against civil disobedience proper."

Whether this explanation is more ingenious than convincing we leave it to our readers to judge. The constitutional plan as it emerged from the third R. T. C. is described as offering "immense possibilities of self-government." All we need do to bring out the exaggerated nature of the statement is to point to the fact that Sir Samuel Hoare himself, the author of the plan, claims nothing more for it than its being the transfer of only "a limited field" to popular control at the Centre.

Abolition of Capital Punishment.

IN the course of a letter to the press commenting on the recent execution by mistake of a Lahore prisoner, Mrs. Margaret B. Cousins makes an earnest plea for the abolition of the death sentence. She says :

There is a great duty laid on intelligent political prisoners who have first-hand experience of this horror of hanging in the Men's and Women's Jails in all Provinces to lead a movement for the removal of the death penalty from the law of this land.

It was with deep happiness that I saw in the newspaper that Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh has introduced a Bill in the Assembly to abolish capital punishment, which is now awaiting ballot opportunity for discussion. Belgium, Denmark, Holland, Italy, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, and some of the States in America have abolished the death penalty. They have found no increase in crime as a result.

Last year the Maharaja of Nepal announced by Proclamation that capital punishment would not be inflicted for an experimental period of five years as it was entirely repugnant to Indian ideals. Thus one Indian State has already set a precedent for the rest of the country. Lord Buckmaster, ex-Lord Chancellor of England, is one of those who has rooted opposition to capital punishment. He is not satisfied as to its being a deterrent. The opinion of a man of such experience should weigh for much.

Our experience in jail showed us that the "life sentences" to which a death sentence had been commuted had always resulted in good. There were over fifty such "lifers" in Vellore (where Mrs. Cousins served her sentence) and they were the finest citizens of the jail. The long term which usually works out to about fifteen years gives them opportunities of rising in positions of responsibility.

Human beings have no right to take life. It is illogical for the law to enunciate this principle and then order its own minions to do the very thing it condemns. Often innocent people are hanged and there is no reparation. The whole process of hanging or electrocution is degrading and demoralising to the executioner, the Jail Superintendents, the jail doctors, men and women, and jail staffs of jailors, warders, matrons and wardresses. It deprives the culprit of all opportunity of improvement, and we have seen how men and women make good when given time, and disciplinary circumstances for their crimes had been due to passion, frenzy, or lack of realisation, or pressure of intolerable circumstances, rather than sheer evil of nature. No man or woman should be deprived of the chance of making good. The harshness of the death penalty coarsens public sentiment also, and is but a relic of an age of barbarity.

Articles.

CONGRESS AND GOVERNMENT.

THERE are already numerous difficulties in the way of the executive organ of the Congress, the A.I.C.C., taking steps to adopt resolutions which will give a new orientation to the Congress policy and break the present stalemate. But if there

was any slender chance of this happening, the Government has completely destroyed it. It was widely believed that if a meeting of the A.I.C.C. was convened the Government would issue orders prohibiting the meeting, and later it was rumoured that Government had already given instructions to their officials to stop the meeting if it was held. In order to ascertain the truth about this, questions were asked in the Legislative Assembly, and in answering them the Home Member of the Government of India made it quite clear, though in an indirect way, that a formal meeting of the A.I.C.C. would not be allowed. He began by saying that no orders had yet been passed proclaiming the meeting, but it was only because the Government had not heard of the intention of the Congress party to arrange a meeting. He then added that though the A.I.C.C. had not been declared an unlawful assembly, like other Congress organisations, it was only because there was no occasion yet for doing so, since the A.I.C.C. had made no effort to meet or otherwise function. Why then set about killing a thing which was already dead? If it was revived, however, the Government would have to take whatever action was thought necessary. For they saw no reason to differentiate between one part of the Congress machinery and another. Now this answer can only be construed to mean that if a meeting of the A.I.C.C. were called, the Government would deal with it as they have dealt with meetings of other Congress Committees. But when such a query was directly made, Sir Harry Haig refused to answer it pointblank, saying that it was a hypothetical question. But when the question was again pressed home, he replied: "if it was considered that the A.I.C.C. should not be allowed to meet then necessary action would be taken." Which is as much as to say that the A.I.C.C. meeting will not be mechanically stopped because other Congress Committee meetings have been stopped, but it will be a matter of policy for the Government to consider whether in the circumstances existing at the moment it should be allowed or not. Does it mean that the Government's decision will depend upon its opinion of what the conclusions of the A.I.C.C. are likely to be? In fact one member asked as much: if the A.I.C.C. members met together informally and ascertained that the majority vote was in favour of a cessation of illegal activities, would the Government permit a formal meeting to be held upon being told what the trend of opinion was? Such a question naturally Sir Harry Haig avoided answering. But it all amounts to this that, unless at least there is a fair amount of certainty that the A.I.C.C. will call off individual civil disobedience as mass civil disobedience has been called off, it will be prevented from meeting.

This attitude on the Government's part clearly makes it extremely difficult for the Congress to change its policy in the way that a very large section of opinion in the country desires. It is perfectly true, as Sir Harry Haig reminded his questioners, that a formal meeting of the Congress or the A.I.C.C. or even the Working Committee was not always needed to take decisions in the name of the Congress; that

the policy of civil disobedience was first inaugurated and subsequently modified without the formality of either of these organisations meeting and recording resolutions to that effect. But all that this proves is that even an informal meeting of the Congress or its subsidiary bodies, or for the matter of that a single individual, can in certain circumstances act for the Congress and make its or his decision operative. But when a minority in the Congress seeks against heavy odds to effect a change in the ruling Congress policy, as seems to be the case at present, it will surely have to meet in the open, discuss the situation frankly with the rest and convert them to its views. It is a difficult enough task in all conscience, and it would have been but fair to expect that the Government should not unnecessarily add to the existing difficulties. To suggest, as one member of the Assembly did, that the Congress minority should first meet informally, convert the majority to its views, and then go to the Government begging it to allow a formal meeting to be held is something atrocious. No self-respecting person would do it. There is no doubt therefore that the Government by its hostile attitude has increased enormously the difficulties facing those Congressmen who desire a change in the present Congress policy. The Government may well have acted differently. Assuming that the A.I.C.C. arrives at a decision contrary to its wishes and continues individual or revives mass civil disobedience, it can easily take action to suppress unlawful activities, and in doing so it will have public sympathy on its side in a larger measure than now, but by banning the A.I.C.C. meeting and thus rendering a change of policy far more difficult, if not actually impossible, it will, we are afraid, lose the sympathy of a large section of the public who have consistently co-operated with it.

