

The Servant of India

EDITOR: P. KODANDA RAO.

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

VOL. XVII, No. 18 }

POONA—THURSDAY, MAY 3, 1934.

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

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK.	205
ARTICLES :—	
The Gage of Battle	207
The Textile Workers' Strike	209
Administrative Side of Sind Separation... ..	210
" Mass Education in India." By M.	211
OUR LONDON LETTER.	212
REVIEWS :—	
Social Value of Universities. By Prof. M. R. Paranjpe	215
Profession of Prostitution. By Prof. R. D. Karve... ..	215
BOOKS RECEIVED.	216

Topics of the Week.

Gokhale-Puri.

ONE of the services rendered by the Servants of India Society's workers in Bihar relief work took the form of designing and constructing a model settlement at Muzzefarpore, which has been named Gokhale-Puri, after the illustrious founder of the Servants of India Society. It is a small colony of twelve semi-permanent cottages, meant for families, and is self-contained inasmuch as it has provision for a dispensary, guest-house, ladies' club, gymnasium, primary school, library and a stage for social functions. The different cottages have been named after cities which contributed funds for them, and London is among them! The community centres, like the dispensary, have also been named but after the chief relief workers.

Mahatma Gandhi did the Society the honour of opening Gokhale-Puri on the 23rd April last. In doing so, he dwelt on his intimate relations with the Society and avowed once again that the late Mr. Gokhale was his political Guru, and said that he considered himself an "undeclared" member of the Society. It has been the misfortune of the Society that it has not been able to see eye to eye with the Mahatma on certain questions and has had to oppose him publicly. Nevertheless, as Mr. Sastri said in 1926, "so curious and contradictory is human relationship that, sharply contrasted as Mr. Gandhi and the Society are in outward action, they would be found near of kin where motives are weighed and the spirit was taken into account."

Cutch and Federation.

CUTCH is one of the very few Indian States in which the subjects are permitted to hold political conferences more. The President of the fourth Conference

held at Bhuj last week-end was able to say that each of the three previous ones "succeeded in doing something valuable towards the redress of our various grievances." Far from prohibiting a political conference, the Maharao of Cutch entertained the President of the Conference as his guest. All this is to the good and it is hoped that the faith of the President in the responsiveness of the Ruler to popular demands will be increasingly justified.

Mr. Mulraj Karsandas, the President of the Conference, referred in his Address to certain local needs and grievances of the people. He complained against the unduly large emoluments paid to the higher officials, most of whom were non-Cutchis; the frequent trips to Europe of the Ruler and his unlimited personal expenditure. Irrigation, industrialisation, reform of the judiciary and education were some of the needs of the people. Touching the larger political question, he reminded the Ruler that his promise to introduce representative government, made in 1928, remained unfulfilled.

Turning to the White Paper, the President rightly stated that the proposed scheme for federation was not conceived in the genuine interest of Indian national solidarity and progress, but merely as a means of perpetuating the grip of England over India. He bitterly complained that "the liberty of person and property of eight crores of the States' subjects and all the chances of their economic and spiritual well-being are bartered in return for the States' undertaking to help England to hold India in perpetual subjection." He demanded that the Indian Rulers should become limited monarchs, that the rule of law should prevail in the States, that there should be a declaration of fundamental rights in the constitution and the representatives of the States should be elected by the people of the States and not be nominated by the Princes. They are so very elementary. But yet in India they are still distant abstractions, far beyond the political horizon. So it seems at the moment.

The President claimed that the "Congress stands in the front rank in opposing this menace", referring to the perpetuation of personal despotism under the White Paper federation. Whatever other Congressmen may have said, Mahatma Gandhi, who was the sole representative of the Congress at the second session of the Round Table Conference, does not seem to have taken this stand. It is true he demanded immediate control over the Army and Foreign and Political Affairs, but it cannot be postulated in his case that he proposed at some near future to utilise the army to "persuade" the Princes to reform their administrations or facilitate a genuine federation. However that may be, the time has arrived, as the President put it, for the Congress, and, we may add, other political organisations, no longer to treat the affairs in Indian States as forbidden ground but to ignore the artificial boundaries between British

India and the Indian States and widen the front for the battle for freedom. The British overlords may impose an undemocratic confederation of autonomous but vassal States and British Indian provinces but the people of India should proceed with a genuine federation in the sphere of action open to them.

* * *

Vicarious.

PERHAPS the bitterest and the most well-founded complaint of the subjects of Indian States is the despotic misgovernment in most of the States. Their insistent demand for administrative and political reform in the States themselves can be easily understood and fully sympathised with. But it is somewhat difficult to understand their opposition to a State joining the federation, even of the White Paper type, unless and until its internal administration is democratised, except on the ground of their concern for the well-being of British Indians. For instance, the Cutch State Subjects' Conference is reported to have passed a resolution that Cutch should join the federation only if fundamental rights were granted and responsible government established and elected representatives of the people, and not the nominees of the Ruler, were sent to the federal chambers. Supposing the Ruler of Cutch declined to liberalise the administration and thereupon stood out of the federation, will it in any way improve the position of the subjects of the State? The opposition of the British Indians to a federation of the White Paper type is readily understandable inasmuch as they naturally do not wish the British bureaucracy made worse by an unholy pact with the autocracy of the Indian Princes; they stand to suffer. If the motive of the subjects of the States in passing resolutions of the kind referred to above is to draw on themselves the full wrath of princely despotism and thereby save British Indians therefrom, it is a piece of vicarious sacrifice which must call forth the admiration of British Indians. It will, however, be inglorious for British Indians to save themselves at the expense of the unfortunate subjects of the States. British Indians would rather see the administrations of the States democratised, so that the lot of both British Indians and the subjects of the States improves. Let us rather swim or sink together.

* * *

Federation by Treaties.

IN a learned article in that very ably conducted magazine, the *Triveni* of Madras, Mr. N. D. Varadachari examines the White Paper proposal that the Indian States should join the federation by means of treaties of accession, and that the federation should be inaugurated by a Royal Proclamation as distinct from an Act of the British Parliament. He rightly says that from the constitutional point of view there is no difference between a proclamation and a parliamentary statute, since the Crown does not and cannot act on its own discretion but only as per a parliamentary statute. The Indian States are not sovereign States and international persons and it is only an illusion to talk of treaties between them and the Paramount Power. Also, if the object of the White Paper is to constitute a federation, then there is no means of recognising and perpetuating the separate sovereignty of the component parts. Federation and the sovereignty of the States are incompatible with each other.

It may be urged in defence that it is the peculiar character of British institutions to be illogical and anomalous but, nevertheless, to be successful in practice. May not the White Paper be but another instance of the British tradition? The Indian constitution-to-be

is different from the earlier ones in that it is subject to interpretation by the federal court. Anomalies matter little as long as it was open to the executive head to give binding decisions, resolving disputed points. But it is far different with a written constitution which is to be the subject matter for the federal court to interpret.

By insisting that a change in the constitution can be brought about only by a revision of treaties between the States and the Crown and the amendment of a parliamentary Act, the White Paper makes Dominion Status impossible of attainment even in the future. So rightly fears Mr. Varadachari. Perhaps that is the very intention of Sir Samuel Hoare and the British Government, seeing how scrupulously they have avoided any reference to that term in all recent discussions.

* * *

Secession.

