

The Servant of India

Editor : S. G. VAZE.

Office : SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY, POONA.

VOL. XIX, No. 11. }

POONA—THURSDAY, MARCH 12, 1936.

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

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	131
ARTICLES :—	
The Ottawa Agreement—VIII. By D. R. Gadgil, M. A., M. Litt.	124
Forcing the Issue of Revision.	126
Trade Treaty Between India and U. S. A. By P. Kodanda Rao.	128
REVIEWS :—	
Recent Economic Thought. By B. N. Adarkar, M. A.	129
Prafulla Chandra Ray. By D. Seshagiri Rao.	130
Problem of the British Empire. By Prof. S. R. Sharma, M. A.	130
SHORT NOTICES.	131
MISCELLANEOUS :—	
A Great Servant of India. The <i>Social Service</i> <i>Quarterly's</i> tribute to Mr. Devadhar's memory.	131

Topics of the Week.

Break the Circle.

OUR comments on the views of Sir Shanmukham Chetty on the power which the British Government is supposed to have of vetoing the introduction of responsible government in the States have met, as was only to be expected, with approval of British Indian journals. But we must confess we had not expected to receive the support of journals conducted in the interest of the Indian States. An agreeable surprise met us however in the columns of *United India and Indian States*, which wrote as follows in its issue of 29th February :

In British India the existence of the States is often given as an excuse for not giving Indians responsibility in such matters as defence, etc. Curiously enough, here we have an enlightened Dewan in an enlightened State, with a Ruler sympathetic to popular aspirations and even agreeable to further popular reform of the administration, confessing that the relationship with the Paramount Power is a hindrance in the way of the free development of even the limited constitutional development possible in the States. It seems to us that here we are in a vicious circle and the solution is to cut it.

WE agree that this vicious circle must be broken. But how does our contemporary propose that it should be done? The States have it in their power to give a quietus to the theory by which British Indian self-government is placed at their mercy. They can say—or rather unsay what they have said at the Round Table Conferences and the Joint Select Committee—

that their consent is not necessary for the transfer of defence or of paramountcy rights over themselves to popular control, whether in British India or federated India. They can also assert their right, instead of taking refuge behind a supposed or real veto of the British Government, to introduce popular government in their territories, and, if necessary, take the help of British Indians in surmounting any difficulties that may in fact arise. But it is too much to hope that *United India's* patrons will agree to it.

Mr. Jinnah's Peace Mission.

IT would be too much to describe Mr. Jinnah's mission of peace in connection with the Shahidganj impasse as having been an unqualified success. At the same time it cannot be denied even by his worst opponents that he has succeeded at least in bringing about a communal truce at Lahore. When he consented to act as a peace-maker, the situation was so full of difficulties that Mr. Jinnah was generally believed to be venturing upon an impossible task. That he has been able to achieve as much as he has done testifies to his tact and sound commonsense in handling men and things, for which he is justifiably noted.

HE foresaw that what was essential for the success of his efforts was a peaceful atmosphere and made a withdrawal of the Muslim satyagraha a condition precedent to his interesting himself in the Shahidganj affair. This done, his appeal to the Government for the release of the interned or imprisoned leaders of the movement evoked a ready response. All this was by way of preparation for his negotiations with the different communities with a view to finding a *via media*. The negotiations themselves lasted for nearly a fortnight but have proved inconclusive for the time being.

THIS is a matter for genuine regret to all well-wishers of the country. But there is no need to throw up our hands in despair. Mr. Jinnah himself being unable to stay on in Lahore indefinitely, the task has been entrusted to a representative committee which will explore the possibilities of a settlement satisfactory and honourable to all the parties concerned in an atmosphere free from communal bitterness. From reports coming from Lahore, it appears probable that the compromise will be somewhat on the following lines. The Muslims will waive their demand for a new mosque being erected on the site of the old one which was situated within the precincts of the Shahidganj Gurudwar, but will insist that the site should be left unused. The Sikhs for their part will express regret to the Muslims for having been the cause of wounding their susceptibilities and will promise to raise no sort of superstructure on the plot of ground in dispute.

All well-wishers of the country will doubtless wish god speed to the committee in its peaceful labours.

The Deccan College.

STRONG non-official pressure was exerted on the Government for securing the re-opening of the Deccan College by means of a token cut moved in the course of the consideration of the Budget by the Bombay Legislative Council. Two recent happenings may be said to have brightened somewhat the prospects of the revival of that educational institution. The one is the separation of Sind leading to an improvement in the finances of the Presidency and the other is the legal veto on the sale of the College buildings involved in the late Mr. Nanavati's judgment. But whether the College is to be immediately re-opened or not depends very largely upon whether Government are prepared to treat the judgment of the Poona District Court as the last word on the subject. It transpired in the course of the debate that on that point their mind was still not made up. Though nearly two months have passed since Mr. Nanavati delivered his judgment, the complexities of the case, it was explained, had not enabled them to arrive at any decision on the subject. A suggestion which found general acceptance was in favour of running the College at comparatively less cost than before by engaging a staff not so highly paid as the old one. It was also strongly pressed on the Government that the possibilities of conducting the institution, not by Government themselves but by the agency of a non-official educational association, should be carefully explored. If the College is to be brought to life again, there is no doubt that a non-official agency will prove less costly than Government agency for running it.

An Iniquitous Arrangement.

THE iniquity of the Government of India keeping in their own hands the right of the final selection of the head of a transferred department, viz. the Medical Department was exposed by means of another token cut. The control of the Department is, under the present regime, completely transferred to a popular Minister, who is however precluded from choosing its administrative head! The local Government enjoyed the right of having a Surgeon-General of their own choice till 1928 when the Government of India usurped it for themselves, not, it was pointed out, without a protest by the Bombay Government. This innovation was defended on the ground of the Central Government being in a better position to judge of the claims of senior officers in all provinces to such prize posts.

THE demurrer of the Bombay Government did not pass altogether unheeded. The sop was thrown to them of their being allowed to submit their say with regard to a panel of three names from which the final choice was to be made. While this is a better plan than the Government of India foisting on the local Government any man of their choice without even so much as 'by your leave' or previously sounding them as to the acceptability of their choice, it can never be a substitute for the local Government appointing whomsoever they liked. And we cannot believe that the Bombay Government have reconciled themselves to their being deprived of that valued privilege. We are however bound to say that the Minister's hesitation to agree to a suggestion to send a report of the debate to proper quarters appears unaccountable to us. The debate was, if anything, calculated to strengthen his hands in fighting for the restoration of the power of appointing their own Surgeon-General to

the local Government. Why in these circumstances he should have made the least difficulty about giving effect to the suggestion we are frankly unable to see. Eventually too he did not promise definitely to send the report to the Government of India but only to consider whether this could or should be done!