The Government's answer is wholly unjustifiable and deserves severe condemnation. But we hope that the Congress workers who wish for a change in the Congress policy will not cease on that account

to press their views as strongly as before upon the attention of the Congress party. For nothing that the Government does or does not do should be allowed by a hair's-breadth to deflect the policy of the Congress, which should be settled on its own merits and without reference to the Government's intentions. We know it is very difficult to act up to this principle in practice, but the country's interest requires a change in the present policy, and an earnest attempt should be made to bring it about in spite of the Government's unfortunate attitude. Men like Mr. Nariman and others who have been moving in this matter will be very greatly encouraged by the freedom which Mahatma Gandhi has given to them to adopt what policy they thought was demanded by the circumstances of the country. Personally the Mahatma has retired from politics and is therefore unable to recommend any particular action. But he does not want the Congress leaders to be slavishly continuing his policy; on the contrary he would welcome a change, even a drastic change, rather than see a creeping paralysis come over the Congress activities. It is time that the Congress, making full use of this freedom, defined its attitude towards the White Paper and took an active part in the agitation that is on foot for its improvement. The British Indian delegation's memorandum has gone a long way in bringing about a united front among Indian politicians on the question. If the Congress joins in, the united front will be complete; and it is quite possible that by concerted action we shall yet be able to secure considerable improvements in the White Paper. It is obvious that when such far-reaching constitutional changes take place they tend to be stabilised, and it becomes extremely difficult to introduce further modifications when the constitution once gets into working order. It therefore behooves the Congress politicians to give up their present sterile policy and help while there is yet time in making the constitution now on the anvil more satisfactory than it otherwise promises to be.

A PIOUS MYTH.

IN the constitutional discussions that have taken place in England and India for the last four years the attitude of British Indian politicians towards the British Government was consistently one of extreme suspiciousness and that towards the Indian Princes one of uttermost trustfulness. While they adopted a policy of haggling and even huckstering with the former, they said to the latter: "come into the federation on your own terms, but do come," and they said it almost on bended knees. Mr. Jayakar in the very first speech he made at the Round Table Conference told the Princes that he and his British Indian colleagues would not make terms with them at all, but would accept such terms as they in the generosity of their hearts would be willing to give. And Mr. Jayakar and those who acted with him fully lived up to this fine gesture. Now the only possible justification that can be advanced for this difference in mentality exhibited by them in carrying

on negotiations with the British Government on the one hand and with the rulers of Indian States on the other is the belief into which they persuaded themselves, that power at the centre could be obtained only on a federal basis, and that federation would be possible only if they took care not to raise any questions which were likely to be inconvenient to the Princes. Both these premisses on which their conduct was uniformly based can be shown to be wholly devoid of foundation in fact. The British Government itself is on record that even without federation with Indian States it was willing to give to British India just as much as it is willing to give now to a federated India. Nor was there any reason to suppose that the Princes were unaware of the fact that federation was at least as necessary to themselves as it might be to British India. A moderate insistence on reasonable terms would not therefore have exactly snapped these negotiations, and if they

had British India would not have been left altogether lacking in resource to meet the resulting situation. But our leaders thought otherwise, and they went on yielding at every step to their princely conferees scattering their own principles to the wind. Since it was a supposed exigency (though the exigency did not exist in fact) that dictated this attitude of helplessness it is understandable though it can by no means be justified.

But our leaders are not content to let their defence rest on this ground alone. They adduce others, and when they do so they forfeit the sympathy which they might otherwise have called forth. An argument commonly used by them in defending a federation in which, so far as the States are concerned, the Princes are all-in-all, and their subjects figure nowhere at all, is that although such a federation will not directly and immediately improve the position of the States' people it will indirectly and ultimately be a powerful lever—and in fact the only lever—in their hands for their upliftment. Similarly it is contended that although for the moment most of the States' representatives will be the Princes' nominees apt to be conservative in their views, their association day after day in the federal legislature with the elected representatives from British India will help to broaden their outlook in a way as nothing else will. In this way British Indian politicians recommend federation to the people in the States as a beneficial arrangement in its long-run effects. Now if those who advance such a consideration merely intend to convey that political progress in one territory has its reaction on other territories they are only uttering a platitude. In every other sense it is a pious myth. British India has always tended to rouse the people in the States to a consciousness of their political backwardness and to implant in them a desire to rise at least to the level of British India. But what those who wish to cover up their pusillanimity in dealing with the Princes must show is how this tendency will be strengthened under federation, and they never try to show it. If a mere physical juxtaposition of British India's elected and the States' nominated representatives in the same house tends to make the latter progressive, there is no reason for us to object to communal representatives or official representatives either. Those elected on a general territorial franchise will so outnumber the others as to convert the latter into the right type of representatives, if the juxtaposition has the virtue which is claimed for it. Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, while leaving it free to the Princes to nominate their own officials or even officials in British India as their representatives, takes very strong exception to British Indian officials being nominated by the Government of India to represent the States during the rulers' minority. How does it happen, one wonders, that the elected representatives from British India succeed in effecting a conversion of the officials nominated by the Indian Princes but not of those nominated by the Government of India?

The truth is that all this is special pleading designed for the purpose of keeping the States' people quiet while federation is formed. The States' people

however are too shrewd to be taken in in this way. Let it be clearly understood that the people of the States are not opposed to federation in itself. Only they would like British Indians to hold out against it till the Princes are in a frame of mind to accept what are everywhere regarded as essential conditions of federation. Democracy will be promoted better in the States, as indeed in British India itself, if British India waits for some time for the formation of federation. If the Princes know that unless they adopt democratic practices British India will not have federation, they will commence mending their ways sooner than if British India takes them into the federation with their autocracy and all. What will be the impetus for them for instance to replace their nominated representatives by elected ones when they are once admitted into the federation even as they are? There will of course be the time-spirit to goad them on, but why not help this time-spirit by holding out to them the prospect of receiving definite material advantages flowing from participation in federation? If, however, these advantages are given them without imposing upon them any conditions, there is nothing left but time-spirit to struggle along as best it can, and naturally it works very slowly. All that the people in the States say, therefore, in regard to federation, is, to use the words of Lord Bacon: "Let us stay a little that we may make an end the sooner" of autocracy. They are not opposed to federation for all time. If federation of the right kind is brought about they will welcome it; but some sort of federation, hastily brought about, will only serve to perpetuate autocracy and will be as little in their interest as in that of British Indians.

