

The Servant of India

Editor : S. G. VAZE.

Office : SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY, POONA.

VOL. XVIII, No. 4. } POONA—THURSDAY, JANUARY 24, 1935. { INDIAN SUBSN. Rs. 6.
FOREIGN 15s.

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	33
ARTICLES :—	
“He Who Seeks Equity Must Do Equity.”	35
What Should the Princes Do ?	36
OUR LONDON LETTER.	38
REVIEWS :—	
Chinese Labour Movement. By V. V. Giri, M. L. A.	39
Indian Educational Policy. By Prof. M. R. Paranjpe, M. A., B. Sc.	40
The Home. By Dr. G. S. Ghurye.	41
Konkan Rural Life. By Prof. S. G. Beri.	42
Problem of Money. By Prof. S. V. Ayyar.	43
MISCELLANEA :—	
No Climb-Down.	43
Is S. I. Society Political or Social ?	44
BOOKS RECEIVED.	44

Topics of the Week.

J. P. C. Report in Bihar Council.

THE Joint Select Committee Report was the subject of a lengthy debate in the Bihar and Orissa legislative council. During the two months the report has been before the country, so much has been said and written about it that hardly any points can be said to be left out which such a debate could be expected to throw up. But the debate was noteworthy as providing a measure of the resentment caused throughout the land by the absence of any mention of Dominion Status in the report, nearly every non-official speaker making a pointed reference to the omission. On another point too there appeared to be substantial agreement among non-official members. Will the new reforms take us backward or forward ? It seemed to be generally felt that, in the name of a forward move, the scheme screened a good deal of retrogression and that it was better on the whole to continue working the present constitution than accept and work the new one willingly. As a matter of fact an amendment embodying this view was duly moved but was not voted upon, the Council passing a compromise resolution acceptable to all sections of opinion.

THOUGH this says nothing about the acceptability or otherwise of the J. P. C. scheme it condemns

it in no uncertain terms. It characterises it as “highly unsatisfactory and inadequate” and challenges the necessity of the safeguards. Moreover, a distinct warning is given to the British Government that unless substantially modified, the scheme would not be likely “to evoke goodwill in its working on the part of the people of this country.” The inevitable reference to the omission on the part of the Committee to mention Dominion Status followed, ending with a request to the local Government to press for its incorporation in the Constitution Bill.

WHATEVER one may think of the resolution, the point for consideration is whether such a debate was likely to result in any practical good. It is clear from the Bihar legislature’s resolution that what it presses for is not amendments of a minor nature but modifications of substance in the J. P. C. scheme. Is there even a sporting chance of securing these ? The policy that the British Government was expected to follow had been made clear by Mr. Neville Chamberlain, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, speaking soon after the J. P. C. report was published. He plainly warned all concerned against expecting any substantial alterations in the scheme. Our London correspondent too who has exceptional opportunities of finding out the official view on such matters tried to impress the same point on the minds of our readers a few weeks ago. If there is little chance of the scheme undergoing any substantial modification, one fails to see any tangible gain from such debates which must be said to be conducted in an air of unreality.

Independence Day.

AMONG the matters considered by the Congress Working Committee at its meetings held last week at Delhi was the question of the celebration of the Independence Day which is the 26th of this month. Thanks to the official ban on such celebration and the Congress policy of civil disobedience which was in force so long, its observance has in the past been attended by arrests and lathi charges in some cases. Now however the situation is completely changed by the Congress having virtually forsworn civil disobedience—a fact which is apparently writ large on the instructions issued by the Committee in regard to the celebration. Whereas formerly a clash with the powers that be was to be courted, it is hereafter to be avoided by every possible means. Thus the Com-

mittee's instructions comprise an express prohibition against the breach by Congressmen of any law or ordinance or official order in the matter of the observance of the Independence Day.

THE possibility of Independence Day meetings being prohibited by the authorities too was not absent from the mind of the Committee. In such cases, consistently with the present Congress policy of obeying laws, the proposed meetings are to be abandoned. Not that the affected area is to go without an Independence day meeting. Its place will be taken by meetings held in every house at which the resolution framed by the Committee will be passed. The resolution reaffirms complete independence as the Congress goal and pledges Congressmen and others to push on the constructive programme as a means of facilitating its attainment. It is also worthy of note that even hartals have been definitely prohibited by the Committee. The country will heave a sigh of relief that the instructions issued by the Working Committee do not contemplate any disturbance in the present peaceful conditions of life.

Congress and King's Silver Jubilee.

ANOTHER matter which engaged the Committee's attention related to the silver jubilee celebration of the King's reign which falls due about the middle of the year. After the manner in which the civil disobedience movement was repressed by the Government during the last five years the Congress could of course not be expected to be particularly friendly to such a celebration. Even so, its attitude might have been less censorious if the Government had responded really handsomely to the public demand for a political advance. This however is very far from being the case. In the circumstances one is not sure if the Congress could reasonably be expected to do more than advise abstention from functions arranged in connection with the celebration. This its resolution on the subject enjoins upon Congressmen and members of elected bodies. A similar course seems to have been recommended by it in regard to official functions of a social nature as well, a visible demonstration of which was to be found in the absence of Congressmen from Syed Raza Ali's party in honour of the Viceroy last week.

Lord Brabourne on the Reforms.

A DEFENCE of the J. P. C. scheme of reforms was attempted by Lord Brabourne, Governor of Bombay, in his speech at the Bombay Rotary Club dinner last week. He set out to prove that the proposed reforms constituted an advance on the present state of things and that the safeguards did not make the scheme unworkable, as was stated in some quarters. In support of his first contention he pointed to the additional departments marked out for transfer to ministerial control. That under the new regime the whole of the provincial administration would be in charge of ministers sounds imposing to unsophisticated ears. The real point however is: in the management of provincial affairs whose voice will be

supreme—the Governor's or minister's? Will the latter have at least as satisfactory constitutional means of asserting his will as are open to him at present? Or can the Governor, if he is so minded, ignore the existence of the minister or for that matter of the whole ministry in the name of his special responsibilities and carry on the administration? We wish Lord Brabourne had examined the position from this point of view.

DO the safeguards make the scheme unworkable? They do, in the sense that nobody worth his salt will be enthusiastic in its working. It is never suggested by anybody that because of the existence of safeguards the future Governors would find it difficult to secure the services of any ministers. This would be a miracle in a vast country like India. That however cannot be understood to mean that the people of this country are willing to work the scheme. If the scheme had been fashioned in a manner to secure their approbation, their co-operation would have been more whole-hearted. As it is, nobody with any acquaintance with political thought in India can pretend that the J. P. C. scheme has the backing of public opinion behind it.

Excise in Bihar & Orissa.

IT is a sad phenomenon that while most provincial Governments are committed to prohibition as the goal of their excise policy, prohibition seems to be receding farther and farther into the background. When in the earlier years of the Montagu-Chelmsford regime the memory of this goal was still fresh in their mind, the tone of excise reports used at any rate to be apologetic in case consumption showed an upward tendency. Things however seem now to be completely changed. The declaration of the goal has become so ancient that excise officials need to be reminded of its existence. If there is increased consumption, they no longer feel called upon to apologise for it or to explain it away. They seem to look upon it as a matter of course. It must in fairness be admitted that increased consumption is not directly encouraged by them; but it follows from their efforts to swell revenue. It is strange that this state of affairs does not cause them any the least concern.