Dr. Jivraj Mehta and Medical Relief.

IN his presidential address to the Khandesh Medical Practitioners' Conference Dr. Jivraj N. Mehta developed his ideas relating to a method of relieving pressure on the hospital accommodation in the bigger towns like Bombay, Poona and Ahmedabad. According to him, about half the patients seeking admission to these hospitals hail from the mofussil, and in a way encroach upon the limited hospital accommodation primarily intended for local people to the great inconvenience of the latter. If this mofussil exodus could be stopped, the number of beds at present available in the existing hospitals could be made to serve local needs more adequately and satisfactorily.

HOW is this to be done? Dr. Mehta suggests that district hospitals should be improved by the appointment of a competent staff and an increase in the bed accommodation and taluka hospitals should be converted into cottage hospitals. With the growth in the number of qualified medical practitioners, Dr. Mehta thinks it should not be difficult to man the district hospitals with staff possessing the required qualifications. The possibility of handing over district hospitals and dispensaries to local bodies may also, he suggests, be seriously considered.

THIS arrangement is of course open to the objection that, owing to the meagreness of their resources, local bodies might not find it possible to maintain these institutions in their present efficient condition. Dr. Mehta has indeed anticipated this objection, for he does not contemplate that Government is to be relieved of all financial responsibility in regard to hospitals so transferred to local bodies. As a matter of fact he insists upon Government continuing to contribute towards their upkeep to the extent of their present expenditure upon them, so that such additional funds as may be found by local bodies for purposes of medical relief would obviously be over and above what is spent on that object under existing arrangements. We hope Dr. Mehta's suggestion, which appears to be quite feasible, will receive from the authorities the consideration which its importance for the welfare of the presidency deserves.

Indians in Malay.

A MEETING of the Standing Emigration Committee is shortly to be held. Among the matters that are to be submitted for its consideration is the important question of the continuance or otherwise of the scheme of assisted emigration. Whether the exemption of the Malay Government from the operation of the rule requiring it to maintain a definite sex-ratio amongst Indian emigrants is to be renewed also forms part of its agenda. The circumstances in which such a concession came to be granted to the Malay Government have never, to our knowledge, been officially explained, nor is it known whether the Government of India had obtained the approval of the Standing Emigration Committee to its action in granting it. Be that as it may, we are confident that Indian opinion will not look with favour upon any proposal to grant a fresh lease of life to the exemption. The reasons for the

insistence upon a definite sex-ratio being maintained among Indians emigrating to Malay have, as can be easily imagined, a good deal to do with the maintenance of Indian morals at a high level. It follows as a corollary that to release the Malay Government from its obligations under that rule is to help in the lowering of the moral standards of the Indian community in Malay. Loud complaints are heard that a relaxation of the operation of the rule has led to this evil result. We trust the Legislature's Standing Emigration Committee will not agree to be a party to such action.

A REFERENCE to the attitude of the Malay Government to the question of the eligibility of Indians for Government appointments may not be out of place here. In reply to a question in the Malay Legislative Council it was stated that "there was no justification for the creation of an administrative service open to non-Malays." To this reply strong objection was subsequently taken by the Indian representative, Mr. Veerasamy, who pressed for an assurance that Indians permanently settled in Malay would be on a par with the Malays themselves in regard to entry into Government service. He made it clear that by "domiciled communities" he meant only members of those non-Malay races "who have been settled here for more than one generation, whose children and children's children have been born here, who have no other country but this to call their own, who have severed all connection with the country of their origin, and who, in short, have adopted this country as their home, their only home." He also made prominent mention of the fact that a bar of the kind which obtains in Malay does not hold good even in Great Britain where any person born on British soil, whatever his race, is regarded as eligible for any appointment under the Crown. This, however, did not prevent the High Commissioner from proclaiming his opposition to any "proposals for the appointment of non-Malays to administrative posts in the Federation." There can be no doubt that the Malay Government's attitude in regard to this question is very unsatisfactory and disappointing. It is for the Standing Emigration Committee to consider whether a Government which treats Indian nationals so shabbily in regard to appointments under its control deserves any consideration at its hands.

Centres of Communal Poison.

THE budget debate in the Punjab Legislative Council was noteworthy for the emphasis generally laid on the undesirability of communal schools. Even more striking was the fact that the Education Minister, a Mahomedan, expressed his cordial agreement with the sentiment. That such schools were doing a great deal of harm to the country was readily conceded by him. If they could be closed down, it was clear that he for one would not waste a tear over it. But since such action was obviously out of the question in the present circumstances, there was nothing for it but to tolerate them.

THE amount spent on grants to these schools in the Punjab is about Rs. 12 lakhs a year. As the schools are not to be abolished, these grants have got to be continued. Even so the Minister deserves thanks for one thing. During the time he has held the Education portfolio, he has, he pointed out, prevented any addition to the list of communal schools. By this means he has helped to prevent the spread of communalism. The Minister's angle of vision towards these schools is such as would do credit to any nationalist, for he described them as so

many "centres of spreading the communal poison." His progressive nature can also be judged from his desire to do everything possible to promote female education. Whenever funds became available, he said he would give preference to the claims of girls' education in their distribution. The fact that despite financial stringency two women's colleges were recently opened in the Punjab also goes to show the Minister's solicitude in the cause of female education.

Closer Union or Merger?

THE Kenya Europeans' demand for a Closer Union of the East African territories was unmistakably turned down by the Secretary of State last year. But the rebuff has apparently not disheartened them. They are once again busy pressing their case on the attention of the British Government. A memorandum has recently been addressed to the Secretary of State on their behalf in which an attempt, though an unsuccessful one, is made to meet the arguments advanced by him against the suggested scheme.