All the British Indian leaders who have accepted without question the anti-democratic features of the constitution resulting from the introduction of the absolute rulers of Indian States into it advise the States' people to agree to federation, bad as it is, on the ground that, somehow or other, eventually it will be to their benefit. But the States' people have definitely and finally rejected this advice. Rightly or wrongly (and I think quite rightly), they would like the States to be kept out of the federation till the Princes are more kindly disposed to popular government. The British Government and the Indian Princes have no scruples in imposing federation upon them even against their wishes. These are used to such methods of coercion. Will the freedom-loving patriots from British India too impose federation upon the States' people? Will they say to these (as the British Government does to themselves): "We know best what is good for you, and you will have to take it, whatever your own feelings may be"? Will they not rather say: "Federation will really be to your advantage; you think otherwise, but you are quite wrong there. Anyway you are opposed to federation, and we cannot be parties to an act of forcing it upon you. We must wait till you change your mind. It is most unfortunate, but there is no help for it"? Will the British Indian people make a start with self-government by first imposing their own will upon their brethren in the States? If democrats

too will be as coercive as autocrats and bureaucrats, what is their love of democracy worth?

Or do they think that the States' people are in favour of federation, with nominated representatives and all the other damnable features of it? With resolutions passed in the contrary sense at numerous conferences of the States' people, there is not the smallest excuse for anyone to be labouring under such a delusion. But we can put the matter to a test, if there is any doubt about it. When Mr. Winston Churchill claimed that his scheme of a sort of Provincial Home Rule would enure to the benefit of the masses and that Central Responsibility would in the existing conditions of general illiteracy and poverty work to their serious damage, Mr. Jayakar posed a question as to why then they followed the intelligentsia and offered by taking a plebiscite to make good his contention that they did trust and follow the intelligentsia. It was considered very clever of him to have made such "a sporting offer" to Mr. Churchill and he was universally applauded in India for putting Mr. Churchill in the right place. Mr. Jayakar said: "Will you see that this Government takes a plebiscite from the masses on the plain and simple question—everybody having liberty to advocate in the masses, your school, my school, the Government and everybody—a plebiscite on the simple question: Do the masses desire a government of their own people or government trammelled by the British? Will you take a plebiscite and be bound by that plebiscite?" I would make a counter offer to Mr. Jayakar, and it is a better offer than his to Mr. Churchill. Let him and his associates alone move among the States' people. The agitators in the States will undertake not to visit them at all. Let him be on the stump continuously for six months and let his persuasive eloquence have the fullest chance of working a miracle. If he can get the people in any single State—there are six hundred of them—to prefer nomination to election or even to accept federation temporarily under the conditions he has in mind, then he may go forward with his constitution-building enterprise. But if he cannot do so then he must agree to go to the British Government with a request to drop it. Will he take the offer? Or let him tell the people of the States what will convince him of the fact that they do not want federation, and that if British India persists in the federal plan, it will be regarded by them as being guilty along with the British Government of imposing upon them a constitution which they have finally made up their mind to repudiate. Whatever test he lays down will be satisfied.

If British Indian leaders will insist upon having federation even if it be frankly undemocratic, let them at least give up the pretence that the people of the Indian States are with them, for they are not.

OBSERVER.

THE NEW GERMANY.

INTO the causes that led to the ascendancy of the Nazis and the establishment of the Third Empire (Das DRITTE REICH) I do not here want to enter. In the first place, it is the business of historians and

politicians and in the second place, what I want to do in this short article is to examine the present condition of Germany from a humanist's point of view and to see whether humanity has taken a step in the right direction. The immediate reason of my action is the pamphlet* which lies before me and which some well-meaning friend in Germany has sent to me in the hope of converting me into a friend of the Nazis.

Now, in spite of the word "Socialist" in the name of the party, the Nazis are out and out reactionaries and as has been made clear by Herr Steel, a formal colleague of Hitler in a recent publication, the party is supported by funds contributed by capitalists all over the world. The usual slogan "my country—right or wrong" has been apparently superseded by "my race—always the best" by the Nazis. The speeches of Hitler are full of that arrogance, which is a characteristic of the superiority complex, interspered here and there with sweet platitudes regarding the peaceful intentions of Germany.

As regards India, Hitler has already shown himself to be an imperialist by declaring that as an European he would like the British to continue to dominate India. Even this one fact is enough to cause all loss of sympathy from the Indians towards Nazi Germany.

Racial arrogance seems to have been the principal plank in the Nazi programme. The fact of the German population being a heterogeneous mixture of Nordics, Slavs, Mediterranean and Alpine races has been carefully passed over and the whole conglomerate has been earmarked as "Aryan" while the Jews are branded as non-Aryans. The great crime that the Jews are supposed to have committed is their "internationalism" and their sympathy for fellow-Jews outside Germany. It is, however, a little remarkable for Germans to denounce this kind of feeling, when Germans all over the world, in Russia, Argentine, Brazil, Chile, South Africa and U. S. A., are continuously being urged to preserve their *Deutschtum*. In the case of the Germans, the sympathy for the Vaterland is apparently a good quality even when they are, officially, citizens of other countries!

Another characteristic of the Nazis is their intolerance of every kind of opinion but their own, and results in the suppression of all political parties, subjection of the churches, and interference in the private lives of citizens. Nobody in Germany has now the freedom to publish anything against the Nazis nor to try to obtain public support for views not officially supported by the Government. I am aware that it is now the fashion to smile derisively at the old ideals of personal liberty and democracy; but I hope we in India are still in the stage of understanding their value. A country where the freedom of speech, the freedom of association and the freedom of the press is ruthlessly suppressed,

* The new Germany desires work and peace. Speeches by Hitler, the leader of new Germany—Berlin, Liebheit and Thiesen.

cannot lay claim to the name of a civilised country. The German newspaper from the extreme right to the extreme left (I hear that even the old socialist papers are still being published under the old names but with a new policy!) is certainly the most monotonous reading imaginable. They all say exactly the same things in praise of Hitler and his party.