MR. VARADACHARI asserts in the course of the article that the American Civil War established the principle that no unit of a federation has the right of secession and that the American Constitution made provision for the accession of other States on certain conditions. Both these points seem to require further elucidation. It is permissible to join under conditions and if so, can the right to secede be one of them? Secondly, if the right to secede was a constitutional matter was it tested before the federal court in the United States, in the first instance? A war may settle a dispute, but cannot settle the constitutional rights and wrongs of it, unless it is presumed that invariably the victor in war is constitutionally in the right. A constitutional issue must be submitted to the judgment of a competent court and not to the arbitrament of war. As a matter of policy, secession may be undesirable, but does it follow from the constitution of the United States that it is unconstitutional?

* * *

Unfounded Assurance.

SIR MIRZA ISMAIL has taken the rather unusual step of writing a letter to the *Times*, London, in which he gave the British Government and the British public the reassurance, based on his long and intimate acquaintance of Indian politics, and in particular, the recent phases of it, that the dissatisfaction with the White Paper constitution expressed in India even by moderates need not be taken at face value but that there was genuine appreciation of the White Paper policy which was "essentially generous and just." Perhaps Sir Mirza has over-interpreted the situation. He could not have been struck by the contrast between the reception given to the Montagu and the Hoare reforms. Even the moderates were not satisfied with the Montagu reforms, for in the very first session of the new Legislative Assembly a resolution was moved by an Indian moderate calling for a further advance. Nevertheless, there were some influential Indians, who, when they found the Montagu reforms in danger of being torpedoed, not only publicly supported them, unsatisfactory as they were, but went so far as to break with their own compatriots of the Indian National Congress and form a separate party. They considered the reforms good enough to be worth saving even at the cost of national solidarity. The danger that the Hoare reforms now run is by no means less than what the Montagu reforms faced; if anything, it is more. Nobody in India under-estimates the opposition of the Churchill die-hards in England or of the Congress in India. But yet no British Indian of any standing has publicly defended the White Paper or attempted

to organise a political party to save it. Neither the Aga Khan nor Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru nor Mr. Jayakar has defended it. Instead, they have all demanded considerable improvements in it. Mr. Sastri is not, Sir Mirza will himself acknowledge, an agitator who believes in opposition for its own sake, or one who publicly condemns the reforms but secretly welcomes them. Nobody has denounced the White Paper more thoroughly than he did.

Working the reforms when they are inaugurated is very different from welcoming them or even wishing to save them. People in India and in other countries have had to tolerate and make the best of much worse constitutions, when they became *fait accompli* for the reason that they could not successfully oppose or improve them.

Sir Mirza referred to the need of safeguards for the Indian States. What exactly were the safeguards he had in view is not made clear in the letter. Do the States, rather the Princes, want safeguards against the powerful autocracy of the Paramount Power, or against the incipient democracy of the people of India, both of British India and the States? They cannot have it both ways. They must ally with one as against the other. They cannot ask the Paramount Power to protect them against the democracy of the people of India and yet destrain it from exercising its paramountcy.

Asiatic Labour Conference.

THE proposal to hold an Asiatic Labour Conference consisting of labour delegates from India, Japan, Ceylon and possibly China, in the second week of May in Colombo is most commendable. The International Labour Conference held in Geneva under the auspices of the League of Nations always held that labour conditions in Asia were so very different from those prevailing in European countries that the Geneva conventions did not automatically apply to Asia and had, therefore, to be modified insofar as they applied to Asia. A review by Geneva of the labour conditions in Asiatic countries was first urged by Mr. N. M. Joshi in 1925. Since then two proposals were on the simmer, as it were. One was to organise a conference on the model of Geneva, consisting of the representatives of the Governments, employers and the employed, but limited to Asiatic countries and the other an unofficial conference, as it were, of organised labour in the Asiatic countries. For one reason or another, the former, though accepted by Geneva, has not yet been practicable. But a beginning is being attempted with the latter idea. Its scope is limited, but it is hoped that not only will it be an unqualified success, but that it will be the harbinger of larger and more comprehensive conferences in the future, and that all Asiatic countries, including those to the west of India, will join it and make it truly pan-Asiatic.

Though Asiatic countries are on the whole less industrialised than Western, there is no reason to suppose that labour conditions are anything like uniform in all Asiatic countries. Japan has been both an exception and a puzzle. It is as industrialised as the Western countries. But even Asiatic countries like India have complained bitterly against Japanese competition, which some attribute to deplorable labour conditions in Japan. Others, like Sir Lalubhai Samaldas, paint a more satisfactory picture of labour conditions and attribute Japanese competing power to the efficiency of her labour and to her more up-to-date machinery. Some time ago, as the result, we fancy, of the resolution moved by Mr. Joshi in Geneva, the I.L.O. published a report of the labour conditions in Japan and it was by no means a dark picture. It would add

greatly to the conviction which that report carries if it is confirmed by the labour delegates from Japan to the Colombo conference.

Kenya Legislature.

AFTER many years of abstention and recent half-hearted submission, the Kenya Indians have now for the first time fought with zest and verve the recent elections to the Kenya Legislative Council. Eighteen candidates entered the field for the five seats reserved for Indians. Mr. J. B. Pandya, Dr. A. C. L. DeSouza, Messrs. Shamsuddin, Mangat and Iser Das have been declared elected. No vital political policy divides the Indians; their rights or wrongs are just the same and common to them all. But communal and personal considerations had been imported to a deplorable extent and the contests did not lack in heat and strife. Now that the elections are over, it is fervently to be hoped that all the Indian members will hold together and by their combined ability and sober advocacy, based on careful study, of public questions defend and enlarge such rights as Indians have, keeping the larger interests, particularly of the Natives, in view.

An important reform in the constitution of the Kenya Legislative Council was the recent increase of the representation of Native interests from one to two seats. Hitherto a European Christian missionary has been appointed by the Governor to represent Native interests. The Governor is now to appoint two persons. It is hoped that the Government will have the imagination and fairness to appoint Natives to these places. While the presence of two Natives cannot upset the apple-cart of the Government, it will endow the Natives with self-respect and confidence, and bring to the counsels of the Government the genuine views of the Natives.

Articles.

THE GAGE OF BATTLE.

AT the time of writing this article (Tuesday) it is not known whether Government decide on holding Assembly elections or not; but it is now clear that their decision, whatever it be, will be motivated solely by a desire to save the White Paper constitution from being torpedoed by Indian nationalists. We should ordinarily have found it hard to make such a statement, but messages in newspapers which are known to be very close to Government and are generally admitted unreservedly to their confidence, leave us no alternative. We are told that Government are in two minds on this question: one is the mind of the Secretary of State and the other that of the Viceroy. The former is against new elections, while the latter is strongly in favour. The difference of view arises, however, only from a different evaluation by each of the chances of the Swarajist party capturing the Assembly. Sir Samuel Hoare is apparently very nervous that the Swarajists will sweep nearly all the general constituencies and fill the legislature with extreme politicians pledged to a rejection of the White Paper, leaving only the representatives of special interests and members returned by communal electorates to defend it rather tepidly and not at all too hotly. Lord Willingdon, on the other hand, does not take

such a gloomy view of the situation. While communal and special constituencies will be perfectly safe, in general constituencies too, he believes, the Swarajist candidates will not be able to make much impression, in spite of all their sound and fury. That being so, he sees no reason why Government should be so fearful of this new party. On the contrary he thinks it would be a distinct advantage if Swarajists contest the elections and are defeated in a large number of constituencies, as he expects will happen. Government will then be able to show that the country is behind the reform proposals. We shall know soon which of these views prevails in the end, but even if an appeal to the country on the constitutional question be permitted, we cannot lose sight of the fact that the permission will be granted only because, in Government's judgment, the organisers of opposition to the White Paper will have a very poor response to the appeal. Lord Willingdon too is at one with Sir Samuel Hoare in thinking that if the White Paper is likely to be put in jeopardy by ordering fresh election, the life of the present Assembly must be prolonged for a year or for two years or for three years or whatever may be the time that will be required in bringing the new constitution into operation. Consult the people, says Lord Willingdon as well as Sir Samuel Hoare, only if you are sure that the people will be duly subservient to Government's will, but choke them off if their verdict is at all likely to go against Government.