ONE of the grounds on which the proposal was rejected by the Secretary of State was that of finance. The cost of the proposal was estimated to amount to £34,000. Its prohibitive cost was itself in the present circumstances such a conclusive argument against it that even if it had been otherwise desirable, it could no longer be thought of: The Europeans' way out of the difficulty is surprisingly simple. If you cannot have closer union, say they in effect, why not go ahead with unification, which will considerably save administrative costs? This is by no means a far-fetched interpretation of their intentions as expressed in their memorandum. In point of fact, they plead for "a unified government of the three territories under one Governor, a form of government which would avoid the unnecessary triplication of the many posts and services so evident today." To describe this as closer union is to bamboozle public opinion by the deliberate use of misleading phraseology. Would not "merger" be a more correct appellation?

THE want of unanimity even amongst Europeans about the desirability of the proposed step naturally made the Secretary of State pause and think twice before lending his support to the scheme. The Europeans on the other hand think that he has needlessly magnified these differences. The fact that the Europeans do not altogether deny their existence is what really matters. That they choose to make no reference whatever to the Indian and native opposition to the proposed measure is quite in keeping with their well-known ideas about their own racial superiority as compared with other races. Anyway disinterested opinion will not blame the Secretary of State for his refusal to disturb the status quo when so much diversity of view was noticeable.

Excise Administration in Bombay.

WRITERS of excise administration reports of the Bombay Presidency in the early years of the present regime used to be in the habit of paying at least lip-homage to prohibition. But even that outward form seems to have been dispensed with in more recent reports. To this general rule the excise report for 1933-34 is no exception. Not only is there nothing in it which would even remotely serve as a reminder to the reader about prohibition being the ultimate aim of the Government's excise policy; but the

official anxiety to make the people forget everything about it is writ large throughout the report.

AND even the excise measures adopted during the year appear to be designed to take the Presidency away from that goal. True, consumption of country liquor shows a small, though welcome, decrease, so far as the Presidency proper is concerned. But in Sind, on the other hand, it went up by as much as about 9,500 gallons in a single year at a stretch and by as much as 50 per cent.; from 72,000 to 108,000 gallons, during the last four years, which is without doubt a very alarming increase.

BUT even apart from this broad fact, the increase in the number of shops, though happily not very considerable, and the extension of their closing time even by so much as half an hour—and that too in cities like Bombay and Ahmedabad where the poor people need all the protection from the temptation that can be given to them—and similar other measures argue an anxiety on the part of Government more to minister to the drinker's needs than to bring prohibition nearer.

THE opening of new shops was preceded, we observe, by consultations with the Excise Advisory Committees, wherever this was legally enjoined. A little reflection will, however, show that this process is little better than a formality which might as well not have been gone through. This view need not be affected by the statement in the report that the percentage of the Committees' recommendations carried into effect was as high as 83.5. For in the one respect that matters, viz. opening of new shops and closure of old ones, their recommendations were consistently ignored. Let it be noted that this is not a mere inference from the contents of the report. An admission to this effect is embodied in the statement on p. 6: "Many of the rejected recommendations proposed closure of shops." If the Government wishes the public to believe that the recommendations of these Committees are shown all possible respect, the proper way of doing so is not by pointing to the percentage of their recommendations given effect to but to the percentage of recommendations dealing with the closing and opening of shops, that were translated into action.

THE OTTAWA AGREEMENT.

VIII.*

"Where, however, important and influential nations are concerned which can command the acquiescence of weaker nations in less rigid interpretations of this principle of competitive equality much progress is possible. Perhaps the Ottawa agreements of 1932 in which Great Britain, her colonies and self-governing dominions all participated are a case in point. But if these Ottawa pacts illustrate the possibility of a wide extension of areas enjoying comparatively unimpeded trade they also clearly indicate the underlying conditions necessary for success. There is no need here to review the results of the Ottawa Conference and assess its value to the mother country and to the dependencies. But it would not be easy to refute the criticism that this series of trade agreements between the several parts of the British Empire have been trade-diverting rather than trade-enlarging in their effects. Moreover, they demand sacrifice on the part of some of the participants which in the long run may prove to be intolerable"—Prof. J. G. Smith "Economic Nationalism and International Trade", December 1935.

THE above quotation from the Presidential Address of Prof. J. G. Smith to Section F of the British Association brings out clearly the nature of the agreements entered into at Ottawa. The Ottawa scheme has not been of India's seeking, and Imperial Preference as a general policy has always been held to be not in the interests of India whether by Lord Curzon's Cabinet or the majority of the Fiscal Commission. It was because U. K. imposed import duties to attain to a bargaining position with respect to the other countries that imperial preferential arrangements are said to have become necessary. For it is alleged that if we had not entered the Ottawa scheme we would have lost free access to the "world's most stable and largest open market". This involves the assumption that the Ottawa agreement between England and India reflects correctly the economic needs and bargaining position of the one with

respect to the other. We have already indicated how it is only in the case of few commodities like tea, linseed or tanned hides and skins that U. K. is a dominant market for our products. We are not in the position in which other Empire countries like Australia and New Zealand find themselves, that of having to look to and secure chiefly one—the U. K. market. Neither can we hope for such an extension of the U. K. market for our products as to absorb the bulk of them, even if such an absolute dependence on one market were not otherwise undesirable. We are under the necessity of having to sell a large variety of raw products to a large number of different countries. In some exports, most important from the point of view of the peasantry, such as raw cotton and rice, the U. K. market plays a most insignificant part. Whatever our anxiety, therefore, for keeping a hold on the U. K. market, we cannot afford to do anything which will jeopardise our position in the other important world markets for our products.

We have clearly shown above the strong position that many of our products hold in the U. K. market and the great importance of the majority of them to the U. K. manufacturer. Today when many industrial countries—U. K. prominently among them—seem to be in the midst of a process of economic recovery they must be specially anxious to obtain their raw materials tax-free. The "necessity of obtaining raw materials in the cheapest market" has been put forward as one of the safeguards against retaliation on India by non-British foreigners. Presumably this necessity operates with equal force on the British industrialists. In asking for a free entry for our products we shall thus be not calling for any special sacrifice on the part of the British consumer, producer or tax-payer. Apart from this our position when bargaining with U. K. is one of the strongest, as we are that country's most important market and the most considerable debtor. We have discussed in

* Previous articles in this series appeared in our issues of January 16, 23 and 30, February 6, 13 and 27 and March 5.

detail this aspect of the question above. Any obstacles that U. K. puts in the way of the expansion of Indian exports to that country can merely result in a contraction of our imports of British goods. Hence the U. K. manufacturer has need to be quite as anxious regarding our export trade as about our import trade. If bilateralism progresses apace our export surpluses will in due course entirely vanish; we must awake from now to the new situation that will soon confront us. It may not be possible for us to negotiate for an export surplus but we should at least attempt to maintain our trade relations with other countries lest their entire market slips away from us by stages. We must try to stabilise by trade treaties, at least at the lower level that bilateralism demands, our exports to these other countries.