Only today (7-12-33) I read a laboured apologia by Herr Frick, the Home Minister, regarding the racial legislation in Germany. He protests against the overwhelming proportion of Jews in the legal, medical and a few other professions. Now, even he must admit that all these doctors and lawyers had passed the necessary examinations before they were allowed to practise and that the examinations were open to anybody that cared to appear for them. He even goes so far as to point out that about 30% of the staff of the Universities was Jewish when the population percentage of the Jews was only 1.5%! He, however, does not seem to realise that this only shows the greater efficiency of the Jews in the matter of intellectual work! For, no person is admitted as a teacher in an University without the existing teachers (members of the Faculty) signifying their approval of his or her scientific or literary work. One result of prohibition of mixed marriages is the looking with great suspicion even upon ordinary friendships and association between Indian students and German girls.

A fact that is likely to raise grave doubts regarding Germany's peaceful intentions in the minds of the pacifists is the intensive militarisation of the youth of Germany that is being carried out there. The treatment meted out to Mr. Panter for sending reports about these military displays to his newspaper, is an index of the bad conscience of Germany in this matter. The compulsory service in camps expected of every young man is only a thin disguise for military discipline. Although nobody wants Germany to remain in a permanently inferior position as compared to other nations in regard to arms, every pacifist ardently desires a disarmament of the other nations and not a rearmament of Germany.

The Nazi attitude towards woman is also rather dubious. To brand her as good only for the kitchen and the house and to oust her from all other public activities is a return to the 17th or 18th century for which there is no excuse.

The Nazis want the German woman to breed as promiscuously as in the 19th century but do not want to give her any rights and privileges in the totalitarian state. She has still the right of vote; but is ineligible for membership of the provincial or the Reich parliaments. Married women are to be dismissed from service if their husbands are also earning.

The attempts of the Nazis to increase the population of Germany are, however, doomed to failure. Germany at present is the country with the lowest birth rate and considering the huge unemployment and

the crowding of some of the industrial areas, a considerable reduction of her population is the only sure means of relieving distress. To try to deliberately increase population and then to ask for more space (Lebensraum) for expansion is not reasonable. If a high population were the only criterion for the grant of new territories, all the thinly populated areas in the world shall have to be divided up between China, India and Japan! I wonder how the "Aryans" in Berlin would relish it!

This nonsense about the totalitarian state has been greatly exaggerated. A state that makes a machine out of a man, teaches him only the prescribed dogmas about the purity of race, advocates fighting with fellow-men as a means of gaining efficiency, does not allow him to marry outside a certain prescribed group of persons, inculcates in his mind the intolerance of opinions different from his own, is not likely to advance the world on the path of the brotherhood of all mankind, which idealists have been dreaming of and working for. Friends of the old German intellectual thoroughness and broad human sympathies as emphasised in the advance of democracy and liberalism during the last decade, will grieve deeply at this lapse into what is virtually a phase of barbarism.

D. D. KARVE.

ECONOMIC POSSIBILITIES OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA is a democratic republic at the head of which is a president for a term of seven years. No president can be re-elected more than once unless an interval occurs between his terms of office, but this provision does not apply to the first president, T. G. Masaryk.

Czechoslovakia possesses in her wealth of natural resources, her geographical position in the heart of Europe and in her direct touch with five neighbouring countries, excellent conditions for economic development, even though she is somewhat at a disadvantage on account of her landlocked situation and lack of a sea-board.

The country's natural resources are represented first and foremost by deposits of pit-coal (average annual output about 15,000,000 tons) and of lignite (about 20,000,000 tons), which are found in some districts round Moravska Ostrava and round Most.

I have seen one of the biggest blast furnaces of the leading branches in the iron industry, when I visited the important centre Vitkovice near Moravska Ostrava. The output of iron ore is smaller, but some 1.7 million tons are produced, especially in Slovakia. An important source of radium as well as of finished radium is Jachymov in the Ore Mountains. China clay of excellent quality found in North-West Bohemia has given rise to a famous porcelain industry, the headquarters of which are roundabout Karlsbad, the world famous spas of which have numerous thermal springs (42 to 71 degrees centigrade,) and attract annually about 72,000 visitors. In healing springs of hot and cold

water Czechoslovakia is one of the richest countries in Europe.

Industry is mainly developed in the Western parts of the Republic. Sugar, glass, cotton, paper, leather, metal industries are on a very large scale and the Republic's exports are very great. The capacity of the Czechoslovak industries is greatly in excess of the needs of home consumption, so that Czechoslovakia is a country dependent upon industrial exports. The centres of iron industry are Kladno, Brno, Adamor, Plzen (Skoda Works). Glass-making has been a famous industry ever since the sixteenth century (in Bohemia there are over 120 large glass-works) and every species of glass is turned out, especially 'Bohemian cut glass' which is exported to all parts of the world, bijouterie (the manufacture of which is concentrated round Jablonec) and art glass products (turned out at Kamenicky Sanov, Karlsbad and elsewhere.) The textile trade is highly developed (particularly in the North and North-East of Bohemia, in Moravia-Silesia, at Brno, Opava, Ruzomberk and elsewhere. The boot and shoe industry (the Bata factories at Zilin are the largest on the Continent) and the outfitting industry work largely for export. The musical instruments and the laces turned out in the Ore Mountains are known all over the world. Among agricultural industries Czechoslovak beet sugar has attained an international reputation by reason of its outstanding quality. Other output of the agricultural industries includes alcohol, malt starch and beer. The Bohemian brewery trade enjoys a worldwide reputation (477 breweries produced 11,904,000 hectolitres of beer in 1930 at Pilsen, Prague, Budejvice and elsewhere). Both malt and hops, as raw materials for the brewery trade, are exported to all parts of the world.