This is a situation which no nationalist can view with equanimity. Even those whose opinion is entirely favourable to the White Paper (if there be any such) must insist in the most uncompromising manner that the people at large must be given an opportunity of pronouncing on the constitution that is being made for them. These politicians must say to Government: "Public opinion no doubt seems a little hostile to the reforms at times; but leave it to us to influence and bring round such opinion to our view. If we should fail in the attempt, well—there is nothing for it but to submit. After all you can't coerce a whole nation into accepting your view, even when it is the right view. We cannot therefore see forced upon the people a constitution though it is one which meets with our wholehearted support. If we happen to be in a minority, you must recognise the fact and act accordingly. Any way we won't let you use us as if we were a majority. The constitution must be placed before the people, whether their judgment coincides with ours or not." Even communalists and special interests, if they are to be loyal to the basic concept of popular government, must resist, with all the strength at their command, this attempt on the part of Government to stifle public opinion, and to join with others in asking for a general election in case Government should decide against it. Indeed, they must go farther and ask that the constitution shall be put in force only after a clear verdict to that effect being obtained from the people. A federal constitution, being more difficult to amend, always

requires a larger measure of support behind it than a unitary constitution. The latter, if found unsuitable or inadequate to the needs of the situation, can be altered by one authority without elaborate negotiations with other authorities. The former, however, requires for every alteration the concurrence of all the authorities concerned. In practice this is found to be a very difficult affair. For this reason care is taken in every country, before a federal regime is introduced, to see that public opinion in the federating states is unambiguously in favour of the proposed arrangement. The fact that Sir Samuel Hoare himself has serious misgivings about the result of a general election on the constitutional issue shows that public opinion in India is not unambiguously in favour of his federal scheme. It may be that he misjudges the situation. Let it therefore be put to the test. It would have been quite an arguable proposition for one to say that the constitution be postponed till Congressmen also choose to give their mind to its framework and approve of it, since they form such a large part, if not a predominating part, of the intelligentsia. Such a plea was in fact advanced, but no one questioned then the duty of Government to allow them to do so, when and if they chose. Now, however, the strange spectacle is to be seen of Congressmen being desirous of participating in the elections with a view to leaving their mark on the reforms, but Government do not want to allow them unless they feel certain that Congressmen will be outvoted by other parties.

Here is a challenge to all parties—not only to Swarajists but to others as well, irrespectively of their view of politics in general or of the White Paper in particular. In view of the clear intention of Government to force their reform proposals down the throats of Indians, it is the duty of all who wish to see popular government established in India to ask not only that the Assembly be dissolved and fresh elections held but that the reforms be carried into effect only after the new Assembly elected on that very issue accepts the measure by an affirmative resolution. This is the supreme need of the occasion. The need becomes all the greater because, as said above, the constitution in question is federal instead of unitary. It has so happened that, in the course of all the constitutional discussions that have taken place so far, the willingness of British India to join the federation has been assumed, while in the case of Indian States it is not taken for granted but has to be formally declared by them. This discrimination to British India's disadvantage is the legacy of the Simon Commission's recommendations, but it is so palpably unjust that the Government of India in their dispatch on the Simon Report felt bound to protest against it. It cannot be argued that since British Indian leaders have at the Round Table Conferences generally approved of federation, their desire to enter federation may now be taken to be proved beyond peradventure. So have the Princes expressed themselves as generally in favour of federation. But still their consent is to be expressly taken to the particular federal scheme that

may emerge from Parliament. Why should not British India's consent be similarly taken? It is a wholly reasonable demand to put forward. No one need fear that this will unnecessarily postpone federation, if the federation is such as should be welcomed. But if it is really such as does not find favour with the people, then it would by far be better to postpone it than bring it about prematurely. For a forced federation would only set people to work bringing it to an end, and since constitutionally this will not be possible, recourse will be had to extra-constitutional means. Not to speak of the ending of the federal constitution, even its mending in the major provisions will possibly require, as is observed by Mr. Varadachari in his article in *Triveni*, on which comment is offered in another column, the use

of physical force. He says: "Our constitution will be unduly rigid, so rigid indeed, that, with the growth of popular and progressive opinion, its failure to react to that opinion timely may have the result of forcing a revolution in the place of a peaceful amendment of the constitution as in other countries." To foist a federation upon the country in face of hostile opinion is to invite a revolution. Thus, both from the point of view of those who support the White Paper and of those who do not, it is desirable that the constitution should be enacted and brought into force only if it receives, by an affirmative resolution, considerable support in an Assembly elected on the constitutional issue, officials, it need hardly be said, not voting on the resolution. No one can afford to allow Government to put over their proposition solely by main force.

THE TEXTILE WORKERS' STRIKE.

CONTRARY to expectations, the strike of the textile workers in Bombay City is now a *fait accompli* and has become almost general within a week. The strike is not spontaneous; it has been organised by means of incessant propaganda and agitation on the part of the communists and neo-communists—the members of the M. N. Roy group—who, except for their non-allegiance to the Third International, can hardly be distinguished from the communists. It cannot, however, be said that the strike has behind it no economic grievances of an acute character. A reduction in wages ranging from 7% to 30% and unemployment to the extent of about 60,000 workers are grievances the redress of which it would be perfectly legitimate to secure by direct action if it could not be secured by any other mild type of action. The organised strength of the workers is at present so poor that it cannot open, on a footing of equality, any negotiations with the employers. Moreover, it should be remembered that the action of the millowners is not also on an organised basis; each mill has taken action as it suits it. The workers tried to resist such action by resorting to sectional strikes; but they failed. This unfortunate situation the millowners of Bombay exploited to the fullest extent and failed to realise that such exploitation was driving the workers to desperation and making the ground fertile for mass action. Is it any wonder that the workers should, under such circumstances, succumb to the counsel of despair and play into the hands of the communists who are frankly out to regain their lost influence and prestige with the workers? For our part, while we consider that the strike was ill-timed—we shall presently give our reasons for holding this view—and while we do not agree with communists and their philosophy, we cannot but extend our deep sympathies with the workers and hope that their action, now that they have taken it, will result in securing to them a redress of some at least of their grievances.

While we hold that the millowners are primarily responsible for the present situation in Bombay, we hold equally strongly that the Government of

India are not immune from responsibility. With the consent of the Central Legislature, they have been giving protection to the textile industry for the last eight years; but they have taken no steps whatever to secure the reorganisation of the industry. Their action is like the action of a bad physician who keeps his patient entirely on external or artificial treatment without giving him a chance to build up his internal strength. Indeed we are inclined to think that the industry is over-dosed with protection which has deprived it of any stimulus to pick up internal strength. Mr. N. M. Joshi has been crying himself hoarse in the Assembly that the grant of protection should be made conditional upon the reorganisation of the industry. But who cares for his pleading? The Government of India do not lose anything—they get additional revenue by raising the tariff wall; and the capitalists get what they want. It is the poor taxpayer who suffers. The Tariff Board has pointed out that the labour costs in Bombay City are lower than those in Ahmedabad. They have also shown that while the number of working mills, spindles and looms was less in 1932 than that in 1926, the production has gone up—a fact which shows that the efficiency of the workers has increased. And yet, it is in Bombay that the wage cuts are the highest. The other textile centres are comparatively in a better position and Bombay is fast losing ground. Whatever the millowners may say of the Japanese and other foreign competition, the fact of the matter is that other textile centres are reaping the harvest from protection and at the cost of Bombay. Cut-throat internal competition is the root of all trouble.