An attempt has been made recently in a series of notes issued by the Director of Information on Trade Policies to draw a red-herring across the trail. These notes set out to compare the merits of various trade policies and emphasize the defects of the method of bilateral treaties comparing it specially with the application of the most-favoured-nation clause. In reply to such contentions it may in the first instance be pointed out that India is not in a position today to choose independently for herself her foreign trade policy. We are not in a position to set an example to the world and we must make the best of the international situation in which we find ourselves. Whatever our own wishes in the matter we must seek trade treaties with other countries if our failure to do so means an entire extinction of our trade with them. And that this is likely to happen we have proved above by reference to the course of our trade relations with Germany. Further in seeking trade treaties of this kind we shall only be following the most respectable precedents. That most right-minded of nations—the U. K.—has followed up Ottawa by a series of bilateral treaties with countries in all parts of the world. Canada has only recently negotiated an agreement with U. S. A. and Australia has sent delegations to many countries in the East for the purpose of these negotiations. U. S. A. has further shown how insistence on the application of the most-favoured-nation treatment can be combined with the technique of negotiating bilateral treaties. The supporters of the National Government in England have been at pains to show how the trade with countries with whom agreements have been concluded has increased specially rapidly. It would thus seem clearly necessary and desirable for us to follow this method. Government-inspired criticisms of these trade policies can only mean that they begin to wear a different aspect and have a different result east of the Suez. We are not advocating, we have always most strenuously opposed, the spread of further restrictionism. But when it becomes clear that our exports to other countries are dwindling rapidly, because our Government would not try and enter into trade treaty relations with them, we are surely justified in asking for an exploration of the means of formulating such treaties, and when it is clear that the general adoption of Imperial preference is

not called for in India's interests, and that the benefits we can receive therefrom are very small as compared with the sacrifices and the handicaps that it involves, we are surely justified in denouncing the Ottawa scheme.

In the management of bargains the positions of India and U. K. may be usefully contrasted. Each time U. K. has skilfully manipulated the tariff so as to benefit herself. The latest example of such manipulation was afforded by the way in which the duties on iron and steel imports into U. K. were temporarily put up to enormous heights in view of the negotiations with the International Steel Cartel and thus unexpectedly favourable terms were secured in the agreement of the U. K. producers with that body. On the contrary our Government is interested each time in favouring U. K. manufactures without any chance of obtaining a return, the latest example of this being Article 1 of the Indo-British treaty of 1935. It is difficult to understand why the Government of India should go out of its way to state that the normal Indian protective arrangements may be of a character so as to be preferential to U. K. It has all along been disputed by Indian publicists that the preferential element in our protective tariff has come in without any reference to U. K. interests and it has been repeatedly pointed out that the interest of the consumer could be protected without introducing this preference. But even if this contention were incorrect such a gratuitous admission, which is tantamount to deprecating on one's own motion the benefit of the preference granted to others, must be unique in bilateral trade treaties. It is not to be found in any British treaty with any Dominion, though it is obvious that the comparative competitive positions of the British and the non-British producers are the same in other countries as in India. And the great disparity in results may be emphasized by the fact that in the Indo-British trade treaty of 1935 the *free entry* into U. K. to Indian pig iron, the total value of which trade is in the neighbourhood of Rs. 20 lakhs, is balanced against the most substantial preferential treatment to British iron and steel imports into India worth nearly Rs. 3 crores. In the same way the preferential treatment to British imports of cotton piecegoods worth annually a good deal over Rs. 10 crores is often set off against the propaganda on behalf of Indian raw cotton exports to U. K. Cotton piecegoods and iron and steel are our most valuable import trades and the throwing away of these preferences in the supposed interests of the consumer can best be described as a result of the "acquiescence of a weaker nation" in a "less rigid interpretation of the principle of competitive equality."

If the fiscal autonomy convention is real and our Government, both disposed and able to use to the fullest our bargaining position, then the time has come in our opinion to change radically the structure of Ottawa so far as India is concerned. We have in our former publication shown how the position of India differs materially from that of the Dominions and how a general policy of Imperial preference is not in our interests. Whatever the

decisions taken by Dominion Governments, we on our part should not think of anything but a bilateral treaty within a strictly limited compass with U. K. And we should immediately follow the example of Australia and make energetic attempts to enter into trade agreements with other countries. In 1932 we wrote as follows on this question:

Mere trade bargains are innocuous, nay, they may in a large majority of cases be actually beneficial. And there is no reason why we should not enter into a trade bargain with any country because it happens to be a part of the British Empire. For example, if the Ottawa delegation had not gone beyond negotiating for a preference for tea and linseed and free entry for a few products like tanned hides and skins, pig iron or shellac as against, say, the existing preference on cotton piecegoods and iron and steel, the bargain could have been considered purely on its own merits. It would not have committed us specially towards either the United Kingdom or the British Empire and we could have had an entirely free hand in negotiating with other countries. But the Ottawa agree-

ment, with its long schedules, commits us to a general preferential policy and to the principle of exploring Empire buying as far as possible.... Either the policy of Imperial preference is meant to be lasting and in that case there are no advantages to India in joining this economic block and becoming even more dependent on and tied up to the United Kingdom than it is at present. Or the policy is conceived of as a temporary measure preparing the ground for world co-operation. Then in the latter case it is obviously necessary that we do not commit ourselves so deeply as to remould our economic activities on an Empire basis.

Changing circumstances may shift the emphasis from one trade to another; but all that has transpired since the ratification of the Ottawa agreement confirms our belief in the fundamental position we took up in 1932.

D. R. GADGIL.

(Concluded.)

FORCING THE ISSUE OF REVISION.