The importance of agriculture for Czechoslovakia's economic prosperity is apparent from the fact that the country's farms, apart from buildings and inventory, represent more than one-third of the national wealth and provide occupation for nearly 40 per cent. of the entire population. Rye and oats are grown to a much larger extent than are wheat, barley and maize. A considerable area is under sugarbeet. On the whole, the soil in Czechoslovakia ranks as medium quality for agricultural purposes. Czechoslovak agriculture is therefore conducted on the intensive system, and has for many decades past been the basis of numerous industries which have linked it up with an intensive network of agricultural co-operative societies.

Czechoslovak trade is developing along lines of modern conception and organization. Since foreign trade is the most important item in Czechoslovakia's balance of payments, special attention is devoted to the adjustment of commercial relations with foreign countries. Czechoslovakia purchases considerable quantities of raw material from abroad and pays for them by the export of finished goods or natural products. About 86 per cent. of the total foreign trade is done with Europe, and 14 per cent. with overseas countries.

Czechoslovakia is a progressive country and has a good economic future.

RAJ BEHARILAL MATRUR.

Our London Letter.

(BY AIR MAIL.)

(From Our Correspondent.)

LONDON, December 8.

MR. ANDREWS ON THE INDIAN SITUATION.

ON the return of Mr. C. F. Andrews to London this week, he was overwhelmed with requests for interviews by the press and others. Organisations are most anxious to have him address them, and a general feeling on the part of a large section of the country to receive what they believe to be authentic news from India is very evident. At the Indian Conciliation Group, of which Mr. Andrews is a member, a meeting was immediately called to hear what Mr. Andrews had to say of what he had seen and heard while travelling over India. He spoke quite frankly of the condition as he saw it, and laid great stress on the economic crisis, which in his estimation was almost more important than the political one. Especially was this true, he thought, in Bengal. The terrible economic conditions of all classes of people there produce the dangerous element in the problem of that Province and only by dealing with these conditions can the political situation be rendered easier.

Mr. Gandhi's influence remains undiminished, Mr. Andrews stated, in the villages through which he was touring, and whatever antagonism there is to him and his methods of work is confined to the towns. He also spoke of the terrible havoc wrought by the floods in Orissa and the enormous self-sacrifice displayed there on the part of the people to alleviate distress.

On the White Paper Mr. Andrews said it was condemned by all educated Indian opinion, the greatest criticism being the expense it would involve to so poor a country as India. Two things, Mr. Andrews pointed out, should be done immediately: 1. an impartial enquiry made into the whole penal and police administration of the country, 2. an impartial enquiry into the conditions that are leading to greater and greater discontent in Bengal.

One feature of Mr. Andrews' remarks to-day is specially noticeable, it is the great belief he has in the part that women are taking in the work of reconstruction in India. They have, he says, taken a determined stand against communalism, child marriage, and untouchability, and their influence is growing.

BURMA AND THE JOINT COMMITTEE.

Lord Linlithgow, on behalf of the Joint Committee, delivered a short speech of welcome to the Burmese Delegates on Wednesday when they met for the first time in London, and Dr. Daw Saw Sa in reply said that she wished on behalf of the women of Burma to tender her grateful thanks to the Joint Select Committee for including a woman representative in the Delegation. The women of Burma, she said, had always had a tradition of an equal standing with men, and she was accordingly grateful that this traditional standing had been recognised officially here.

It is expected that the Select Committee will have completed their consultations with the Burmese Delegation by the end of next week. They do not want this part of their business carried over to the

new year but if they find there is more work than they can get through in the short time they have allowed themselves between now and Christmas, the Burmese delegation will have to be prepared to be available again in the first week in January, 1934.

INDIAN COTTON AND LANCASHIRE.

A meeting took place in Manchester on Thursday the 7th between the representatives of the Liverpool Cotton Association and the Indian Cotton Enquiry Committee. Sir Robert Jackson, the chairman of the Committee, stated that the Committee had several meetings since the return of the Textile Mission to India last month, to consider the proposals made by the Mission for further measures to increase the Lancashire consumption of Indian cotton.

The Mission had put forward a policy advocating a steady extension in the use of Indian cotton by Lancashire, this to be secured by means of permanent co-operation between the Lancashire mills and Indian growers. A proposal was also unanimously approved that the British cotton industry should appoint two cotton commissioners who would carry out their duties principally in India and who would act as liaison organisations.

The Lancashire Committee have also decided to take a stand at the British Textile Exhibition which is to be held shortly in London to exhibit a display of Lancashire cloths made from Indian cotton.

BRITISH INDIAN DELEGATION'S DEMANDS.

Few people will have realised that next to the White Paper itself the most important publication connected with the Joint Select Committee so far issued has appeared this week. It contains a number of documents of varying value, but two in particular are of the highest significance. One is the Joint Memorandum of the British Indian Delegates, of which I wrote recently, and the other is the famous Memorandum of Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru delivered by him to the Chairman of the Committee just before his departure in the summer. These two papers ought to give furiously to think both here and in India. They contain the most formidable and the best informed criticism hitherto published of the White Paper proposals. They indicate the very minimum that will satisfy self-respecting Nationalists of the balanced type. The mere fact that amongst the signatories of the one document are a number of personalities for whom Indian opinion, rightly or wrongly, has expressed the strongest dislike or contempt, ought not to detract from the fact that other signatories are men of capital importance in the political and intellectual life of the country, and include men whose superiority in ability and knowledge and equipment it will be difficult to find. It is significant that the Press has so far maintained a very discreet silence on the contents and the merits of these two Memoranda. It is not unnatural in these days when Editors require to be spoonfed, and on topics of this kind, to be told what Government opinion is. The India Office has so far been sensible enough to express no opinion. The situation, however ought to be very different in India. The political world is crystallising out into new shapes. There will, of course, be for some time to come a noisy repetition of old mumbo jumbos. All that may be taken for granted. The time, however, is now coming when minds of thoughtful men must be directed to more productive channels and these two Memoranda, if they are sensibly and constructively used, may help to create a sound and fertilising public opinion that will enable India to pull her maximum strength in the difficult and critical days ahead. It will be sad, however, if personal vendettas or the dislike of particular personalities should, if even for the time being, replace the constructive and healing work above suggested.