When Bombay was losing so rapidly and at the cost of other centres, it was, we feel, the duty of Government to institute an immediate enquiry into the position of the Bombay industry with special reference to wage cuts and unemployment. We have reason to believe that the state of affairs in the Bombay industry had been brought to the notice of the late Governor of Bombay as early as November last; and we are sorry to say that the Bombay Government failed to realise the gravity of the

situation and shirked what was their obvious and legitimate duty. The new Governor, Lord Brabourne naturally took some time to make up his mind but succeeded in inducing his Government to instruct the Labour Office to make an enquiry into the industry with special reference to the wage cuts, unemployment and cost of living. But it cannot be denied that a psychological moment was missed and an opportunity was given to the Girni Kamgar Union to stir up agitation. It will be remembered that we had ourselves approved of the Labour Office enquiry. At the same time we had stated that public opinion in India is not yet accustomed to departmental enquiries and to attach to them the status of independent committees. It thus failed to assert itself to the extent of influencing the organisers of the strike to put off their strike action till after the publication of the Labour Office report.

If Government have blundered badly, so have the strike leaders. They knew that they had no organisation and no funds. The workers were seething with discontent; and day to day propaganda prepared them for a strike. But the leaders should have realised that although it might be comparatively less difficult to organise a strike, it was extremely difficult to conduct and maintain it when there was no financial strength behind it. Moreover, they had no reliable and accurate information in fact none with regard to the wage cuts and their extent. Prudence and tact should have, therefore dictated that it would have been wise to have awaited the result of the Labour Office enquiry. The workers have a splendid case. If it had been presented to the Labour Office committee, their cause would have been better served and the leaders would have had more time to strengthen their organisation and build up their resources. Moreover, they would have got the moral and material support of the public which is not visible today in a very marked degree, if they had postponed action by eight or ten weeks. But lack of experience and prestige betrayed them into premature action which we deeply regret. It is for these reasons that we hold that the strike was ill-timed and should have been postponed.

In the last session of the Bombay Legislative Council, the Home Member announced that it was the policy of Government just to keep the ring in industrial disputes and not to use the Emergency Powers Act in them. In three weeks' time he reversed this policy. The Emergency Powers Act has been used in the present dispute. In their anxiety to maintain law and order, Government have put severe restrictions on the movements, meetings and demonstrations of the strikers by promulgating, within three days after the declaration of the strike, section 144 of the Criminal Procedure Code. They have also arrested most of the strike leaders under one pretext or another. And on the top of it, they have again rounded up most of the strike leaders under the Emergency Powers Act. We cannot too strongly condemn all these acts of repression. We are afraid the prestige and moral authority of Government have suffered enormously by giving a complete

go-bye to their settled policy announced on the floor of the legislature only three weeks ago. They may by this action succeed temporarily in removing the communists from the field; but their action will have the result of increasing in the long run their prestige which suffering generally helps to do. At the same time, so long as no check is put on the action of millowners, the workers' grievances will continue to exist and their agitation will be driven into undesirable channels.

We are convinced that if what little of Bombay's prosperity is left today is to be maintained, the dispute must be ended immediately. And the responsibility for this rests entirely upon Government. We are anxious that the labours of the Labour Office enquiry should not go in vain. We are at the same time clear that, when the dispute has reached the present stage, that enquiry may not help to terminate the strike quickly. We, therefore, strongly urge that Government should take immediate steps to institute a strong and impartial committee, either under the Trade Disputes Act or independently of it, with broad terms of reference, and the Labour Office should place before it all the material they may have collected and should otherwise help it. In the meanwhile the millowners should be induced to restore the cuts and bring the wages to the 1932 basis. If necessary, Government may even take, in view of the special circumstances and on this occasion only, special powers to get the cuts restored, pending the results of the enquiry. This seems to be the only course to settle the dispute. With regard to unemployment, we suggest that Government should announce a definite policy of relief, the details of which may be left to an expert committee to work out. We believe that they cannot any longer shirk their responsibility in this behalf; and the sooner they take it up, the better for them and the public.

ADMINISTRATIVE SIDE OF SIND SEPARATION.

IT will be recalled that the separation of Sind from the Bombay Presidency and its constitution into a separate province was recommended by the Sind Committee of the first Round Table Conference. At the same time it suggested the prosecution of inquiries with a view to finding out whether separated Sind would be financially self-supporting or would be a deficit province. It is of no practical use mentioning at this time of day the fact that the Committee's recommendation went clean against the view of the Bombay Government which was strongly against the severance of Sind from Bombay. It considered the proposal for the separation of Sind as "both impracticable and undesirable" mainly on the ground that the proposed province would be too small, both from the point of view of its extent and population, to afford the expensive paraphernalia consequent upon its elevation to the status of a Governor's province. But the Sind Committee brushed aside these and similar difficulties as not being insuperable and stressed the need of only a financial inquiry

before Sind was set up as a new province. Two such inquiries, one under the leadership of Mr. Brayne and the other under that of Mr. Miles-Irving, have since been completed while the one conducted by a committee presided over by Mr. Dow, the result of whose labours was published last week, concerned itself with nothing but the administrative side of the problem. It may be stated that this Committee was composed not only of officials, but had four non-officials, 2 Muslims, 1 Hindu and 1 European, out of its total membership of 7.

The questions considered by the Committee are hardly likely to have any interest for the general reader; and if reference is made to some of them here it is with a view to enabling him to form some idea as to the nature of the problems that came before it for decision. In dealing with the question of the provision of accommodation for the Governor and his staff, it recommends the construction of a new Government House at a cost of Rs. 3 lakhs and his private secretary's quarters at a cost of Rs. 40,000, it being, in the committee's opinion, impossible to so change the existing one as to serve the purpose of the residence for the Governor. No fresh building need however be constructed for the Secretariat which can be conveniently accommodated in the building now used as the Judicial Commissioner's Court. This was built at a cost of Rs. 30 lakhs exclusive of the cost of the site and is found to be too spacious for the purposes of the Court, leaving a good deal of space unused. With the Secretariat located in that building the Committee's suggestion for the erection of a suitably sized Council Hall in the same compound at a cost of Rs. 3 lakhs is quite reasonable and will conduce to public convenience.

With the creation of Sind as a separate province, it follows that the status of the highest judicial authority should be raised from that of a judicial commissioner to that of a High Court. Indeed the Committee unanimously makes a recommendation in this sense but does not believe that this reform will mean any considerable addition to the provincial expenditure. For the High Court a new building costing Rs. 8 lakhs is necessary, according to the committee.