THE excise report of Bihar and Orissa for 1933-34 may be cited as a typical instance of this state of the bureaucratic mind. It is found that the excise revenue there increased by about Rs. 2 lakhs. If the added revenue had not led to added consumption, there would not be much cause to regret the phenomenon. But in this case the increased income resulted from increased consumption. That people drank more swadeshi liquor instead of foreign wines, as in this case, can only be a matter of cold comfort to prohibitionists. The incidence of excise revenue per head naturally went up by one pie to five annas and a quarter. True it is lower than in some other provinces; but it seems to us that such comparisons are beside the point. What matters is whether consumption is decreasing or increasing. The increase, if any, must set excise officials at thinking as to the suitable means to check it, if they have any regard for the goal of prohibition. It is this however which appears to be generally at a discount at the present time, and to which pointed attention needs to be drawn. For the rest the report does not seem to contain anything which calls for special attention.

“HE WHO SEEKS EQUITY MUST DO EQUITY”.

THE Liberal Party has passed a resolution declining the proffered constitution with thanks. It asks for nothing more than to be saved from this constitution. It does not perhaps expect that India will be so saved; perhaps it feels that the constitution will be imposed upon the country in despite of the weight of unanimous opposition from all progressive parties in the country.

But whatever the Government may do or may not do, the Liberal Party itself is estopped by its very resolution from doing certain things which it may be said to have countenanced, or at any rate not put its foot down upon, in the past. Certain proposals have been made purporting to force a federation upon those who have either expressed their opposition to it or who, it was feared, would oppose it if they were given the chance. If the Liberal Party wishes the British Government to desist from coercion, so must the Party itself in all its dealings with others.

It will be recalled that at the Round Table Conferences British Indian leaders have always insisted that the next instalment of reforms must not be limited to provincial autonomy, but that it must comprehend a large measure of central responsibility; that both must be introduced simultaneously, or almost simultaneously; and that if a long period of time is found necessary for bringing the central responsibility part of the constitution into operation, the establishment of provincial autonomy should be deferred till then rather than allow central responsibility to be separated from it by a lengthy interval.

To the extent that this objection to provincial autonomy unaccompanied by central responsibility was founded on the fear lest, if the former is introduced at first and the latter left to follow at an unspecified date later, central responsibility would never come, one would endorse it. A petty reform, as Mr. Sastri observed in his article week before last, often proves the enemy of big reform, and politicians have frequently to refuse to accept a smaller gift for tactical reasons, not because the gift itself is undesirable, but because it stands in the way of a larger gift coming quickly afterwards. A question, when once partially settled, becomes extremely difficult to reopen shortly thereafter, and it is found best on many occasions to leave the whole question undecided rather than accept a fragmentary solution.

But it was not on this ground alone that insistence was placed by British Indian politicians on central responsibility being conferred at the same time as provincial autonomy. Another ground was the fear that if provincial autonomy came first, freeing the provinces from the effective control of the Central Government, some of the provinces, particularly those in which the Mahomedans are in a majority, might declare themselves against an all-India federation, and that an all-India federation would thus become impossible on the British India side, apart from the difficulties that have to be encountered on the other side. And if an all-India federation became impossible, these politicians

believed, just like British politicians, that central responsibility would be wholly unattainable. In order therefore that the door to central responsibility be not closed, it was desired that an all-India federation should become an accomplished fact before the provinces obtained freedom to express an opinion of their own as to its desirability or otherwise. The provinces must somehow be forced into an all-India federation, these politicians said in effect; let provincial autonomy be therefore withheld till federation comes about and central responsibility is reached through its avenue.

Now it must be clearly stated that this reasoning was not put forward by any member of the Liberal Party; only Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru is on record as having put it forward. Sir Tej, when he used this argument, had gone out of the Liberal fold, and no responsibility attaches to the Liberal Party for what he said as an Independent. But, in the public mind, the distinction between him and the Liberal Party is not too clear; it is blurred. For this reason it is necessary for the Party to be particularly careful in dissociating itself from a statement which urges, by implication, the imposition of an all-India federation upon all the provinces in India. The Liberal Party has never lent support to Sir Tej Bahadur's view.

Indeed, one of its criticisms against the Simon Commission's Report was that, although entry into an all-India federation was left to the option of each individual State, the Report recommended that the future constitution of British India be cast in such a form as to make it easily capable of being organised on a federal basis. The Liberal Party was not opposed to federation, but it took exception, and rightly, to a unilateral arrangement whereby federation would be forced on British India, but would be left to the choice of the States either to accept or reject it. It insisted even at that early stage that accession to federation should be voluntary as much for British India as for the States.

A Party which took this line on the Simon Commission's Report is not likely, directly or indirectly, to endorse a plea for postponing provincial autonomy with the object of deliberately depriving the provinces of the power of saying "no" to an all-India federation. It may plead with the provinces and try to convince them how federation, if of the right type, is essential to India's national unity. But it will in the last resort make the realisation of such federation dependent upon the willing consent of the people in British India. It can be no party to a process of compelling them to accept it. How can it? What moral right will it have to complain against the imposition by the British Government of an unwanted constitution upon the country if it will urge, or even acquiesce in, the imposition of an all-India federation upon the provinces?

The Liberal Party's record is clean in this respect, but in another respect it might have taken a stronger line than it actually did. All the negotiations at the Round Table Conferences in regard to federation

were conducted with the rulers of Indian States, their subjects being rigorously excluded from these Conferences. For this the Liberal Party is of course not at all to blame. But when it was found later that the States' people were against the federal scheme evolved at the Conferences, it was the duty of the Liberal Party to make clear that it would not consent to the scheme being forced upon them even as it would not consent to the scheme being forced upon British Indians. It ought at least to have pressed for ascertaining the wishes of the people in the States in that behalf.

It cannot say: "This is not our concern. If the will of the States' people is being disregarded in this matter, the responsibility for the defiance of popular wishes does not attach to us. It attaches to the British Government and the Indian Princes. We have a hard enough job already on our hands in protecting our own interests. We cannot afford to add to the difficulties that exist at present by making ourselves the champions of all the oppressed peoples in the world. They must look after themselves." This is not only a short-sighted view of the question. It is distinctly immoral. It is not as if the Liberal Party is asked to go to the succour of a people in distress with whom the British Indian people are unconnected. It is not an act of altruism and philanthropy which is asked of the Party. The Party, if it agrees to the federal scheme, would agree to something which involves the coercion of the States' people, and it cannot escape part of the responsibility for such coercion. It is true that now it does not agree to the federal scheme and is consequently absolved from all responsibility. But it would have tremendously enhanced its moral prestige if it had from the start made its own acceptance of federation conditional upon the consent of all parties concerned and would have immensely strengthened its plea with the British Government for not saddling the Indian people with a constitution which they do not want.

Why is it, for instance, that the Protestants and Jews all over the civilised world are protesting against the restrictions put upon the Roman Catholic Church in Mexico? How is it their affair? The answer is, obviously, as it has been so forcibly put by

a journal of religion, and a Protestant journal at that, as follows:

Wherever religious liberty is denied or the freedom of the church—or of any church—is destroyed by subordination to governmental policy, an injury is done to human rights. Against such an injury free men everywhere ought to raise their voices in protest, whether they be members of this or that church or of no church, whether the injury be done in their own country or in some other country. Nations are too close neighbours to permit a political boundary to be a barrier to either sympathy or indignation; and men are too truly knit together in brotherhood, in spite of differences of race and creed, to leave any justification for indifference when the rights of their common humanity are attacked.