IRELAND.

On November 14th Mr. J. H. Thomas, Secretary of State for the Dominions, made a curious reference to Ireland and to the impossibility of Ireland assuming an in and out position vis-a-vis the British Commonwealth. Curious, because it was in fact dealing with a hypothetical position although understandable in view of the general trend of recent constitutional legislation in the Free State, but his remark has caused an effect other than was anticipated. Mr. de Valera has asked him what Great Britain would do were the Free State to declare a Republic and would Great Britain endeavour to use force to prevent it. One would suppose that this is a question of considerable importance from a realistic standpoint, but there seems to be a general belief that the question was asked, not so much to obtain a reply, but to obtain such a reply as would enable Mr. de Valera to go to the country on a General Election with a strong anti-English programme.

Mr. Thomas, however, did not rise to the bait. Instead he stated that he could not believe that Ireland would so far break the terms of the 1921 Treaty or that it was impossible for Britain and Ireland to live in amity within the Empire, and that, therefore, he must regard the question as a purely hypothetical one not calling for an answer. There has been a relief in many quarters at this easing of the tension temporarily between the two countries, but it would be a mistake to consider the matter settled. Mr. de Valera's avowed object is the declaration of a Republic of all Ireland, although his political opponents, and possibly even his political allies, are uncertain to what extent he would be prepared to face the economic and financial consequences on an existence independent of the British Empire.

It is generally admitted that under the Statute of Westminster any Dominion may secede from the Empire should it so desire, but the position of Ireland is in some respects different from that of the other Dominions. In Ireland there is not only the Statute of Westminster, but also the Treaty of 1921 and it is a question whether the Statute so far supersedes the Treaty as to enable Ireland to leave the Commonwealth without agreement with Great Britain on this point.

Despite this unique position of Ireland in the Commonwealth, however, the matter may have its repercussion on British political thought as regards India, and indeed it may well be the reason for the recent statement that the White Paper policy does not in itself grant Dominion Status. India's secession from the Empire is looked upon by a large part of the Conservative party in this country with an abhorrence which is only equalled by the relief that they would feel if the Irish Free State were to quit. They cannot conceive of India outside the Empire and the quarrel with Ireland has brought forcibly home to them the danger as they conceive it that lies in the granting of Dominion Status to India. The recent declaration to which reference has been made above will, however, solve the conscience of these Conservatives, constituting the majority of the party in this country, who desire to see the White Paper policy put into execution and so perhaps the repercussions may dwindle to little more than, as usual, words.

PROHIBITION IN AMERICA.

One of the greatest social experiments attempted by a country has now come to an end. The 10th Amendment to the American Constitution, making illegal the manufacture and sale of alcoholic drinks, has been repealed and America is once again to be permitted to buy intoxicating drinks without breaking the law. One would have to look far for a better

example of the disaster which overtakes a country endeavouring to legislate in advance of its social conscience.

Owing to the intemperance of the few and the natural horror which arose against that intemperance, the American public was persuaded to embark upon "The Great Experiment." Its results were as unforeseen as they were un hoped for. The illicit manufacture of alcohol in the States, frequently highly poisonous substances, sprang up in every part whilst smuggling became rife along the sea coasts and the Canadian border. Endeavours to quell it were met by corruption, a corruption which could be, and was, on a gigantic scale owing to the gigantic profits which were being made. The widespread abuse of the law in this one aspect led to an equally widespread contempt for the law in many other aspects, whilst the corruption of many whose duty it should have been to enforce the law was used as a cover and protection for further crimes, such as kidnapping and racketeering.

The people who wished to drink continued to do so in nearly every case, the only real exception being the very poor who could not afford the prices demanded. It was estimated that last year the cost of endeavouring unsuccessfully to enforce prohibition was £11,000,000 sterling, which could not be considered other than a waste in the circumstances. A growing dissatisfaction of "The Noble Experiment" finally surged up in a demand for action, and, against the expectation of the great majority of the people, Congress passed a further Amendment of the Constitution eliminating the 18th Amendment, which further Amendment was in a remarkably short time, ratified by the requisite three-fourths of the States of the Union. American prohibition has gone the way of that of Norway and Iceland.

A NEW EXPERIMENT.

The experiment is over and a new experiment is about to commence, an experiment to eliminate the bootlegger and racketeer from American life by depriving them of their main source of revenue. If taxation of alcohol is fixed at the high level which the municipal and financial position of the States may possibly require this second experiment will be equally unsuccessful. It is only by selling at competitive prices with the bootlegger that it will no longer be worth his while to continue his trade.

It will be interesting to all social workers to see how the figures of consumption will vary from year to year in the future. In this country by a system of control of licensed premises, of elimination of surplus licensed premises and of the fairly high taxation there has been a remarkable decrease, not only in the number of cases of drunkenness dealt with by the Courts, but also in the consumption of alcohol. This reduction is no mere flash in the pan, as is evident from the steadiness and continuity of the decrease. The advantages of the British system have been recognised in America. There have appeared suggestions that, subject to adaptation to local needs, a similar system should be introduced into America in the hope that it will produce a more real temperance than prohibition has done.

Reviews.

PROBLEM OF THE CRIMINAL.

THE LAWBREAKER. By E. ROY CALVERT and THEODORA CALVERT. (Routledge.) 1933. 20cm. 294p. 7/6.

THE book before us, though in the nature of a short essay, touches most of the important points about

the modern treatment of crime in England. It gives carefully collected statistics and the results of inquiries, public and private. The conclusions based on these are in most places intelligent and logical. Above all the book displays a stubborn faith in the practicability of improving our treatment of crime.

The first topic considered is naturally the purpose of punishing the criminal. The authority and justification for doing so is really the key to all subsequent problems arising out of it. If we once clearly know why we punish (which does also include why we should punish) our treatment of crime becomes at once sensible and just. Now this question has a fourfold aspect. Legitimately our notion of crime is based on moral, social and political considerations. The three are in most cases mixed up and unavoidably so. The State desires to prevent whatever is wrong from either of these three standpoints.