If the province is to be a separate entity, it logically follows that even in educational affairs it should be completely self-sufficient and should have a university of its own. But in the course of its inquiries the Committee found a great deal of opposition to the idea. In this connection it makes great capital of the fact that the number of registered graduates in the whole of Sind does not exceed 200. The number is undeniably small but cannot be said to be a true index to the strength of Sindi graduates. The conclusion to be drawn is not that the Sind graduates as a class are indifferent or hostile to the creation of the new university but that under existing conditions they see no practical utility of registration. Things however may reasonably be expected to be different once it is decided to give them a university in which their voice will prevail. But this line of reasoning does not commend it-

self to the Committee. The appointment of two "scholars of repute", one of them an Englishman and professor of English, is suggested by it for the express purpose of going about the province on the mission of overcoming public opposition to the proposed University and trying to implant British ideals in the youth of Sind. The Committee would delay the establishment of the University till success crowned the efforts of these University missionaries. Frankly the project is not very hope-inspiring. Without in any way wishing to underrate the strength of the public hostility to the University which came to the Committee's notice, it is by no means unsafe to assume that the opposition is based on an imperfect realisation of the advantages of a University and may in all likelihood fizzle out or at any rate diminish considerably as the University goes on with its educative work. In any case it seems open to serious doubt whether the kind of mission which the Committee has in view would really serve any useful purpose and would not lead to an unjustifiable waste of public funds. Would not these funds be put to better use if they are utilised in properly equipping the University?

With important matters like the Sukkur Barrage, the Sind land revenue system and the extent of official corruption which rightly find a place in the Committee's report, we would have very much liked to deal. But their discussion must stand over till the text of its report becomes available. To do so on the strength of newspaper summaries is somewhat risky.

"MASS EDUCATION IN INDIA."

THIS pamphlet is a valuable publication by the Local Self-Government Institute, Bombay. Its author, Mr. R. V. Parulekar, holds an important administrative post under the Bombay Municipal School Committee. As an experienced officer, his views merit serious consideration on the part of those who are earnest about mass-education. Two things may be noted at the outset. The first is that the pamphlet is written with special reference to Bombay Presidency. And the second thing is that it has been written primarily with the urban area in view.

Speeding up the pace of mass-literacy forms the central theme of this pamphlet. The patent plea of financial stringency is fully met by the author, not by scrutinising the provincial budgets, but by showing the lines of advance in mass literacy without having to ask for more funds. This is no miracle here though. The author has been compelled to put forth suggestions for speeding up mass-literacy, which cost nothing in actual practice, since he is conscious of the impossibility of "financial stringency" receding into the background for several years. And till then, we cannot wait.

Lest his suggestions be declared unscientific, the author has given statistics of several European countries which convince the readers of the normality of his five suggestions. They are: (i) Increasing the number of pupils per teacher from 30 to 60; (ii) Reduc-

ing the period of primary school course from 5 to 4 years; (iii) Simplification of the curriculum; (iv) Raising the minimum age of admission from 6 to 7 and (v) Adoption of the shift system or some variation thereof. The author observes: "In adopting these remedies we shall be in good company, for our fellow banner-bearers will be some of the most enlightened countries of the world."

One need not however go to Europe to find oneself "in good company." Several Indian provinces, C. P. for instance, have long ago enforced two of these remedies, viz. Nos. ii and iv. As for No. i, the maximum limit in C. P. is, I believe 40 pupils per teacher and in my opinion that is quite the limit. 60 pupils per teacher is a bit too much. After all even the imparting of the three R's is not a mechanical mill-process. 60 pupils per teacher, and double shift (the very phraseology connotes mechanisation) would not be conducive in the long run to any effective literacy. Relapse into illiteracy would be "facilitated" thereby, unless circulating libraries are provided in the rural area with a view to sustain the interest of the rural public in the acquisition of literacy. Further, the goodwill of the teachers has to be taken into account. Their lot is enough of a misery today. To make them work double-shift without any extra allowance would amount to compelling them to run the wheel absolutely mechanically. What little interest is at present evinced by them in teaching would also disappear and that would be no fault of theirs.

If extra allowance is forthcoming, double shift may be given a trial. In rural areas, double shift would not be necessary except in a few places as enrolment of all children of school-going age is usually almost complete. The problem there is to improve *attendance*. In urban areas, however, double shift may be found suitable, under certain conditions. Remedy No. iii—simplification of curriculum—is the most important of these suggestions. It would not be long before something in this direction is done by Provincial Governments.

Efficiency in instruction need not be necessarily sacrificed totally to speed up mass-literary. What would meet the situation is average efficiency and maximum speed in the imparting of the three R's, to the masses.

M.

Our London Letter.

(BY AIR MAIL.)

(From Our Correspondent.)

LONDON, April 20.

MR. CHURCHILL'S BOMBHELL.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL sprang a first class sensation in the House of Commons on Monday, when he alleged that Sir Samuel Hoare and Lord Derby, whilst serving as members of the Joint Select Committee, had successfully attempted to tamper with the evidence prepared for and sent to the Committee by the Manchester Chamber of Com-

merce, or by its Indian section. He was careful to declare that in charging the two members with a grave Parliamentary offence, he made no suggestion affecting their personal honour. He, however, insisted that their conduct as alleged was a breach of the privileges of the House as defined under its Sessional Orders and as well recognised in its practice and procedure. In the opinion of the Speaker, whose ruling was asked, Mr. Churchill had made out a *prima facie* case, and he thereupon moved that the alleged action of Sir Samuel Hoare and Lord Derby should be referred for investigation by the Committee of Privileges. The motion received general support in all quarters of the House, and the matter is now *sub judice*.

It was easy to see when Mr. Churchill rose, with a formidable dossier in his hands, and with his excited henchman Mr. Brendon Bracken eagerly assisting him in sorting out the documents, that Mr. Churchill was about to create a situation of the gravest seriousness. It appears that he had given notice of his intention to the Speaker and to Sir Samuel Hoare the previous evening, and they were therefore not taken by surprise. When, therefore, he rose to make his explanation and to frame his indictment before the House, immediately after questions on Monday afternoon, it was noticed that the Treasury Bench was packed, and that many of Mr. Churchill's followers, who, it is believed, had received telegrams urging them to be in their places that day, were present. Something very serious was afoot, and the first few sentences of his speech sent the message through the lobbies that Winston was up and making a thundering attack upon the Government on its India policy, with chapter and verse. The House immediately filled to its maximum capacity, a most unusual event on the very eve of the Budget.

The gravamen of Mr. Churchill's charge was that the evidence of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce was prepared and forwarded to the Secretary of the Joint Select Committee last June, but that the evidence actually presented to the Committee on the 4th November bore no resemblance whatever to the original evidence presented. Fundamental changes had taken place, the only explanation of which, as he could prove, was pressure exerted by Sir Samuel Hoare and Lord Derby beginning with a dinner at the latter's house on the 25th June, and continuing with blandishments offered by Lord Derby in September, when he canvassed members of the Chamber to secure a change in the evidence. A month later similar pressure was brought to bear upon the Lancashire Textile Delegation in India, (though unsuccessfully) in order to persuade it, to advise a change in the evidence. All that they were willing to do was to recommend the addition to the evidence of a supplementary paper. On the 24th October, nevertheless, the remaining members of the Indian section of the Manchester Chamber made fundamental alterations in the evidence, which was formally presented to the Committee a few days later. Mr. Churchill laid stress, in a speech as unjudicial as one could imagine, upon the judicial character claimed for the Committee and its individual members by the Government, when he charged the two members concerned with having "tampered" with certain witnesses and their evidence behind the backs of the rest of the members of the Committee, and with having committed an offence against Sessional Order No. 4 which had been held in 1899 to be operative even if pressure was exercised without corrupt motive. He expressed the deepest regret at having to launch an attack upon two former colleagues, whom he held

in high personal respect, but he affirmed that no alternative was left to him as a member of the House, conscious of his duty to it, at the first possible moment, after having had placed in his hands unsought ample documentary evidence of every statement which he had made.