Now, suppose that the Roman Catholic Church was being deprived of its freedom in order to confer special privileges upon the Protestants and Jews. Then it would clearly be the duty of the Protestants and Jews to reject with scorn and indignation the privileges offered to them at the expense of the freedom of their Roman Catholic brethren. Similarly, British Indians, if they value self-determination for themselves, must refuse to accept a constitution which involves denial of self-determination to others, and on this ground alone, even if there be no other ground for such refusal. Fortunately for them, they have to take this course merely on grounds of self-interest, but what an accession of moral power they would have derived if they had shown themselves from the beginning to be as regardful of the interests of the States' people as of their own!

It is necessary to state that in this matter the Liberal Party is in no worse case than the other parties. No political party in British India has shown much concern at the imposition upon the States' people of a constitution which they have rejected. But it is to be hoped that when the aim of all political parties at the present time is to save themselves from an unwanted constitution, they will not be tempted, at a favourable turn in their fortunes in future, to be parties in imposing a constitution which they want upon others who do not want it. They must be prepared to say with Walt Whitman: "For every atom belonging to me, as good belongs to you."

WHAT SHOULD THE PRINCES DO ?

THE OFFER MADE TO THEM OF FEDERATION IS NOW WITHDRAWN.

THE Chamber of Princes, which at this writing is in session in Delhi, will consider the Joint Parliamentary Committee's Report, but will not reach a final decision as to the desirability or otherwise of entering into a federation, not only before the Constitution Bill is published, but before the Constitution Act is passed. But we may know provisionally whether the favourable opinion which the rulers of the States formed of the White Paper proposals is now confirmed or shaken by the recommendations of the J. P. C. The general view seems to be that, upon the whole, the J. P. C. Report constitutes an advance upon the White Paper. Looked at from the narrow point of view of their immediate self-

interest, this view can find much justification. Their strength will be centred chiefly in the upper chamber of the federal legislature. Its size has not been reduced, as at one time it was feared, which would not only have made it difficult for them to adjust satisfactorily all the claims of the States for individual representation, but would have left them in a relatively weaker position in the joint sessions to be held in all cases of dispute between the two houses. The Council of State will, under the J. P. C. scheme, enjoy wider financial powers than under the White Paper scheme, and from the Princes' point of view it is an improvement. The additional restrictions upon popular power recommended by the J. P. C. relate to

British India alone; they do not relate to the States. And on this ground some spokesmen of the States urge that the States need not decry the J. P. C. Report as British Indian politicians are doing. Sir Kailas Narain Haksar, for instance, in an article contributed by him to the current number of the *Indian Review*, takes this view. After referring to the abandonment of direct election for the Assembly and the superimposition of upper houses in several provinces as the chief reactionary changes suggested by the J. P. C., he says: "Whatever objections British India may have to the present proposals, the States—the necessary complement of federation—can have none beyond those that they had to the White Paper."

But this is an entirely wrong line to take. The States may disinterest themselves in matters concerning British Indian provinces, but they cannot and must not disinterest themselves in provisions concerning federation, although the provisions may relate to British India alone. The creation of second chambers in provinces is not a matter which the States need worry very much about, but the substitution of indirect for direct election to the Assembly in British India is a matter of which they have to take serious note. For it affects the composition of the House of Assembly, which is as much the States' as British India's Assembly. The States insist that they can enter into a federation only if the federal Government is a responsible government, and whatever militates against responsibility militates against their entry into the federation. They cannot therefore remain indifferent to such matters, even if they relate to British India. Indirect election of the type proposed in the J. P. C. Report certainly makes the Assembly's responsibility very shadowy, and for this reason the States must protest against it even as British Indian politicians find it necessary to protest against the nomination of the States' representatives by the Princes. The additional safeguards again, which the J. P. C. Report recommends, e. g., the creation of a new special responsibility for the Governor-General giving him power to prevent the levying of what he may choose to look upon as penal tariffs on the United Kingdom imports into India, are restrictions on the power of the whole federal Government, and not only on the British India part of it. How can the States affect to treat them with unconcern? Whatever the Princes may do, we hope that they will sternly refuse to follow the very unwise advice tendered to them by Col. Haksar.

What again happens to the Princes' stipulation that their joining the federation is conditioned by effective responsibility being conferred upon the federal Government? Already British politicians are indulging in jibes, not without reason, at the Princes' continuing to view the federal scheme with favour, though it is riddled through and through with reservations and restrictions. "I thought it was a very funny thing," said Mr. Winston Churchill in the House of Commons, "that these autocratic Princes... insisted that there must be responsibility." British politicians are reluctant to believe that this stipulation was seriously meant, and if the

Princes can accept the J. P. C. scheme as conceding real responsibility, no one in British India will believe either that the stipulation was seriously meant. Do the Princes claim either that the scheme gives effective responsibility immediately or will lead to it soon? Surely, they cannot if they are true to themselves. The Princes' stipulation really went further than this. They not only laid down the condition that what they regarded as real responsible government should be granted at the Centre, but that what was generally regarded in the political circles in British India as real responsible government should be granted. Only the other day Sir Manubhai Mehta explained the position of the Indian Princes thus:—

"A resolution adopted by the Chamber of Indian Princes in March 1932, had also promised that the scheme of federation to which they would be prepared to accede, could only be a federation that provided for real responsibility at the Centre and was found generally satisfactory and acceptable to the country as providing such responsibility at the Centre. The Princes would, therefore, naturally await the well-considered verdict of their countrymen whether the scheme of governance now offered did contain the seeds of such effective responsibility."

The deciding factor was thus to be not their own opinion alone, but that of the Indian people as a whole. Do the Princes believe then, like British politicians, that the resolutions of non-acceptance or rejection passed by the Congress, the Liberal Party, the Nationalist Party, the Responsivist Party and several Mahomedan organisations do not represent the country's considered verdict, but that the opinions of extreme communalists, champions of vested interests and official propagandists like Lord Brabourne do? They surely will not say so, and therefore, like all the progressives in the country, they too must come down definitely on the side of non-acceptance.

There is one more consideration which must be brought to the notice of the Princes. They have been saying that the offer of federation came from British India, and that they have only been considering whether they should accept the offer and if so, on what terms. This version of the start of negotiations has been challenged, but it must be conceded that, whatever may have happened behind the scenes, the official records of the negotiations show that the initiative in regard to federation did come from British India, as the Princes claim. Be it so. But if the offer originated with British India, it is now clear that British India has since withdrawn it. The British Indian leaders originally thought that a federal scheme could be hammered out which would give reasonable satisfaction to the political aspirations of both the provinces and the States and they therefore proposed a scheme and worked on it for some time. But they have now found that the form which it has ultimately taken is objectionable from many points of view. They do not want the Princes to consider the scheme in this form. The Princes have therefore now no proposal for federation submitted to them, and for this reason alone they must say to the British Government, if the latter persists with the scheme, that, the original offer being withdrawn by those who made it, they must refuse to take any fur-

ther part in the discussion of the scheme, and that at any rate they can never accept it. The British Government would naturally like the Princes to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for it, but they must not let themselves be exploited in this manner. If they do, the ill-will which the forcing of the new constitution upon British India will inevitably create among British Indians against His Majesty's Government will be partially turned against the rulers of Indian States. It would be well if the States carefully weighed the consequences that would flow from such a policy and take a decision accordingly.