But in addition to these three very legitimate aspects a fourth one, not so legitimate but actually more important, is the historical one. From the ancient days various modes of dealing with criminals have become habitual with us. And we have come to believe that these are not only permissible but essential. They have become a sort of institution and we feel that somehow our wellbeing and security depend on them. Even a slight change creates a feeling of insecurity and though changes do come now and then they do so after a great struggle.

No doubt this consideration is apparently an illogical one, but we cannot afford to ignore it. Merely abstract notions of justice are hardly of any use. It is not enough that you are just, but that you should be looked upon as such. This latter aspect perhaps is actually more important than the former. This mixture of considerations renders the task of fixing the quantum of punishment and of carrying it out extremely complicated. And as if this were not enough we are further faced with the difficulty of finding sufficient money and suitable men to perform this function efficiently. The problem is thus vast and can only be tackled by careful research and cooperation.

There are two totally divergent views held on this subject. One is that our body politic consists of law-abiding men and is entitled to protect itself against crime and criminals; that a sneaking sympathy with what is wrong and harmful ought not to find favour with administrators; and that public opinion ought to be very decisive on this point. There are others who plead that crimes are in most cases the result of mental diseases and it is the duty of society to treat the unfortunate victims of the disease with sympathy. If we consider it our duty to provide hospitals and sanatoriums for physical diseases, no less is it our duty to make arrangements for the treatment of moral diseases. It is also urged that our present arrangements are neither economic nor effectively deterrent as they are claimed to be.

In the practical application of their doctrines however both schools are prepared for some give and take and in the result seem almost to agree, for both realise the necessity of conforming as nearly as possible to the prevailing notions of the adequacy of punishments. Thus the first group does not advocate the restoration of such punishments as mutilation or flogging nor does the latter recommend putting a premium on crime. The difference in the point of view is however undeniable and in a sense is very valuable, for the two theorists mutually act as a wholesome check on each other.

The authors of this book profess to belong to the latter class. They hold that most crimes can be explained by the environments in which individuals

are placed and that society as a whole must share the responsibility for the same. They also point out that heredity is in some measure responsible for lapses which cannot be accounted for by mere adverse surroundings. It will be seen that this proceeds on the moral hypothesis that man is not a free agent and his actions are predetermined for him by circumstances over which he has no control. It is very difficult to subscribe to this theory and it has also been refuted successfully times out of number.

In the second chapter dealing with present crime, the authors recognise that crime is essentially an individual matter though it is affected by social and economic causes like poverty, unemployment, overcrowding, motor transport, want of emigration facilities and the decline of the Church. It is very aptly pointed out in the end that though the death of old conservatism is inevitable, still a new conservatism must take its place. The third chapter deals with the machinery of justice. An appeal is made for the centralisation of police organisation which curiously does not exist till this date in England. A further appeal is made for the separation of traffic duties from the shoulders of the police. In India we may add that political duties may be separated from the ordinary duties of the police. The same chapter also deals with the courts and the forms of punishments. The authors pertinently point out that even in England the Judges do not possess the necessary training in psychology and the science of human behaviour to qualify them to prescribe the most suitable punishment. If this is so in England, what may we say about India?

The fourth and the fifth are important chapters which take stock of the reform in prisons already made by public and private efforts and also suggest the need for further reforms. It is pointed out that unnecessary harshness of treatment is already minimised. What remains to be done is a systematic reclaiming of the criminals who have to be segregated from society for some time owing to their anti-social outlook. The authors think that allowing anti-social persons to become further degraded by the inhuman, senseless and dull routine in prisons is a serious crime. They suggest individual and differentiating treatment for all criminals. This sounds all right, but would be found to be impracticable to a great extent. Suitable men for the job and sufficient money cannot be forthcoming.

The next three chapters deal with probation— young offenders and women offenders. Valuable suggestions are made for the enlarging of the provisions relating to special treatment already in vogue in these cases.

The next two chapters deal with corporal punishments and the death penalty. Both naturally create a sense of horror in the public mind and the authors who are well-known advocates of capital punishment have attacked them with great vigour. It must however be said that unless equally deterrent punishments could be substituted it will not be safe in any stage of society to abolish entirely either of these. There are some kinds of crimes utterly unnatural and obnoxious, which must be discouraged effectively. The only punishments considered effectively deterrent happen to be corporal and death punishments. If public opinion so far changes that less severe punishments come to be felt to be equally deterrent there will certainly be every reason to abolish these.

In conclusion we recommend the book very heartily to every one interested in criminal law and administration; and though we feel that our problems in India are very elementary as compared with those

discussed in this book, still we are thankful to the authors for pointing to us the goal which we have to keep in view.

B. R. DAMLE.

RENAISSANCE OF INDIAN WOMEN.

INTO THE SUN. By FRIEDA H. DAS. (Dent.)
1933. 20cm. 312p. 7/6.

"INTO the Sun" is really a story of Ramadevi, the widowed daughter of an ultra-conservative Brahmin household. Ramadevi belonged to the unfortunate class of girls who lose their husbands without knowing any life: such widows are known in India as virgin-widows. Ramadevi's grandfather lived the true Brahmin's life in a remote village in Bengal scorning all modern life. He was content and happy with his ancestral acres. He attended to his daily religious observances while his wife tended *Ishan-Agni*, the sacrificial fire which is never allowed to die out in an orthodox Brahmin's home. Ramadevi's father, however, had ambitions for his own sons and hence after the death of his own father decided to shift to the town of Barisal and put his two sons to school. He engages Ananda Babu, a private tutor, to help the boys at home in their studies.

While the elder of the two boys had to get back to the old village, the younger one, Krishna, gets moulded and fashioned at the hands of Ananda Babu who also puts the idea of Ramadevi being taught to read and write even while observing the strictest purdah. Krishna secretly teaches Ramadevi, who becomes an apt and willing student, a thirst for the knowledge of the outside world. The main spring of this process of education is Ananda Babu who discreetly remains in the background, so much so that in the earlier stages of the story there is but one meeting between Ramadevi and Ananda Babu. This meeting had tragic consequences. The poor father who was ailing from an advanced stage of heart disease is shocked to instantaneous death at the sight of his widowed daughter setting eyes on and holding conversation with a gentleman even though he was Ananda Babu himself, an otherwise welcome visitor to their own home as a private tutor to Krishna.