Whilst Mr. Churchill's attack was welcomed with loud cheers by the diehard "olique" led by the vociferous Mr. Bracken, the House as a whole turned eagerly to hear Sir Samuel Hoare's defence. In substance it amounted to this. Whilst it was true that he was a member of the Committee, he had never ceased to be during the period in question, and he still was, Secretary of State for India, charged with high responsibilities, and in particular at the time he was promoting essential direct negotiations between Lancashire and Indian cotton interests. He had procured, as any member of the Committee was free to do, a copy of the Manchester Chamber's evidence several days after the dinner at Lord Derby's House, and he found in it certain passages which would have made negotiations impossible. It was his duty to call the attention of the Manchester Chamber to that fact, but without succeeding in inducing them to change the passages. Four months later, however, on similar representation by the Lancashire delegation then in India, and after full consideration, the Chamber changed the evidence, with the result that the textile negotiations succeeded. Sir Samuel claimed that he was fully justified in the steps that he had taken in the mutual interests of the two countries. Mr. Churchill vigorously disputed both Sir Samuel's facts and his dates. He denied that the changes in the evidence took place upon the initiative of the Lancashire Indian Delegation, and appeared to be supported in this by Mr. Hammersley, and he charged Sir Samuel with having endeavoured to bring pressure upon the Chamber as early as the 3rd May. In the event, spokesmen of all parties agreed that the matter should be sent for enquiry and report to the Committee of Privileges, who, among other matters, will have to consider whether, for all practical purposes, a Cabinet Minister becomes temporarily *functus officio* from the moment of his appointment to be a member of a Joint Select Committee of Parliament.

MR. CHURCHILL'S MISTAKES.

What Mr. Churchill apparently had overlooked, among other things, was that Lord Derby, who is not a member of the House of Commons, could not possibly come within the jurisdiction of the Committee of Privileges set up by the House, at the beginning of each session, under its Standing Orders. It is understood that even though Lord Derby is quite willing to appear voluntarily before the Committee and to testify to what he knows of the events alleged by Mr. Churchill, he may not do even this without an express resolution authorising him thereto by the House of Lords. This, it is believed, will be obtained by him immediately. But Mr. Churchill has made a much worse blunder. He asked that the matter should be sent for investigation to the Committee of Privileges, meaning thereby, as everyone understood, the Committee already set up at the beginning of this session. The present Committee consists of ten members selected by the House. These include the Prime Minister, who acts as Chairman, Mr. George Lansbury, the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Attlee, the Acting Leader, Sir Thomas Inskip, the Attorney-General, Mr. Baldwin, Lord Hugh Cecil, Sir Austen Chamberlain, Sir Ian Macpherson, Sir Herbert Samuel and Colonel Spender-Clay. Mr. Lansbury, however, who is still incapacitated by his recent accident has been replaced by Mr. Arthur Greenwood.

It would appear, however, that Mr. Churchill, upon second thoughts, became greatly dissatisfied with this personnel, which includes no less than three of Sir Samuel Hoare's Ministerial colleagues, and he accordingly gave notice of the following motion: "That having regard to the fact that the question of breach of privilege now remitted by the House to the Committee of Privileges involves the conduct of a Minister of the Crown, and to the fact that three of the members of the Committee are his colleagues in the Government, it is desirable that three extra members should be added to the Committee for the purposes of this enquiry." The implications of this motion were, however, deeply resented throughout the House, where it was felt that having appealed to Caesar, Mr. Churchill was not entitled to quarrel with his tribunal, but ought to be prepared to abide by the consequences of his action. It was at first believed that, having regard to the state of Parliamentary business, the Government would refuse to provide facilities for the discussion of this motion. Last night, however, Mr. Churchill was amusingly caught out. At the end of the official business the Speaker called upon Mr. Churchill to promote his motion. The Hon. Member for Epping, however, was not in his place, with the result that the motion fell, and the House passed on to other business.

The Committee held its preliminary meeting yesterday, without, however, hearing evidence, its sole object being to consider the charge brought before it and its own procedure. It is understood that upwards of twenty witnesses may appear before it, most of them, of course, produced by Mr. Churchill and it is believed that its report to the House will be delivered without much delay. If the Committee should report adversely to Sir Samuel Hoare, a very grave situation affecting the Cabinet will have arisen, for the least penalty that the House would impose would be a very severe censure upon the erring Minister, with possible consequences to the personnel of the Cabinet and even perhaps to the constitution of the Government. On the other hand, failure on Mr. Churchill's part to vindicate his charges will involve a very severe set-back to that belligerent gentleman's prestige in the House and in the country. As it is, I understand that all is not plain sailing within his own group, and that considerable estrangement exists between him and Lord Lloyd. Mr. Churchill, however, has much to lose, for it is generally believed that he is aiming at the downfall of the National Government and his own substitution for Mr. Baldwin as the Leader of the Tory Party. In any event it is doubtful if he could at any time achieve his ambition, but in the meanwhile he will be satisfied if he can cast discredit upon the White Paper policy, the Government and the report of the Joint Select Committee in so far as in general terms it may support a constitution framed substantially upon the lines of the Government's proposals, though possibly with certain differences of an unprogressive character. I very much doubt whether the Report will be published as early as the middle of June. It may be delayed. Very much will depend upon what Mr. Baldwin means by a cryptic passage, in his recent speech, in which he spoke of his desire so to lead the Party on the Government's India policy as to maintain it as a united fighting force at the next General Election. This may be a subtle hint that certain compromises are now being contemplated with a view to conciliate the diehards and so as to prevent a Tory Party split.

BRITISH OPINION.

It has to be borne in mind that in recent weeks there has been a definite hardening in British opinion

against the White Paper policy as it stands. The Government have been precluded by the proceedings of the Joint Select Committee from carrying on effective propaganda on behalf of their scheme. The Union of Britain and India, which has been doing something in that direction, has been hampered by lack of funds, whilst the India Defence League has had no such difficulty, and has had almost a free hand in arousing the fears of the public, and especially the Tory rank and file. The result has been the creation of a good deal of doubt in the public mind as to the wisdom of certain proposals, and the diehards have taken the utmost advantage of this fear and doubt, and they are certain also to take advantage of the fact that the Congress now threatens to attempt to capture the constituencies and the legislatures. The fact, too, that there has been no outward support of the reforms in India has also not gone without comment, and the absence of such support from British Indian leaders has been seized upon to decry the reforms, not so much from the point of view of making them more progressive, but in order to create the impression here that reforms of a far more reactionary character are called for seeing that there is general opposition in India to the scheme now proposed. It has to be remembered that the general public is very ignorant of the Indian situation, and no really good occasion has arisen that would enable the Government to carry on with the education of the public. The result appears to be at the moment that the Government fear that they may be obliged, in order to prevent a very dangerous split in the Tory Party, which would, in their opinion, do the country the utmost mischief at the next general election that they have, to some extent, to compromise in order to attract once again the middle-minded people of the Party, the diehards themselves being definitely irreconcilable. Whether it will be on the franchise or on Upper Houses in the Provinces, or in some other way is not yet all clear. It seems incredible that the Government would surrender on the question of Law and Order, though it may be that they would be prepared to devise a formula designed to enable the Governors to have ready access to police information. I am writing this as a warning against any expectation of an easy passage, either through the Committee or through Parliament, of even the present reforms proposals. It seems already fairly clear that the recommendations contained in the Memoranda of the British Indian delegation and of Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and his colleagues are hardly likely, in existing circumstances, to carry a hearing.