Our London Letter.

(BY AIR MAIL.)

(From Our Correspondent.)

London, 11th January.

DOMINION STATUS.

TO-DAY'S *Spectator* strongly supports Indian nationalist criticism against the omission of all reference to Dominion Status from the Majority Report as the goal of British policy in India. Its remarks:-

"The text of the Government of India Bill will be available in a few days now and it is to be hoped very much that in its preamble or somewhere else it will frankly and openly admit the justice of the claim of India to Dominion Status. Considerable harm has been done in India by the Archbishop of Canterbury's speech in the House of Lords debate, in which he sought to banish that particular term from the present and impending discussions. That might be defensible if the term had been used in relation to India for the first time a month or two months ago. Actually it represents a goal to which the eyes of India have been deliberately turned by public men in this country for the last dozen years or more. Mr. Churchill in 1921 looked forward to the assumption by India of Dominion Status. The King himself, in inaugurating the present regime in India, looked forward to the day when British India would attain 'its due place among our Dominions.' The present Prime Minister in 1928, Lord Irwin, as Viceroy, in 1929, Mr. Baldwin in the House of Commons in the same year, Lord Willingdon in 1933, all made use either of the actual words 'Dominion Status' or some such phrase as equality of status with other Dominions. Sir Stanley Reed, in an article from Bombay which appears on a later page of this issue, shows how grave an obstacle to good understanding the tacit or open rejection of the claim to Dominion Status has become in India. Having gone so far the Government has neither justice nor logic on its side in stopping short of the frank acknowledgment of Dominion Status as the goal."

It is interesting to note that the Calcutta Correspondent of the *Observer* emphasises the same point, and he adds: "India is brooding over the Archbishop of Canterbury's and Lord Crewe's depreciatory references to Dominion Status, which now prove to have been more unfortunate than all the 'Dishard' oratory in both Houses."

REFORMS NOTES.

Sir Samuel Hoare had a consultation this week with the Prime Minister, on the latter's return from Lossiemouth. Presumably the subject of discussion between the two was the final form to be given to the reform proposals as expressed in the Bill in which they will be incorporated. Though the Dishards will

undoubtedly attack the main features of the Bill, with specific amendments, and notwithstanding Mr. Winston Churchill's roar of rage at the prospect of curtailment of discussion which Sir Samuel requested them to consider in his broadcast on New Year's day, it is not expected that there will be any perverse attempt to block the progress of the Bill through its various stages. To do so would be to fly in the face of public opinion, which expects, first that the minorities in the country will take note of the heavy Parliamentary majorities against them already secured on the principles of the Bill, and secondly that the Government will make a firm effort to proceed as rapidly as possible with the constructive programme with which they claim to wish to tackle the problem of domestic and industrial reform. In order, therefore, that the stage may be cleared for an appeal to the country that may come any time after the end of this year's summer holidays, it is not considered likely that the Dishards will be unduly obstructive or the Government unnecessarily provocative.

The National University Labour Federation Conference has been held this week at Ilkley, where Mr. H. N. Brailsford roundly condemned the new constitutional proposals for India as "a complete sham". He added: "At present the Government of India rests upon nothing but naked force. We conquered India a hundred and fifty years ago and we have been conquering it ever since." If that is a correct report of Mr. Brailsford's views, it is quite clear that the history of Indo-British relations during the last century and a half is susceptible of more than one interpretation. On the general question of the reforms he was supported by Mr. Jack Jones, who went out to India with the British Universities Debating Team, last year, and Mr. V. Krishna Menon.

Lord Lynton, to the joy of the *Daily Mail*, has completely supported Major Courtauld's statement of the position which he put into the mouth of the Viceroy during the Commons debate on the Report, last month, and which the Viceroy categorically denied.

The *Morning Post* editorially describes the proposed Constitution for India as "the Banias' Raj," and quotes Major Attlee in its support. Incidentally it drags in the Mahatma to its aid by describing him as a money-lender by caste and a lawyer by profession. The paper might at least have gone a step further and described him as an agriculturist and a weaver by occupation, and an untouchable by choice.

Sir Henry Page-Croft in a letter to the *Star*, welcomes the Indian Liberals as "comrades in arms." I do not know whether he has formally addressed the members of the Indian Liberal Federation in these terms.

Viscount Wolmer, one of the most prominent critics of the Government's India policy, has just been defeated by an overwhelming majority at the Annual Meeting of the Aldershot and Northants Conservative Association on the following resolution: "That the Central Council of the Association is desirous that a conference of the National Union of Conservative and Unionist Associations be convened before the terms of the bill for the better government of India are made known, in order to give the leader an opportunity of consulting with the party on the subject." This is Viscount Wolmer's own constituency.

FINANCIAL ASPECT OF FEDERATION.

In his broadcast talk on Tuesday the financial aspects of the federal scheme were dealt with lucidly and adequately by Sir George Schuster. Broadly his view was expressed in the following passage:

"The total budget of the Central Government runs to about £100,000,000, and that Government, even at the

present slump levels for revenue, is still paying its way and setting aside £2,250,000 annually for debt reduction. There are already signs of an improving trend in tax revenue and State railways receipts. In these circumstances I think it impossible to say that financial difficulties must be accepted as an obstacle to proceeding with the constitutional plan. But the most effective answer to such arguments is that the greater part of these difficulties would have to be met regardless of the constitutional changes. The really new expenditure that results from them is only £1,250,000, and all the additional transfers from the Centre—the object of which is to help the Provinces—represent needs that exist and that would, in any case, have to be faced."

Sir George was equally emphatic that too much weight should not be given to the theoretical point that the States insist that they shall not become liable to the present Income Taxes. "A federation of this kind cannot start without anomalies. The hope must be that, in practice, they will be smoothed out." This is very much in accord with the view expressed by Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru in the analysis of the reforms scheme appearing in this month's *Twentieth Century*, which will be widely and appreciatively read here by all who hold his experience and his opinion in respect. Another point that was emphasised by Sir George was that it must not be assumed that the Provinces' resources for raising revenue within their existing powers were fully exhausted, and that it would be wrong to create the impression that every outlet for expansion was closed, and that the only hope was to deprive the Centre of taxes on income.

Then followed a very impressive passage in which Sir George dealt with the transfer of responsibility. He emphasised that safeguards were the negative side of the plan. There was, however, a positive side to the transferring of responsibility and that supplied its real justification. Even in these hard times India could find a margin for expanding expenditure on social services, but the problem could only be properly tackled by governments at the Centre and in the Provinces which could command the support of the public in raising additional revenue because they were national governments, and because they had the responsibility of deciding how the revenue was to be spent. He paid a tribute of admiration to the manner in which many elected members had faced unpopularity for the sake of supporting principles of sound finance, but he felt that the present system was unfair to both sides. "All of us who have worked recently in the Government of India feel that the time has come when, if the national problems—financial or otherwise—are to be fairly faced, real responsibility must be given to the national governments."