There is first of all the question of the demilitarisation of the Rhine. It is no use thinking that for long a great nation is going to submit to one of the greatest areas in its country being open to invasion by armed neighbours without having the right to defend itself. It is pure delusion to think that that can last. It has lasted some years but it cannot last in perpetuity, and unless that is remedied by consent it is going to be remedied in exactly the same way as the rearmament of Germany has been remedied, by Germany taking the law into its own hands and saying to its neighbours: "Now what about it?" Sooner or later that is inevitable, and statemanship in time has to discuss and negotiate about these things and try to get an agreement regarding the limitation of armaments.

THUS spoke the Marquess of Lothian in the House of Lords on 1st May of last year in pointing out the futility of investing treaties imposed by *force majeure* on vanquished countries with a sacrosanctity without providing reasonable means for their peaceful revision. We wish to place this quotation from a remarkable speech at the head of our article, for, in our opinion, that is the lesson to be drawn from the repudiation by Germany of the provisions of the Versailles Treaty and the Locarno Pact concerning the demilitarised zone in the Rhineland and resumption of this zone under her military protection. Lord Lothian instanced this question of the demilitarisation of the Rhine, with the questions of Austria, the Polish Corridor and the former German colonies, to point to the conclusion that, in the case of a treaty of extraordinary severity like the Treaty of Versailles, it was idle to think that we could enforce its terms against a country unless we were also prepared to soften the harshness of those terms and do some kind of justice to those upon whom we have inflicted defeat. In order to make effective Article 16 of the League Covenant which permits imposition of sanctions upon treaty-breakers,

we must make effective Article 19, which provides for pacific changes of treaties which have become obsolete. If no readiness is shown to meet legitimate complaints on the basis of reason and justice, infringements of treaties must be expected. "The reason of revolution inside a State," said Lord Lothian, "is that the legislature is unable to deal with the grievances of sections of the community in time"; similarly the reason for breaches of international law and resort to violence on the part of nations is that the world parliament is unwilling or unable to revise conditions which call for revision, but is ever anxious to retain the *status quo*, however, unjust or harmful. What in legal terms is covenanted justice becomes in these circumstances covenanted injustice, and the League becomes only a disguised military alliance of pre-war times, an alliance, as Lord Esher said on the same occasion, "of those nations who are satisfied with their position against those nations who are not satisfied with their position."

The immediate cause of this action on the part of Germany is the ratification of the Franco-Soviet Pact of Mutual Assistance by the French Chamber. It is Hitler's contention that it contradicts the Locarno Treaty which, unlike the Versailles "dictate", was freely negotiated and was fully accepted by Germany, inasmuch as it requires France even without the consent of the League Council in certain circumstances to enter into hostilities with Germany, whereas the Locarno Treaty prohibits France from attacking Germany without the consent of the Council. It is clear that there is no substance at all in this contention. For, in drafting the Pact care has been taken to see that no such conflict need arise. The explanatory protocol attached to the Pact expressly lays down that the provisions of the Treaty should not be carried out in any way which, being inconsistent with obligations of other treaties by

either of the parties, might expose one of them to sanctions of an international character. That is to say, according to the terms of the Pact, France will be entitled, and indeed bound, "to withhold action even in fulfilment of her evident obligations under the Pact should such action place her in the position of being the guilty party according to the terms of Locarno." On the face of it the Pact is defensive; it is within the framework of the League; and it is not exclusive, being open to adherence by other countries. In fact it is stated in the protocol that the original intention was to conclude a treaty of mutual assistance between Russia, France and Germany, under which each of them would have been pledged to assist any of them subjected to aggression by one of those three States. The protocol also states that this Pact is intended to complete the Eastern European Pact, proposed in 1934, between the countries of North-Eastern Europe (that is, Russia, Germany, Poland and the three Baltic States) and Czechoslovakia, France being its guarantor as Great Britain and Italy are guarantors of the Western European Pact concluded at Locarno. The Pact is thus, in its essence, France contends, a reciprocal agreement, and not a selective alliance against any country, or an old-style instrument of power politics.

While conceding this, however, it must be pointed out that the fact that one of the countries against which the Pact is directed is actually out of the Pact, though by its own choice, changes the whole character of the Pact. The Locarno Treaty was intended to give protection to certain countries which feared aggression, and they were all in it. The Eastern Pact was intended to include Germany and was to go into effect only if it included Germany. In commending the principles of this Pact to the support of the House of Commons, the then Foreign Secretary, Sir John Simon, said, on 13th July, 1934, "As a practical matter, Germany must be a member of the new combination if it comes about." If Germany was not in, the new arrangement would, he feared, look like building up one combination as against another, and that it would lead to a recrudescence of the old system of balance of power, which is now universally condemned. It is perfectly true that Germany is not excluded, that in fact she was invited to join the Pact, and that she has elected to stay out. It must also be admitted that the abstention—deliberate abstention—of Germany from a Pact which is intended to give a mutual guarantee to all on right principles places statesmen in a most difficult situation. But if, rightly or wrongly, Germany chooses not to join, the Franco-Soviet Pact is just as unobjectionable as the Locarno Pact is or as the Eastern Pact, as originally designed, would have been. Germany somehow objects to the undertaking of automatic commitments in the East; she is in favour of concluding Pacts of non-aggression; but against pacts of mutual assistance in the event of aggression. This may be an unreasonable attitude, but the character of the Pact in its present form gives

some ground for the fear which Germany entertains of being encircled. After all Germany's attitude is not materially different from Great Britain's. As Lord Allen remarked in the House of Lords on 7th May, 1934, "So far as the Eastern Pact is concerned, she (Germany) takes precisely the same position which this nation has taken before to all pacts, so far as pledging her word to take part in some action under circumstances which have not yet arisen. When I was discussing the Eastern Pact with the German Chancellor himself, he constantly referred to the British attitude so far as it was concerned with our becoming entangled in situations which we could not envisage and which we must allow to arise before we could commit ourselves to taking part in them. He said: 'In what respect is the attitude of my nation in a different moral category, so far as the Eastern Pact is concerned, from the position which your own nation has taken all the way through in regard to being entangled, as you call it, in situations in Europe?'"