Time passes and in spite of her own efforts not to devote any more of her time for studies, in spite of lack of any direct encouragement from her own mother, Ramadevi finds the urge for acquiring knowledge insistent and irresistible and just at this psychological moment becomes acquainted with the sisters of Ananda Babu who had cast off purdah and who were engaged in contributing their own share in the national movement of India. This happens to be in the eventful year of 1931 when ladies of India came forward in great numbers to participate in the non-co-operation movement and bore bravely the merciless lathi charges and uncomplainingly went to prison, the inevitable penalty for certain forms of patriotic demonstrations. Ramadevi herself did not become a victim of the different processes of emergency laws since she was considered by the "War-Council" of Barisal too valuable a "minister" to be sacrificed to the lathis of the police. The real triumph of Ramadevi finds expression in the spirit of the cult of khadi and also in the work of regeneration of the untouchables. In her eyes as in the eyes of millions of others in India, Mahatma Gandhi became the divinely ordained saviour of India and his slightest wish was a command to be implicitly followed irrespective of the consequences.

This transformation of Ramadevi "from purdah-darkness out into the sun, into the freedom of inde-

pendent searching and self-expression" took place gradually and irresistibly on account of the special circumstances and times in which she lived. The book is rich with vivid descriptions of the hardships, the struggles, the agonies, the doubts and misgivings and the final emergence of a completely emancipated and fully educated Ramadevi, a live and patriotic woman of modern India. The book may be considered as a description of the renaissance of the Indian womanhood.

Even though for the sake of convenience the author has adopted the form of a story, it is obvious on going through the pages of the book that it is merely a description of the astonishing changes that have taken place in India even in the ultra-conservative and orthodox Brahmin families. The book wants to lay stress on the fact that the modern movement, the national regeneration of India, is not a transient surface movement; but it has gone deep into the lives of every class of Indians even in the remotest villages. Herein lies the value of the book to the western readers. The author deserves a compliment for the amazing grasp of accurate details of life in an orthodox Brahmin's family and these details testify to the thoroughness with which she has approached her task. It may however be remarked that the book would not have suffered at all if the first chapter had not been included, because the pictures therein seem to have been overdrawn to some extent.

The glossary requires a little revision since there are a few inaccuracies.

S. G. SASTRY.

JANJIRA RULING FAMILY.

BOMBAY AND THE SIDIS. By D. R. BANAJI.
(Published for the University of Bombay by Messrs. Macmillan & Co., Bombay.) 1932. 25cm. 434p.

MR. BANAJI'S book treats of the relations between the rulers of Janjira and the English for two centuries from 1628 to 1840. Mr. Banaji has nothing to add to what has been already given us by Briggs about the origin of the Sidi rulers and how they came to establish themselves at Janjira. The word *Sidi* comes from *Siyadat* (black) and nothing would be gained by claiming a holy origin for this family, the founders of which came from Somaliland or Aybssinia as they are often termed *Shamal* or *Habshi* in Marathi correspondence. This is also borne out by the application to the Governor of Bombay in 1813, of Kazi Abdulla refusing to form matrimonial alliances with the rulers of Janjira, reproduced by the author in full in his last chapter.

The author traces in minute detail the relations between the two powers from 1628 onwards missing the wood for the trees. While the Sidis continued insolent towards the English throughout the seventeenth century, their attitude in the eighteenth century was one of helpless dependence on the English for their very existence. The reader gropes in vain for the explanation of the vicissitudes in the Sidis' political power and we doubt whether the author, even after the 600 books which he claims to have gone through, has any satisfactory explanation to offer. That is due to his total disregard of Marathi sources. The overbearing manner of the Sidi rulers during the seventeenth century is to be explained by the fact that they were then supported by the

might, prestige, and financial as well as military strength of the Mughal Empire. With the rise of the Marathas in the eighteenth century the Empire crumbled and with it disappeared the Sidi's insolence. He was hard put to it in keeping up his head against the Maratha onslaught. But for the help which the English rendered him from time to time he would have been long annihilated and nothing heard of him afterwards. The English maintained him as a buffer-state, as their first line of defence in case of hostilities with the Maratha Navy.

As regards the unpublished documents printed at the end of the volume it seems the author has totally overlooked the Home Series of Mr. Forrest (1887) in which some of them have already appeared. We are sorry we cannot agree with Principal Rawlinson, who remarks in the preface that the thesis won Mr. Banaji a richly deserved first-class. The University should be more careful in distributing its rewards and the sooner it stops the evil of the thesis M. A., the better. A work of history is not a patch-work of extracts from published and unpublished documents but should aim at drawing a complete picture.

D.

Correspondence.

"FEDERATION AND INDEPENDENCE."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SERVANT OF INDIA.

SIR,—I regret I cannot follow "Observer's" reasoning. The goal of the Congress is complete national independence. To-day it has not got the strength to achieve it. It must and will bide its time. But the proposed Indian Federation is objectionable, not only because it is inconsistent with Dominion Status or Independence, but because of innumerable inherent defects. I do not understand what "Observer" means when he says we should "resist the constitution." Verbal resistance I have no use for. Direct action I believe in, but it is out of the question for the present. Even if the Princes revise their attitude, I will not accept the White Paper constitution. If India develops effective sanctions to compel the British Government to agree to what we want, the Princes will not resist.—Yours, etc.

S. SATYAMURTI.

Madras,

December 17.

[The purpose of my article was to show that not merely independence but dominion status itself is incompatible with federation. To this proposition Mr. Satyamurti agrees in full. Of course I never meant to suggest that this is the only defect in the White Paper scheme. There are many others, and I have myself pointed out a good few of them. But to those who are wedded to constitutional means this surely is the gravest defect of all, and in fact fatal to their political ambitions, that dominion status, not to speak of independence, is from a constitutional point of view inconsistent with federation and therefore impossible of attainment, at any future time, under federation. To those who can resort to extra-constitutional means this will of course not be an insuperable difficulty, but I was thinking for the moment of those who were pledged to use constitutional weapons alone. I have myself said that a revolution will be needed in India, if she accepts federation, to attain dominion status in its full significance.

What I mean by "resisting the constitution" is that we should prevent it from coming force.—OBSERVER.]