The following final paragraph will be read with mixed feelings in the Provinces :

"There is good ground to anticipate that the minimum obligatory needs for setting up the Federal and Provincial Governments, and placing the latter in financial equilibrium, can be met without jeopardising the financial stability of India. When resources are available further adjustments should be made between the Federal Governments and the units, but the possibilities of this cannot yet be fairly relied on, and it is better not to hold out hopes until those hopes are within sight of realisation. Meanwhile, the duty should be clearly laid on all the units of government in India to adjust their expenditure to their present resources, and to make the most of these resources in preparing for the new constitution."

INDIA AND THE PUBLIC.

Mr. John Fletcher, the Secretary of the lunch-hour meetings held on Tuesday at Friends House, has been quick to seize upon the fact that just now an

important matter of interest to that section of the public that looks to Friends House for guidance is the subject of the Indian constitutional proposals, which is accordingly made the special subject for the month.

Miss Mehra Masani, B. A., who is in close touch with the Congress Socialist Party, of which her brother is Secretary, is a student of the London School of Economics and opened the series with a talk on "What Young India Thinks of the Proposals". Briefly, the answer was, just nothing at all. She described Britain as worse than a foreign country such as France or Italy because it has vested interests in India. "Congress", she remarked, "says that if the Report of the Joint Select Committee were a thousand times better than it is, it still would not look at it, and young India does not condescend to look at the Report, which they say does not concern them." The first part of this statement is confirmed in a news letter contributed to this week's *Spectator* by Sir Stanley Reed, from Bombay. The second part is somewhat discounted by Miss Masani's conclusion that young Indians would have to accept the Report whether they liked it or not because it was being thrust down their throats, but in their minds they rejected it. A thing that is thrust down one's throat can only be rejected in one way and it is not quite correct in those circumstances to say that this much-disliked constitution does not concern young India. Apart from these somewhat summary views, Miss Masani was at great pains to give the meeting the several arguments urged by other parties against the scheme.

Other speakers in this series will be Mr. Amijo C. Chakravarty, M. A., formerly secretary to Dr. Tagore, and at present making post-graduate studies at Balliol College, Oxford, on "India and England: The Psychological Tangle"; and on the same day that he broadcasts Mr. C. F. Andrews will speak on "The Latest News from India." On the 29th Mr. B. N. Mukerjee, M. A., will speak on "Indian Music" and give a demonstration thereof.

ITEM OF INTEREST.

The name of the Earl of Athlone is mentioned as a new possibility for the office of next Viceroy of India. His experience as Governor-General of South Africa might, in that event, stand the Queen's brother in good stead.

Reviews.

CHINESE LABOUR MOVEMENT.

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT AND LABOUR LEGISLATION IN CHINA. By LINTUNG-HAI (China United Press, Shanghai.) 1933. 24cm. 252p. \$6.

THIS book of Prof. Lin Tung-Hai (Jefferson D. H. Lamb) is the first one of its kind on Chinese labour written by one who has devoted several years of close study to the problem. The first two chapters are devoted to a description of the impact of western ideas on China and the growth of the revolutionary Kuo-Min-Tang movement with its repercussions on the labour movement. The author shows how the revolutionary movement under the leadership of Dr. Sun-Yat-Sen directed against Manchus and the foreign capitalists successively failed until the consciousness of the workers and the farmers was roused by holding out hopes of economic emancipation, how the militant Chinese workers, though outnumbered by the imperial army and navy, carried everything

before them on account of the new fervour imported by the advent of Borodin and several Russian revolutionaries and how Kuo-Min-Tang, after having entrenched itself in power, began a campaign of suppression of Trade Unions in the guise of expelling the communist elements. At one time in the heyday of the Trade Union movement in China, there were nearly 300,000,000 organised Trade Union members in 1927 as against 574,766 members in 1930.

The author makes it clear that although there are more than 15,000,000 persons constituting the wage-earning population in the Republic, China is industrially a very backward country. There are only about 25 establishments each employing more than 1000 workers in this vast country. 85% of the industrial establishments employ only about 7 to 30 workers per establishment. The employment of women and children in the factories is a great social problem in China. Mr. Hai says that from one to two-thirds of the family expenditures is earned by the combined labour of mother and children. The third chapter contains many statistical tables showing the size and strength of industrial establishments, the average wages earned, the daily working hours, the weekly rest days and the position of organised labour in China.

He gives a vivid description of the development of factory legislation in recent years. He shows that China has made more rapid progress in enacting progressive labour legislation than in enforcing it. The Chinese Factory Law has many noteworthy features such as the minimum wage provision, the 8-hour day clause, the child-labour clause, the prohibition of night-work clause, the rest days clause, maternity benefits, legalisation of strikes, provision for compulsory arbitration, recognition of only one union for each industry, registration of collective agreements, etc. But unfortunately, it is admitted that a greater part of the Law is evaded in practice. Since 1927 Trade Unions were suppressed and only in 1931 the ban has been removed to a certain extent. A regrettable feature is that all factories run by foreign capitalists have not complied with the requirements of Chinese Factory Law. Added to this is the difficult question of the powers of extra-territoriality enjoyed by industrially advanced countries like U. S. A., Great Britain, France, Japan, etc.

The wealth of information contained throughout the book which covers nearly 262 pages of printed matter constitutes a first step in the direction of keeping the outside world informed about certain recent developments in the Chinese Labour Movement. This book, though written by one closely associated with the present Government in power, should find a place in every public library.

V. V. GIRL

INDIAN EDUCATIONAL POLICY.

EDUCATIONAL POLICY IN INDIA. A NEGLECTED ASPECT. By F. F. MONK. (Oxford University Press.) 1934. 20cm. 43p. Rs. 1/-

THIS monograph is substantially the memorandum submitted by Mr. Monk to the Hartog Committee in 1928, and is a plea for the re-orientation of the educational policy in India so as to secure from the secondary schools and the University a much larger supply of the "directing class" so necessary for shouldering the new responsibilities resulting from the "transfer of the administration of India from foreign hands to those of the people of the country." Mr. Monk apparently belongs to that class of Britishers—now almost extinct—who believed that the conquest of India by the British people was an act of

Providence and that the happiness of the conquering nation lay in re-transferring the control of affairs to the Indians when they were qualified to resume it. On page 13, he argues :

The Briton's scepticism and delay in re-transferring his responsibilities as ruler are not entirely due to self-interest but based also to a considerable degree on an honest doubt regarding the training of the men who are destined to take them over, and the Briton implicitly confesses that he has failed to provide that training. Here in fact, in the failure to train for rule, not in the failure to transfer ruling powers, is the real onus of the charge that the Indian politician tries to establish against the foreign administration."

With the help of the White Paper and the still more ominous-looking Report of the Joint Parliamentary Committee it would be easy to knock down the basis of the author's argument quoted above, but that would not be relevant to a review of the book, the central theme of which is that one of the most urgent needs of the day is a superior type of secondary school—let us not call it a Public School—, that the real University work should begin at the present Intermediate stage and that both in the secondary school as well as in the University, greater attention has to be paid to inculcating the virtues of leadership or, as the author prefers to put it, "towards creating an Indian ruling class to take over the duties and privilege she (Britain) has hitherto enjoyed, including that very trusteeship of the masses." There is much that is acceptable in this contention, although one would not agree with the author in his view that "such provision of proper schooling of the directing class, not merely as a development of education, but as *the one solution* which goes to the root of all the questions with which the Indian Statutory Commission and the Round Table Conferences have been occupied."