The march of German soldiers into the Rhineland is undoubtedly a breach of the Versailles Treaty and the Locarno Treaty, and it will no doubt be dealt with as such by the League Powers. But this breach is nothing so serious as the breach of which she was guilty when she launched out on a programme of rearmament. Of all the contingencies that one can contemplate that of France being the victim of an unprovoked attack at the hands of Germany is the remotest at present. Germany may be censured, but a satisfactory settlement of the question will appear in sight only when nations will cease to judge Germany in the ideology of the Versailles Treaty. All the regional pacts that are being concluded are with the object of freezing the *status quo*; what is required is however an alteration in the status imposed upon Germany at Versailles. As the League Powers were forced to waive the letter of the disarmament provisions of the Versailles Treaty, so probably they will be forced to waive the letter of the demilitarisation provisions, and if Hitler's contingent of troops in the Rhineland is, as has been asserted, only symbolic, intended to assert Germany's right in the abstract to defend her own country, it will serve a good purpose too inasmuch as it will remind the League Powers of the need of a revision of the Versailles regime. A lasting and viable solution of the present difficulties lies in our moving away from this regime as rapidly as possible. Another lesson to be drawn from this incident is that instead of making individual pacts with countries in different regions—pacts which have all the marks of old-world alliances—the system of "collective security" must be organised in its integrity, each member State placing at the disposition of the League all the resources at its command according to need.

TRADE TREATY BETWEEN INDIA AND U. S. A.

I.

THERE is more than one reason why a trade treaty should be concluded between India and U.S.A. In view of the recent trade treaty between Canada and U.S.A., and the more recent reports that negotiations of an exploratory nature are afoot for a trade treaty between the United Kingdom and the United States, it seems opportune to consider the question of a trade treaty between India and the U.S.A.

At present there is no direct trade treaty between India and U.S.A. Replying to Sirdar Sohan Singh's interpellation in the Indian Legislative Assembly on 13th February 1934, the Hon. Sir Joseph Bore, on behalf of the Government of India, said:

There is no direct trade agreement between India and the United States of America, but there is a Convention of Commerce concluded as long ago as 1815 between His Britannic Majesty and the United States of America, Article 3 of which is applicable to India. The provisions of this Article are unilateral inasmuch as they make no stipulations for the treatment of Indian trade in the United States of America.

The chief purpose of the Convention was to provide a "reciprocal liberty of commerce" and the most-favoured-nation treatment as between the two countries. This purpose is secured in Articles I and II of the Convention. On the British side the scope of the two Articles is limited to "all the Territories of His Britannic Majesty in Europe."

India is mentioned only in Article III, and then only to give U.S.A. the most-favoured-nation treatment in India without, however, conferring a reciprocal advantage on India. Says the Article:

His Britannic Majesty agrees that the vessels of the United States of America shall be admitted and hospitably received at the principal settlements of the British Dominions in the East Indies *vide* licit, Calcutta, Madras, Bombay and Prince of Wales' Island, and that the citizens of the said United States may freely carry on trade between the said principal settlements and the said United States in all articles...

The Article does not confer on Indian citizens the right freely to carry on trade between India and U.S.A. That is why the Government of India characterized it as unilateral.

There is no reason to suppose that this discrimination against India, which continues to this day, is anything but a historical accident. None of the Articles of the Convention refers to Australia or South Africa either for reciprocal advantage or unilateral discrimination. "His Britannic Majesty's possessions in the West Indies and on the Continent of North America" are however expressly excluded from the scope of the Convention.

The discrimination against India cannot be due to the feeling in U.S.A. against Orientals. In the first place, the Convention was concluded when there was no Oriental immigration into U.S.A. In the second place, U.S.A. has trade treaties with China and Japan, notwithstanding that she has prohibited the immigration of the Chinese and the Japanese. Considering that the "Hindu problem" in U.S.A.

pales into insignificance by the side of the Chinese and the Japanese "problems," there is no reason to suppose that U.S.A. has had a special animus against India to prompt her not only to exclude "Hindu" immigration, but also to claim a unilateral advantage in India in matters of trade and deny reciprocal advantage to India in U.S.A.

Nor can it be due to the insignificance of the volume of trade between India and U.S.A. U.S.A. has trade treaties with Borneo, Ethiopia, Liberia and Siam, among other countries. The U.S.A. trade with the first three is apparently so insignificant, if there is any at all, that no mention of it is made in the official report on "Foreign Trade of the United States."

The trade between U.S.A. and Siam is but a fraction of the trade between U.S.A. and India as the following official figures show:

(In millions of dollars.)

	1929.	1930.	1932.	1933.	1934.
Exports to					
India	55.4	45.2	24.9	19.9	27.4
Siam	3.2	2.4	.7	.8	—
Imports from					
India	149.3	104.1	33.2	43.8	55.1
Siam	.5	.4	.1	.1	—

If the volume of trade between U.S.A. and countries like Siam, Ethiopia, Liberia and Borneo justifies trade treaties, there is an overwhelming case for a trade treaty between India and U.S.A.

Apart from this comparative aspect, the volume of trade between India and U.S.A. and the tendencies of that trade are significant, as the figures quoted above indicate. U.S.A. has consistently imported more from India than she exported to India, the imports being more than double the exports, except in 1932. In 1933 exports to British India amounted to 1.2 per cent. of the total exports from the United States and the imports from India amounted to 3.0 per cent. of the total imports into the United States. From the Indian side, imports into the United States formed 6.2 per cent. of the total Indian imports, and the exports to the United States formed 9.3 per cent. of the total Indian exports.

The volume of trade between U.S.A. and India is increasing, rather recovering from the depression since 1929. In the first six months of 1935 U.S.A. exports to India amounted to 15.6 million dollars and imports to 29.6 million dollars. From the point of view of U.S.A., India ranked nineteenth in the matter of exports and eleventh in the matter of imports.

II.

There is yet another reason why there should be concluded a trade treaty between India and U.S.A. as soon as possible. India is perhaps alone in being subjected to a disability which does not apply to any other people, white, black or brown. The Immigration Act of 1924 denies admission into U.S.A. to all those who are "ineligible" to naturalization. Under the Act of February 18, 1875, amending the Act of July 14th, 1870, naturalization is open only to

"aliens being free white persons, and to aliens of African nativity and to persons of African descent." And the Supreme Court of U.S.A. held that "a high-caste Hindu of full Indian blood" born in India was not a "white person" within the meaning of the naturalization law (261 U. S. 204 of 1923).

The same disability applies to most Asiatics, and in particular to the Japanese and the Chinese. It does not seem to apply to the Syrians, the Turks, the Armenians, the Persians and the Parsees.