THE REFORMS.

Sir Herbert Samuel on behalf of the Liberal Opposition has come out strongly in favour of the reforms as set out generally in the White Paper proposals. He spoke on behalf of Mr. John Foot, Liberal candidate at the Basingstoke by-election. He declared that Liberals, with others who knew India best, were supporting whole-heartedly the White Paper scheme as the best policy for India. If that policy were not carried through, it would, in their view, be a blow to the Empire as a whole. This was in reply to the Tory candidate, Mr. Drummond-Woolf, who, whilst pretending to be neutral pending the publication of the Report of the Select Committee, is really a follower of Mr. Churchill, whose son, in fact, is his most active canvasser. Unfortunately, the progressive forces at Basingstoke already with a strong Tory tendency, are divided, and it seems very probable that a new opponent of Indian reforms, whether these or any other, will be returned.

Lord Rothermere in an article entitled "India and the 'White Flag' Paper" denounces the projected

reforms as a policy of betrayal of British interests in the *Sunday Despatch* reproduced in the *Mail*. Lord Rothermere is making a characteristic attempt to stampede the Tory Party into tearing up the White Paper and hauling down the white flag. He makes a virulent attack upon the integrity of the Joint Select Committee, which he describes as a "packed jury", and he makes an unconcealed appeal to the cupidity of all classes of the British people. The plain fact is, he says, that India is as indispensable to Britain as Britain is to India. It would not, however, be a distortion of Lord Rothermere's mentality to suggest that to him Britain's indispensability to India is the less important element of the two.

Sir James Crerar, in a paper on "The Logic of the Reform Proposals" before the East India Association this week, declared that any alternative to the White Paper scheme of reforms must either resemble it closely in cardinal points, or it must be a complete break with our own tradition and the sequence of events and legislation in India.

At the meeting on Monday of the India Parliamentary Committee of the Conservative Party, Sir Henry Lawrence supported the threefold principle set forth in the White Paper—Federation, Central Responsibility, and Provincial Autonomy—but warned against attempting to secure them at express speed lest the State machine should crash. He objected to the proposal that there should be more than six Provinces, and considered that the Central Provinces, Assam, the North-West Frontier Province, Orissa and Sind were superfluous. Among other things he declared in favour of a wide extension of the franchise, but that it should be exercised in the interests of the masses of the people by indirect election.

Professor Coatsman, in a letter to *The Times*, strongly supports Sir Henry Lawrence's plea for indirect election as the basis of the franchise for the Federal Legislature, in order to, among other things, make better provision for the expression of provincial opinion than could be obtained by inchoate all-India political parties, largely dominated by individuals and interests not primarily concerned with the interests of the people.

The anti-reforms party here are making great play with Sir N. N. Sircar's recent address to the Indian Association at Calcutta, and his vehement questioning of the virtue of Democracy. The *Evening News* which, with Lord Rothermere's Press generally, is still hankering after a Fascist regime, referring to his question whether Democracy has succeeded in any other country in the world outside England, says, "Even here in England a mere whiff of real Democracy under the Socialist Government has caused us furiously to think; yet our democracy-mongers persist in foisting it on to the 97 per cent. illiterate *mélange* of races, castes, and creeds, that people the sub-continent of India."

Mr. Horace Alexander in a special article in the *New Statesman & Nation*, attacks the reforms scheme from the other end, and urges consultation with Mr. Gandhi and acceptance of the decision of a constituent assembly in India.

Sir Mirza Ismail contributes a letter of first-class importance in to-day's *Times*. He warns the British public against the supposition that because there has been no public support in India of the White Paper proposals as they now stand, it should be supposed that India would reject a constitution based substantially on them. He considerably points out the extreme difficulty and delicacy of the position relative to their constituents of Indian party leaders, which prevents their making any statement on the subject, other than a criticism of the present proposals, such as those embodied in the Memorandum of the Bri-

fish Indian delegation. He emphasizes the safeguards necessary to prevent encroachment upon the powers and rights of the States as federal units, but he denies that moderate criticism signifies hostility to the safeguards, which he considers to be a natural desire to minimise them and secure the maximum of power and independence for British India. The clear indication of Sir Mirza's letter is that, subject to these safeguards, Mysore, and presumably the other great States in India, will be willing to come into the Federation.

Reviews.

SOCIAL VALUE OF UNIVERSITIES.

THE OBLIGATION OF UNIVERSITIES TO THE SOCIAL ORDER. (New York University Press.) 1933. 24cm. 503p.

THIS is a centenary publication of the University of New York, but unlike the history of the University, this volume will have a wider appeal. At the centenary celebration the University authorities had called a conference to discuss certain social and educational problems of the hour. The theme adopted for discussion was "The Obligation of Universities to the Social Order", for it was thoroughly consistent with the background of the University "which has been animated by the purpose to serve the wide community through the adoption of its own curriculum and methods to the changing needs of a highly dynamic society." About three hundred delegates, heads of different Universities and University Colleges, attended the conference by invitation and the volume which records the proceedings of that conference necessarily makes heavy reading.

It is obviously difficult to do justice to the contents of the volume in the limited space at the disposal of the reviewer. The President of the University of Minnesota remarks: "History records the important fact that whenever nations diminish their interest in and support of their Universities they soon become second-rate nations." This Presidency of Bombay, which once led all-India movements, is at present thrown into the shade comparatively, and one may ask if it is not due to the very inadequate help it has got from the Government of Bombay in the last twenty years. The Vice-Chancellor of the University of the St. Andrews remarks: "The tragic interlude of 1914-18 shattered many of the dreams. Even the oldest, the proudest and the best endowed were placed under the necessity of accepting help from Government and this dependence on grants has increased steadily in the past fourteen years in proportion as the capacity of the private benefactor has diminished. It follows, then, that while there is no such thing as a State University in Britain, it is equally true that there is no University financially independent of the State. Although there seems no immediate danger that the freedom of Universities may be jeopardised through increasing dependence on public funds, this possibility cannot be ignored. 'He who pays the piper calls the tune' is a proverb with many applications. If this materialises the result may well be disastrous." The Chancellor of the University of Buffalo says: "An institution is not a University because its title entitles it to bear the name. An institution offering nothing beyond the level of undergraduate instruction in the Arts and Sciences is not a University. An institution that includes, in addition to an undergraduate College of Arts and Sciences, a collection of professional schools, however numerous, which are engaged solely in the routine preparation of practi-

tioners, is not a University. A University is an institution in which the advancement of knowledge is deliberately fostered, an institution which is committed not only to the higher forms of instruction, but also to research, and which rests its reputation on the quality of its scholarly output." "There is a vast difference", says another eminent delegate, "between the technically trained mind and the educated mind. They can be reconciled but there is a difference, a fundamental difference, between them. Both are necessary, but the University is not the place to produce both if it is to preserve its character of being a mother of learning and a home of seekers after truth...I have come to think that the provinces of a University and a technical college are utterly distinct; as institutions they demand and produce different types of mind and the ground they possess in common is infinitely less than is generally imagined. A University is responsible for enlarging the boundaries of knowledge rather than for colonising the territory it explores."

M. R. PARANJPE.

PROFESSION OF PROSTITUTION.

HISTORY OF PROSTITUTION IN INDIA. (Ancient. Vol. I.) By S. N. SINHA and N. K. BASU. (Bengal Social Hygiene Association.) 1933. 22cm. 291p.