India is no longer so blind as not to note the fallacy—if not deception—in the above argument that a systematic propaganda for the creation of a directing class is a *sine qua non* of the transfer of control from the hands of the British to those of the Indians. Sound education in a distinctive school is an essential requisite for efficient administration and such schools do throw up young men and women who by their better education assume the leadership of a nation; but self-government and the growth of a directing class are concurrent and interdependent. If Public Schools in England have in the past supplied the nation her great statesmen and generals, her great judges and administrators, it is no less true that the English Public School has been the result of the history of England in the last five hundred years. Schools are not the only places where training for leadership can be obtained, nor are they the best places so long as they cannot enjoy the freedom so necessary for imparting such training; and it is not correct to say that India will not be able to throw up the right type of directing class, in the absence of schools designed for the purpose—if she be asked to shoulder real self-government. It would also be incorrect to deduce such a conclusion from the experience of the last ten years when she worked the Montford reforms, verily a make-believe of responsible government in the Provinces.

One of the most obvious fallacies of such argument lies in viewing India in English perspective. The adjectives "Upper", "Middle" and "Lower" when applied in India to the classes of people do not necessarily connote the same groups as they would in England. The real middle class corresponding to the English middle class has yet to make its appearance in India. It is still largely enveloped in illiteracy and has little interest in the affairs of government. It wants schools and education only to help

its members to rise in social status by entering Government service or by establishing themselves as lawyers, doctors or engineers. India therefore cannot support the plea that "aid to middle class education (i. e. education of the directing class) is even more of a nation-building character than the promotion of literacy," nor would she listen to the advice: "In the matter of primary education, go slow; a complete revolution has to be accomplished in the spirit of school education; take one stage at a time; it may be logical to insist on beginning from the beginning, but we have to start from facts, not logic".

One wonders if Mr. Monk is arguing in favour of what was once known as the "filtration theory" in education, so popular among the educationalists of the last century. It was proposed to create a highly educated nucleus through whom education would filter downwards. F. W. Thomas strongly criticises this theory in his "History and Prospects of British Education in India":

"The large features of the character of nations," says Mr. Thomas, "do not change rapidly. The intensely sacerdotal spirit of the chief Indian caste, the one which benefits most largely by English education, is not dead. The rules of caste are as rigid as ever. The exclusiveness, which has reigned for three hundred years, is as rampant as before. Of anything like public feeling and mutual confidence and help there is no hope for many a year. It is not conceivable that knowledge should under these circumstances filter down. There is no evidence that it has filtered down."

Things have changed since this was written fifty years ago, but the change has been in quantity, not in quality. Any attempt, under the circumstances to artificially create a directing class by some kind of exclusive education must fail in these days when power is passing out of the hands of that class which would supply qualified recruits for the type of education contemplated by Mr. Monk.

While therefore admitting the central theme of Mr. Monk's monograph, that in order to enable the Indian youth to shoulder the responsibilities of a self-governing nation, education of a superior type is necessary it is essential that efforts in this direction should be initiated, financed and guided by non-Government agencies with active co-operation and help from Government. But any organised effort by Government to lay down a new policy of education, as suggested by Mr. Monk, must conflict with other interests equally important and create prejudice which would do more harm than good. There is therefore more truth than modesty in the following observations of the author:

"The writer's command of the data is limited to only a portion of the country and to a relatively short period of time. If then the data are inadequate or misapplied, let the fault be laid on him, but let the intention of his argument be pursued, irrespective of defects, to the one conclusion which it desires to establish as unavoidable, that in order to give India that Indian rule which the British race has promised her, it is before all things necessary to provide her with Indian rulers and that they can only be produced by education."

M. R. PARANJPE.

THE HOME.

THE HOME AND A CHANGING CIVILISATION.

By NAOMI MITCHISON. (The Twentieth Century Library Series, No. 7.) (John Lane.) 1934. 20cm. 169 p. 2/6.

MRS. MITCHISON sees in the organization and functioning of the home through historical times and at the present day the principle of ownership at

work. The male has owned and still owns the female and both in their turn the children. She distinguishes ownership as personal and social. Social and economic ownership is, according to her, the most objectionable feature of social life which has vitiated the atmosphere of the home. On the other hand, she has not only no objection to personal ownership mutually between the husband and the wife, but she looks upon it as "the necessary assuagement of our inherited instincts from the social apes." She would like to see that pregnancy and children are not made an excuse for obstructing married women in their ordinary pursuits nor a reason for their economic dependence. She believes that because at present a woman is made to feel that she is economically and socially owned she is revolting against such natural instincts as that of maternity. As an example of social owning may be mentioned the contemporary practice in some of the avocations in England of discharging the services of a woman employee as soon as she gets married. To lighten the burden of home management there must be nurseries and creches all over the country and the hours of attendance in schools must be increased to keep the infants and children usefully engaged. The husband and wife must cultivate an attitude of sympathy towards each other and each in turn must imbibe the feeling that giving is better than taking or even expecting. Similarly the attitude of parents towards their children must be one of non-interference as far as possible so that the widening gulf between the two generations need not create bitter feelings. Her proposals contemplate an equalitarian society and she looks up to U. S. S. R. for the prototype of the economic organization of society in which her new homes can flourish.

No thinker can take any objection to Mrs. Mitchison's contention that there is a certain amount of unnecessary and inequitable social owning of woman. Her plea for correct attitude among the members of a home is all in keeping with the teachings of modern psychology, sociology and educational theory. But her proposals envisage an average home as a place kept by husband and wife who both of them as a rule go out in pursuit of their occupations, where they and their children return only for meals and sleep. Evidently the parents cannot have much time at their disposal either for mutual companionship or for devoting to the service of their children, a state of affairs which prevails in many a working class home of industrial society. A number of middle class families in American cities keep such homes and we are informed by American sociologists that the contacts between the three principal constituents of the home—the husband, the wife and the children—are of the thinnest. It does not require much imagination to realise that such a home must be devoid of all homeliness and emotional appeal. If homes are to be kept in such a pattern it is difficult to resist a national movement to demolish such homes and to communalise children. The children in such homes can look upon their parents only as economic supports—the persons who pay for their schooling and up-bringing without any of the emotional effects which personal care and service introduce and which characterise a good home as a place different from a communal nursery or a school. Social effort must be largely spent on reconstituting the home in such a way that it plays its part as a necessary complement of the public school. Mrs. Fannina Halle records that in the U. S. S. R. the little experience in communalising children is against such experiment. If we are serious about the future of society, we must frankly admit, at the risk of appearing anti-feminist, that the place of woman is largely in the home till children become adult and that her

economic independence must be sought to be brought about by such methods as that of endowment of wifehood and motherhood, and not through her wholesale plunging into the midst of factory or office-occupations.

G. S. GHURYE.

KONKAN RURAL LIFE.

BADALAPUR (OUR VILLAGE). By N. G. CHAPEKAR. (Aryasanskriti Mudranalaya, Poona 2.) 1933. 22cm. 504+25pp. Rs. 6/-

THIS is a recent work written in Marathi by Mr. N. G. Chapekar, who is already well-known in Marathi literary and historical circles as the author of several books of high merit. The volume under review is the result of nearly eight years' steady and patient research work carried out by the author who has made a very detailed socio-economic survey of his own ancestral village of Badalapur after his retirement from Government service. While several village surveys have already been carried out in different parts of India by economists and social workers like Dr. Mann, Dr. Gilbert Slater, Mr. Mukhtyar and Mr. Bhalla, we have not so far come across any other publication similar to Mr. Chapekar's 'Badalapur', which, in addition to being an economic survey of that village, also embodies the results of a detailed sociological investigation relating to the various castes and sub-castes in the village, their functions, customs relating to marriage, death and other social ceremonies, rituals, spells, and charms, popular beliefs in ghosts, etc., etc. The book also gives interesting particulars regarding the history of the village, its principal deities, the different varieties of reptiles found in it, diseases prevalent in the village, vital statistics, the population and its distribution on the basis of caste, sex and occupation.