The U. S. Immigration law, however, exempts certain defined people from the bar against entry, though not from naturalization. Among these are what are called "treaty-merchants." A treaty-merchant is "an alien entitled to enter the United States solely to carry on trade under and in pursuance of the provisions of a present existing treaty of commerce and navigation" (Sec. 3 (6)). Inasmuch as the United States has trade treaties with China, Japan, Siam and Borneo, *bona fide* merchants from these countries may enter the United States as "non-immigrants" and carry on trade, though the citizens of these countries are debarred from entering U.S.A. As there is no trade treaty between India and U.S.A., no Indian merchant may enter U.S.A. Merchants of the "white" and the "black" races may enter U.S.A. because of their racial qualifications; merchants of China, Japan and Siam may enter because of trade treaties, though racially ineligible. Merchants from India alone may not enter because they are racially ineligible, and there is no trade treaty between India and U.S.A.

Whether a trade treaty between India and U.S.A. to be concluded *hereafter* will place the Indian merchant on the same basis as the merchant from Japan and China under the existing Immigration law is not without some doubt. It is conceivable that the courts may hold that inasmuch as the statute speaks of the "present existing treaty", the rights secured thereunder will not accrue under treaties made *subsequent* to the passing of the Act in 1924.

Even so, a trade treaty between India and U.S.A. will confer a right on Indian merchants already in U.S.A., which, in view of the few and diminishing rights of Indians in U.S.A., may not be despised. At present no Indian, who is already in U.S.A. and who cannot be deported, can introduce his Indian wife or minor children. An amendment of U.S.A. Immigration Act of 1924, passed on 6th July, 1932, however, permits a treaty-merchant to introduce "his wife and his unmarried children under twenty-one years of age." This provision will give relief to but few Indian merchants, but India cannot afford to despise even trifling advantages.

To sum up. In the trade relations between India and U. S. A., India suffers from an unfair discrimination, though there is reason to believe that it was due to a historical accident and not due to any deliberate policy on the part of U. S. A. The merchants of U.S.A. have a unilateral advantage in India, and Indian merchants enjoy no reciprocal facilities in U.S.A. Indian merchants are denied rights in the U.S.A. which merchants from China,

Japan and Siam enjoy. U.S.A. has trade treaties with Borneo, Liberia and Ethiopia with which she has hardly any trade but not with India with which she had a volume of trade which is not negligible and which is increasing, and which she may well cultivate.

The fact that India is a subject country and her Government is a subordinate administration under the British Government need not stand in the way of a trade treaty between India and U.S.A. For, recently, a trade treaty was concluded between India and Japan, though, for diplomatic reasons, the treaty was signed in London between Great Britain and Japan.

P. KODANDA RAO.

New York.

26th Jan.

Reviews.

RECENT ECONOMIC THOUGHT.

TENDENCIES IN RECENT ECONOMIC THOUGHT. By BRIJ NARAIN. (University of Delhi.) 1935. 22cm. 213p.

"It is not my object in these lectures" says Prof. Brij Narain, "to give you a summary of recent discussions on economic theory. I am concerned with tendencies". There are only a few chapters in this book which really fulfil this promise. The author seems to have deliberately chosen the word "tendencies" which is either very subtle or very vague in its connotation.

Instead of dealing with the specific branches of science in which economic thought has reached a state of ferment as it were at the present moment, instead of even indicating in a nutshell the several fascinating fields of current research work such as the determination of value under monopoly or imperfect competition, the operation of the laws of changing returns, the nature of capital, the theory of price fluctuations, the new theories of international trade and international prices, the author has embarked upon a very lengthy and tiresome discussion of the most obvious tendencies in current economic practice such as the universal trend towards collectivism and authoritarian rule. Out of the ten chapters in this book only four deal with economic theories as such along with a good deal of superfluous matter and what is "recent economic thought" but the new developments in the theories of value, distribution and monetary policy that the leading economists in Europe and America are racking their brains over?

The first two chapters on Indian and American economic thought respectively add very little to the reader's knowledge of economics. The conflict between the institutionalist and the theorist which occupies the major portion of Chapter II is an old one and is now out of date, and no problem of immediate importance depends on the solution of it. One can indicate the value of the chapter on Value merely by stating that there is no reference in this to the epoch-making study of imperfect competition, which is the tendency in the recent thought on the subject, being in a sharp contrast with the classical tendency to concentrate on the idealistic theme of perfect competition, which started in the *Economic Journal* in the year 1931, and which inspired a bril-

liant controversy between Robertson, Figou, Robbins, Sraffa, Harrod, Mrs. Robinson and Jacob Viner.

The lecture on Money is equally behind the times. There are many presumptuous statements made in this chapter about the theories of Keynes and Robertson which will not bear a moment's examination. The author seems to hold the view that it is possible for prices to vary independently of changes in the quantity of money, velocity of circulation and volume of trade. Want of confidence in the existing currency may, for example, directly act on prices without the intervention of any of these factors. It is inconceivable how this can ever come about. It may be true that German prices used to rise instantaneously with a rise in the value of the dollar, even before there was any time for velocity to change. But such a rise was only anticipatory in nature. It could not be maintained unless there was ultimately a rise in velocity. The point is too simple to need any further explanation.

Chapters IV to VI comprise perhaps the most useful part of the book. In these the author has displayed considerable ability in critical economic analysis, the general discussion being conducted on a much higher plane than in the rest of the book. He brings his versatile knowledge of psychology and statistics to the service of economics and the very wide range of reading in a number of foreign languages which is revealed in these pages really compels admiration. At several places the learned Professor has enlivened his discussion by quotations from Sanskrit and Persian works.

The get-up of the book is simple but satisfactory.

B. N. ADARKAR.

PRAFULLA CHANDRA RAY.

LIFE AND EXPERIENCES OF A BENGALI CHEMIST, VOL. II. By PRAFULLA CHANDRA RAY. (Chuckervertty, Chatterjee & Co., Calcutta.) 1935. 22cm. 469p. Rs. 4.

THIS book is, in essence, an elaborate verdict on a century and a half of British rule of Bengal and incidentally of India, supported by a mass of material gleaned from diverse authorities. It is a document of historical value bearing the unmistakable impress of a man of science, to whom evidence which is beyond challenge, and more of it, is a first consideration. Its preparation has involved exhaustive research into the life and being of modern India and extensive reference to authors whose words are authoritative pronouncements. Dr. Ray, whose religion is the love of his country, has done more than mere justice to his self-imposed task.