IT is perhaps hardly possible to expect from any writer an entirely dispassionate view of any subject connected with sex, and writers on prostitution have long been divided into two opposite camps known as abolitionists and regulationists. The first camp is in theory supposed to advocate the abolition of all special laws and regulations concerning prostitutes, though in practice its members are found to support laws for harassing prostitutes and hounding them out with the ultimate idea of abolishing prostitution itself, while regulationists aim at making rules for compulsory periodical medical examination of prostitutes with a view to check the spread of venereal diseases, which is the principal danger of prostitution. The abolitionist camp has the support of the League of Nations, principally because England has the preponderant voice there and has been able to carry out a programme full of hypocrisy and prudery. The present book is published by the Bengal Social Hygiene Association, an institution founded to support the programme of the League of Nations in this matter. One might therefore expect the book to be strongly tinged with the abolitionist bias.

There is all the more reason therefore for congratulating the authors on having succeeded in keeping their bias in the background and producing a very readable and useful work for all readers, whether they have or have not any definite views about prostitution one way or the other. The present volume brings up the history of prostitution from the Vedic age to the Maurya period, i. e. the second century B. C., when Vātsyāyana wrote his famous "Kāma-Sūtra." In the opinion of the authors, the origin of prostitution is to be found in religious prostitution and guest-prostitution, which began apparently in South India. Egypt seems to have copied these from India, and "the Egyptians were quick to outstrip the stage of guest-prostitution and to pass over into legal prostitution with all its primitive naivete. Even about 2500 years before Christ, we find in Egypt a set of courtezans who maintained, down to 400 B. C., a reputation of possessing incomparable talents for satisfying irreconcilable (sic) human lusts."

The English is decidedly funny in places, and this does not seem to be entirely due to the printer's devil. Also quite unnecessary extracts giving voluptuous descriptions of Apsaras or prostitutes have been interspersed all over the book. Of course, representing the official view, the authors do not risk a prosecution for obscenity, as this is reserved for writers whose views are unacceptable to the authorities, but these seem rather out of place in a historical work.

In my opinion, the authors give undue importance to the rules laid down by Deerghatama and Swetaketu, the former prohibiting promiscuity for women only, while the latter ordained chastity for both men and women. Ordinances of this kind have usually very little effect and things which are not permitted openly are done on the sly.

There is plenty to shock the orthodox in this work, especially those who insist on interpreting spiritually anything which does not agree with their pet superstitions. Thus when Rāma returns home after his exile and Hanumān brings the good news to Bharata, the latter gives order that "16 women born of noble families with lovely face, beautiful form, well-shaped breasts, broad hips, and tapering thighs... be given to Hanumān as wives" (p. 46). "Even if a wife becomes pregnant in result of an extra-marital intercourse, she should only remain unapproachable and unclean to her husband as long as she does not menstruate after her parturition; then she becomes as pure and bright as the unalloyed gold (Manu-Samhitā)" (p. 111).

"But at least in one point authenticity has not been called in question and it was that Krishna was a veritable sexual athlete like all the greatest personages of the old world. Like Solomon the Wise or the Kings of Siam, he could boast of possessing several hundred wives and concubines... From Vishnu, Bhagavata and other Puranas, it transpires that Krishna was already a passionate lover at an age when our boys of to-day have hardly forgotten their bibs and pinafores... Young Krishna's *Rasa-Leela* or 'divine orgy' with the milk-maids of the neighbourhood of Vraja has been delineated in glaring terms by many of the Puranas. Even a stolid reader could understand that the orgy was far from being of a spiritual nature. It has most perspicuously been described in the Puranas how the married and unmarried girls having fallen desperately in love with this indefatigable pastoral lover paid midnight visits to him on the banks of the Jamuna and how they offered their everything for the satisfaction of Krishna, who was equally hospitable to every one of them... In spite of their being dissuaded from meeting that inveterate gallant any more by their fathers, husbands and brothers, these love-distraught ranch-women stole away every night from their homes to have sexual congress with the swarthy bucollothero of Vraja."

Krishna's 16,000 ordinary wives apparently fell in love with Sambha, Krishna's son by Jambavatee, their step-son, and when Krishna came to know of this, he cursed them that they would be captured by highway robbers after his death, but told them that Rishi Dāidya would advise them how they could be redeemed from serfdom. And this is how he did it. He told them to observe a Vrata, which involved the worship of the nude image of Madana, the Hindu *Eros*, by touching different parts of the body including the sex organ and uttering certain words. And "thereafter each woman should invoke a Brahmin with faultless features, ... the Brahmin should be given a sumptuous repast and be deemed by the woman ... the fittest man to have coition with..."

This was to be done for 13 months and then they would meet Krishna after death. The authors observe: "This vile Vrata passed into a custom not only among many of the prostitutes of the locality but of other parts of India where Brahmin supremacy was in evidence."

The spread of Buddhism gave special importance to prostitutes. "It had chosen the prostitutes and their constituents as one of its first objects of reclamation just like Christianity ... and by holding out some alluring privileges, the dignitaries of Hinduism probably wanted to stop this exodus."

In the Maurya period, there was a vast number of laws relating to prostitutes, though this could not be called regulation in the modern sense. The authors quote from Prof. N. C. Bandyopadhyaya's 'Kautilya'. "Taxes were levied on prostitutes who seem to have remained under the direct jurisdiction of royal officials and were regarded as royal property as in some countries in the Middle Ages. They were under the Superintendent of prostitutes who fixed their rates and fees, settled their disputes and complaints or decided cases relating to their succession." During the the Maurya reign, they were classed with actors, dancers singers etc. and had to pay to the State the earnings of two days in every month.

The authors have compared ancient India with ancient Rome and Greece, apparently to the advantage of India, and seem to take some pride in it, though it is very difficult to conclude anything with any certainty about ancient history.

The second volume of the work will carry the history to the end of the 18th century and the third up to modern times.

The authors share the common prejudice against prostitution, which is not based on anything fundamental, but merely on certain current ideas about morality, tending to restrict sex-freedom, for both sexes and particularly for women. In Japan, till recent times at any rate, prostitution of unmarried girls was socially tolerated and they could give it up after a time and contract marriages with perfectly decent people. There is no reason why prostitution should not be recognised as a perfectly legitimate profession, provided no woman is forced into it against her will. But sane thought on sex is as yet so rare that it will be a long time before this attitude becomes current if it ever does.

R. D. KARVE.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- THE THEORY OF PROFITS. By PRAFULLA CHANDRA GHOSH. (University of Calcutta.) 1933. 22cm. 442p.
 INDIAN LABOUR IN RANGOON. By E. J. L. ADREWS. (Oxford University Press.) 1933. 22cm. 300p. Rs. 7.
 THE WORK OF RURAL RECONSTRUCTION IN THE MYSORE STATE AND BRITISH INDIA. By G. RUDRAPPA. (Bangalore Press.) 1934. 20cm. 38p.
 CHARLES LAMB. Comp. by EDMUND BLUNDEN. (Hogarth Press.) 1934. 22cm. 256p. 7/6.
 BOMBAY-POONA. (Taraporewalla.) 1934. 21cm. 247+120p. Rs. 3.
 GOD, MAN AND SOCIETY. An Introduction to Christian Sociology. By V. A. DEMANT. (Association Press, Calcutta.) 1933. 20cm. 224p. 6/-.
 HOW CAN I FIND GOD? By LESLIE D. WEATHERHEAD. (Westminster Books Series.) (Association Press, Calcutta.) 1933. 20cm. 288p. 3/-.