The economic survey section of the volume under review describes the conditions of life and labour in the village and extends over a wide range of topics such as the land and its divisions, the principal crops and agricultural operations, the live-stock and implements, marketing, land revenue and other farming costs, forest, indebtedness in the Village, the drink habit, etc. This is followed by the drawing up of a balance-sheet of the village stating the principal items of income and expenditure. In the concluding chapter the author gives an outline of an ideal self-contained 'happy village.' The utility of the book is considerably enhanced by the inclusion of some pictures relating to the village and especially of detailed statistical tables furnishing particulars about the inventory of the families belonging to the various castes resident in Badalapur.

The village of Badalapur is situated in the Thana district at a distance of $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles from the railway station of the same name at mile 42 on the G. I. P. Railway line between Bombay and Poona. Since Mr. Chapekar hails from this village, has lived in it ever since his retirement and has taken special pains to verify the information collected by him, his survey might be regarded as a reliable picture of the village to which it relates. It has a population of nearly 2,500 according to the Census of 1931 (or about 2,300 as stated by the writer who excludes some people who have only a temporary interest in the village). Although the village is subject to city influences owing to its being on the Railway line and in the vicinity of towns like Kalyan, it could be regarded in many ways as a typical Konkan village with rice-economy as its predominant feature. The conclusions drawn by the author possess therefore more than local significance

and have a certain bearing upon the conditions of life and labour in other Indian villages.

The main finding of the author, so far as the economic conditions in the village are concerned, is that the village is not in a position to pay its way. This conclusion is based on the following figures. The total income, agricultural and non-agricultural, is Rs. 2,05,343. The total expenditure comes up to Rs. 2,40,705 (Rs. 1,20,705 on rice and Rs. 1,20,000 on other expenses on the basis of Rs. 5 per head of the population). Thus the expenditure is not balanced even by the gross receipts and but for the remittances received from their relations staying outside by the people in the village, the economic situation would have been even more acute than it is today. The yearly income per head is Rs. 93-4-0. The net income, after deducting the amount of land revenue (including local cess) and interest on debts comes to Rs. 75. This is of course the general average. A large number of income, we are told, belong to the class of Rs. 50 and below. The total indebtedness in the village is Rs. 2,79,417, of which the Mahomedan population owes Rs. 1,90,000 mainly for buying forest wood for sale. The Hindus owe the remaining debt of Rs. 89,417, which comes to Rs. 51 per head. As regards the agricultural population the permanent debt amounts to Rs. 81 per family (or Rs. 17-8-0 per head). In addition, the farmer has to borrow for his current domestic and agricultural needs. Out of 131 agricultural families only 36 are free from debt. It is a notable fact that the village spends Rs. 9,502 on liquor annually, which comes to Rs. 4 per head.

The author's diagnosis of the poverty in Indian villages is instructive. Among the various factors that account for the low economic condition of the people, the principal ones are: the tendency towards overpopulation, the so-called civilised but expensive mode of living (witness the money spent on the railway and the bus), wasteful expenditure on petty civil litigation, marriage and drink, the abuse by the farmer of the freedom to alienate his land and by the moneylender of the facilities conferred upon him to recover his loans. While the burden of land revenue has not increased in view of the rise in the prices of paddy during the last 150 years, in the author's opinion the expenditure by Government on village dispensaries, schools and roads is not quite justifiable having regard to the more pressing elementary needs of the village-folk. While there can be no two opinions about the poverty of Indian villages, we are afraid few persons will agree with this view of the author. Increased literacy, better communications, which mean better marketing facilities, and a better standard of public health, are all of them calculated to improve the economic condition of the masses. Most people will, however, endorse his suggestions that there should be cheap and expeditious disposal of petty disputes by Village Panchayats, that adequate facilities should be given to every village by the Forest Administration (and village forests should be revived), that facilities for obtaining drink should be curtailed and that certain rules should be enforced to ensure and maintain a certain proportion between Warkas and Rice land in the Konkan tract.

While we welcome the publication of a comprehensive one-volume survey of the various aspects of an Indian village, we wish the author had devoted more space to the economic sections of his book, which have been dwarfed by the far bigger sociological and other sections. We would have welcomed more information regarding the sub-division and fragmentation of holdings and a more critical and convincing exposition of the case against consolidation of

holdings. So also, instead of writing a few paragraphs regarding indebtedness in the village, the author might as well have devoted a whole chapter to the discussion of the subject, giving particulars regarding the sources of credit, rates of interest charged, security for loans and the purpose for which debts are contracted. So also we wish the chapter on Marketing had been fuller and had traced clearly the movement of the staple commodity—rice—from the field to the market.

Altogether Mr. Chapekar's 'Badalapur—Our Village' will undoubtedly rank high as a classical volume of its kind in the Marathi literature. The publication of his book at this juncture is very timely having regard to the widespread interest in problems of village uplift and rural reconstruction that is now being taken by the Government as well as social workers in India. Mr. Chapekar's book should prove to be a veritable mine of information and a source of inspiration to all those who are engaged in this work. The author has set a very commendable example of devotion to one's village, and we congratulate him upon the lead thus given by him to all those who are interested in the welfare of rural India.

S. G. BERL.

PROBLEM OF MONEY.

WEALTH, VIRTUAL WEALTH AND DEBT. THE SOLUTION OF THE ECONOMIC PARADOX. By FREDERICK SODDY. (Allen & Unwin.) 1933. 23cm. 320p. 6/-

In the preface to the second edition of the book under review, Professor Soddy says that his first edition was out of print within a short time after its publication in 1926. Professor Soddy is a well-known specialist in one branch of science who has frantically attempted to suggest remedies for the problems in another field of knowledge. It is a work of great difficulty, especially where, as in these days, specialists build stone walls about their own boundaries. Professor Soddy writes with refreshing candour about the corruption of the monetary system and how the very life of the people is being affected by the mishandling of the currencies by Banks.

In page 131 Professor Soddy writes as follows about the dangers of money:

"Money is a dangerous necessity only too apt in the body politic to engender diseases potent enough to bring the proudest nations to dust. It substitutes for the natural inalienable right of the worker to the produce of his toil a vague generalised claim upon the totality of the fruits of the community's efforts—a highly indefinite quantity which opens the door to any kind of abuse."

Professor Soddy defines money as something of 'virtual wealth' and not wealth. His criticism of the credit machinery and the cheque system is very interesting and will repay careful analysis. Professor Soddy is right in saying (page 140): "It is not the amount of Money that people have that is of any importance, but the amount of wealth that they are in a position to obtain any time in the future *on demand* that is of importance."

Dr. Soddy's parody of the rhapsodies of Hartley Withers about the beauty of the English banking system is extremely interesting. On pages 148 and 149 Hartley Withers is quoted as saying that 'The banking system is a wondrous example of human ingenuity applied to the cheapening and furtherance of trade finance and speculation.' Dr. Soddy answers that this is not merely the case of the old lady of the fable who overdrew her account and sent her banker

a cheque for the amount, but that her misfortune was that she was not her own banker.

Dr. Soddy is nothing if not interesting in his analysis of the economic future of society. He writes on page 270:

Next to an honest monetary system, the need for the continuous redemption of revenue-yielding capital out of income appears to be the most important step towards reform. The State should exercise a general control over the question as to the due balances to be preserved between the production of goods for use and consumption and the accumulation of fresh capital as it did during the War.

There is no doubt that Professor Soddy writes with deep feeling and deeper sincerity, and his challenge to the orthodox school is in unmistakable terms, but one would have wished that scientist as he is, he would have avoided a jibe at the Jew (p.289).

It is difficult to say with any precision what exactly can be done by a single nation in the matter of the regulation of its currency without reference to other nations, but every one, economist or other, would welcome all interested to break any conspiracy that may exist in the matter of currency systems. We certainly require more and better education in the technique of this very important activity of the banker.

The reviewer would very strongly recommend this very thoughtful and thought-provoking book to all those engaged in the art of creating money at the banks and also to the very many men and women who may be intelligent enough to want to understand what is going on about them.

S. V. AYYAR.

Miscellaneous.

NO CLIMB-DOWN.

IN an article under the heading "Mr. Sastri's Climb-Down" *Forward* castigates Mr. Srinivasa Sastri for his recent article in the *SERVANT OF INDIA*. After paying a just tribute to Mr. Sastri's "unquestionable patriotism, sincerity of purpose and long record of public service" and expressing its warm appreciation of his dignified statement at the last session of the Liberal Federation that "it was impossible for the Liberal Party to give an atom of co-operation to the Government" with regard to the proposed constitution, the journal writes:—

"To-day the same Mr. Sastri paraphrases his own text and tells the world that Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru's opinion that 'India has not the capacity to reject the new order' is amply confirmed by the authoritative statement that enough persons will be forthcoming to work it. The Liberal meeting at Poona fully realised this. It would have advised rejection if it had considered that course practicable."

In our opinion the inconsistency which *Forward* has discovered between Mr. Sastri's two pronouncements is wholly imaginary. In the Poona speech itself, as in his articles in the *SERVANT OF INDIA*, Mr. Sastri stated his belief that enough persons would be forthcoming to work the proposed constitution. That is all that he means by saying that the rejection of the constitution is impracticable.

We do not think in this matter, there is any difference of opinion between Mr. Sastri and the Congress. All that the Congress means by "rejection" is that it would rather remain under the present constitution than accept the proposed constitution, and secondly, that if this new constitution is thrust upon the country it would do everything in its power to bring it to a speedy end, so that on its ashes a new and acceptable constitution may be reared. That this is exactly Mr. Sastri's position we know not only from his speech but from a leading article in the *SERVANT OF INDIA* which has always been regarded as his organ and mouthpiece. In that article our contemporary said:—

"There is no doubt that this is for the Liberal Party definitely the left turn. It must be ready hereafter for a political re-orientation much to the left of the position it now occupies. It cannot continue to stand where it does; it will be driven leftward by the force of circumstances. Most of the leaders of the Old Guard indicated in their speeches the necessity that would arise, in case the proposed constitution was thrust upon the country, for intensifying the Swadeshi movement, creating difficult situations for the Government, and bringing into effect the more radical measures which constitutional agitation understood in a large sense allows."

Again:

"Its (the Liberal Party's) main task will be that of finding out ways in which the united weight of progressive opinion of all shades can be brought to bear upon the Government. What can be more significant than this change in the general attitude of the Liberal Party indicated by the fact that the thoughts of Sir Chimanlal Setalvad and Sir Cowasji Jehangir are now turned in the direction of political Swadeshi and constitutional deadlocks?"

There is not a word in Mr. Sastri's article under reference which shows that this is not still his position.

We should like very much to know what else the Congress itself means or can mean by the word rejection, now that civil disobedience has been suspended or abandoned. If Mr. Satyamurti knows the mind of the Congress, and *Forward*, at any rate, which belongs to exactly the same school of thought in the Congress as Mr. Satyamurti, will not deny his claim to speak for the Congress, it means exactly what the Liberal Party means. This is what he said in a recent speech:—

"Positively the Congress means by the word 'rejection' that it has no use for these proposals, and would gladly do without them. If, however, the constitution is forced upon us, rejection does not mean that we are committed to the boycott of Legislatures. It is quite on the cards that we shall contest all the elections on the twin issue of the Constituent Assembly and the rejection of these proposals, rather the substitution thereof by a constitution to be framed by the proposed Constituent Assembly, and we shall capture the power such as there is in these Legislatures and use them as an instrument in the struggle for Swaraj. While we are doing that we shall also do everything in our power to mitigate the people's difficulties and to improve their lot to the extent to which it is possible to do so under the restricted constitution."

Well may Mr. Sastri say that there is no difference in substance between the Liberals as represented by him and the Congress as represented by Mr. Satyamurti, and that "the difference between them is reduced to the narrow verbal question whether the word 'rejection' expresses the idea best—a point of comparative unimportance which it is possible to debate too minutely." The plain fact is that the Liberal Party to-day stands for the rejection of the proposed constitution in exactly the sense in which the Congress itself stands for it.—*The Tribune*.

IS S. I. SOCIETY POLITICAL OR SOCIAL ?

The following letter from the London correspondent of this paper was recently sent by him to the Daily Telegraph of London for publication :

SIR,—In a footnote to the Reuter message from Poona, reporting the views of the Servants of India Society on the recommendations of the Joint Select Committee, it is stated that "The Servants of India Society is a social movement which has done a great deal of educative and social work in the villages. It is non-political."

I refer you to the following extract from the constitution of the Society, as settled in 1905 by the late Mr. G. K. Gokhale, its founder and first President, adopted by its members, and carried out by them in the spirit of national missionaries ever since:

"The Servants of India Society will train men prepared to devote their lives to the cause of the country in a religious spirit, and will seek to promote, by all constitutional means, the national interests of the Indian people. Its members will direct their efforts principally towards (1) creating among the people, by example and by precept, a deep and passionate love of the Motherland, seeking its highest fulfilment in service and sacrifice; (2) organizing the work of political education and agitation, basing it on a careful study of public questions, and strengthening generally the public life of the country; (3) promoting relations of cordial goodwill and co-operation among the different communities; (4) assisting educational movements, especially those for the education of women, the education of the backward classes, and industrial and scientific education; (5) helping forward the industrial development of the country; (6) the elevation of depressed classes."

From the foregoing, it will be clear that the Society is certainly not "non-political," and its weekly organ, the *SERVANT OF INDIA*, is a powerful influence in the formation and formulation of Indian political opinion. The present head of the Society is, not the Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, as stated, but Mr. G. K. Devadhar, C. I. E.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- WHAT NEXT? By K. F. NARIMAN. (The Bombay book Depot, Bombay 4.) 1934. 19cm. 368p. Re. 1.
THE WORK OF RURAL RECONSTRUCTION IN THE MYSORE STATE AND BRITISH INDIA: FURTHER REFLECTIONS AND THOUGHTS. By G. RUDRAPPA. (The Public Library, Bangalore.) 1935. 16cm. 50p. As. 4.