The book is a scathing indictment of British rule in India: it records how and why the pitiful poverty, the appalling illiteracy and above all the utter helplessness of India's millions are traceable to the deliberate acts and the graver inaction of the development of the Indian Empire. Dr. Ray establishes the vital fact that the "Policy" of the rulers is the exploitation of the subject country for their own benefit. Whatever may be one's measure of agreement with the author's opinions, one cannot doubt his jealous love for the land of his birth.

This is the central core of the book. Around it are woven other themes for the consummation of which Dr. Ray has dedicated his life. His clarion call for the economic regeneration of the country through industrial development has been heard in remote corners of this vast continent. He is a prophet of the Swadeshi cult. "If you must smoke, smoke biris," he exclaims. Coffee and tea are not for the Indians. He has no use for "Western Civil-

ization." He pleads with child-like fervour and enthusiasm for a return to simplicity and constructive regeneration of the social, intellectual and economic life of the country. One perceives with perfect clarity the working of the mind which prompted the famous utterance "Science can wait but not Swaraj." Truly the grandest sacrifice was made, when Dr. Ray forsook the laboratory to preach the gospel of salvation through economic independence.

This volume belies its title in that it neither portrays the busy and fruitful life nor provides the rich experiences of its author. Dr. Ray has anticipated criticism in this direction rather inadequately in the third paragraph of the preface. The division of the book is somewhat arbitrary and there is a certain delightful but unscientific jumbling of ideas damaging the continuity of the theme, which renders it slightly hard for the average reader to follow. This is rather surprising.

There is a certain tinge of provincialism running through the book that, one wishes, were absent. Bengal is instanced more often than appears necessary. One may be prepared to concede that Bengal which generally leads the rest of India may not have been dealt with fairly. But does it matter when the whole country is grovelling in the dust? Is it fair that Dr. Ray who is a valiant son of India and who indeed is a noble citizen of the world should plead for Bengal with great insistence? When the great day of emancipation dawns, Bengal, mother of illustrious sons, will take her rightful place in the sun and make history as indeed she was making before this pall of darkness descended on her as on her sister provinces two centuries ago. The darkness will soon lift and make way for glorious light, and perpetual light.

This book will rank with Mahatma Gandhi's "Autobiography". The trumpet call of this sturdy champion of India's glory and her greatness will find an echo in the hearts of her millions. Posterity will treasure the message of this fearless patriot and derive strength and wisdom on their onward march to progress and happiness.

D. SESHAGIRI RAO.

PROBLEM OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE.

THE EMPIRE IN THESE DAYS. By R. COUPLAND. (Macmillan, London.) 1935. 20cm. 276p. 8/6.

THIS illuminating collection of lectures and essays by Professor Coupland is to be heartily welcomed for more than one reason. In the first place it contains a very frank statement of the well-informed opinions of one who can speak with authority on the subject he deals with. Secondly, it is valuable as revealing the trend of political thought in England today, at least in enlightened circles, regarding the future of the British Empire, especially its vital relations with its various component parts. This, as the author rightly stresses, "is a subject which no student of the modern world can ignore."

The book under review deals with the British Commonwealth of Nations, India, and the Tropical Dependencies of mid-Africa. But despite its wide range it does not "suffer from the lack of a continuous thread of argument" and "taken all together, it provides a fairly comprehensive and connected interpretation of the character and purpose of the great society to which we belong."

Professor Coupland writes with a deep faith arising out of his firm convictions. His outlook is genuinely liberal and is rooted in an earnest study of

documents as well as first-hand experience of the lands and peoples he writes about. In other words, he is an idealist whose vision does not fly away from realism and therefore does not ignore the hard facts of practical politics. This is evident in every page of the book whether he is dealing with Ireland, India or the Native Administrations in Nigeria. He steers clear of the shoals of extremism, both Left wing and Right wing, and maintains throughout a sane optimism regarding the future of the Commonwealth. He would sooner see the Empire disrupted than witness a return to Reactionaryism which "will go on saying that to recognize our fellow-citizens in the dominions as our equals is to disintegrate the Empire, that no terms should be made with Indian Nationalism except at the muzzles of machine-guns; that our duty to the Africans is to 'keep them in their place' as serfs of Europe."

Professor Coupland sees in the British Empire a practical demonstration of the soundness of the ideal of international and inter-racial amity and consolidation, and significantly asks, "If the British League of Nations dies, what other League of Nations will live?" He is at the same time not blind to its existing defects and points them out without mincing matters. He feels confident that if English liberal traditions should be maintained—he sees no reason why they should not—India and even Native Africa would in due time be 'assimilated' to the organization of Unity and Freedom, for which in his opinion the Empire has always stood.

His interpretation of "Dominion Status" is thought-provoking and his comparative study of its evolution within the Empire instructive. Indian readers will find particular interest in this part of the book.

Full justice cannot be done to so valuable a book within the compass of so short a review, but I cannot conclude without alluding to the delightful "snapshots" given by Prof. Coupland towards the close of his book which is throughout marked by clear thinking, careful examination of facts, sound judgment and fine expression.

S. R. SHARMA.

SHORT NOTICES.

THE FEDERATION OF INDIA. By P. R. LELE. (Bombay Book Depot.) 1936. xxxiv + 115p. Re. 1.

THIS book makes an impartial study of the new constitution. The author takes no sides. There is not the least intention on his part to cater for any political bias of the reader. He puts the whole problem clearly and critically, giving at the end a detailed survey of the whole Act.

In the introduction he makes a comprehensive analysis of the Federal Structure and Provincial Autonomy and compares very critically the main departures that the new constitution makes from the outgoing one. His criticism is always brief and enlightening. It explains in a word or a sentence the real substance of his argument. Remarking about the Governor-General's powers, he says, "Every part of the Constitution Act bristles with the expressions 'in his discretion,' and 'exercising his individual judgment', but every repetition of either of these expressions is a shadow of the Secretary of State." The whole of the introduction which is thirty-four pages long, makes an illuminating study of the real implications of the reservations and the safeguards contained in the Act. In the pages that follow the introduction the author has carefully condensed a

voluminous book such as the new India Act into readable matter extending over a hundred pages. Wherever the matter was found to be too valuable, it has been reproduced almost bodily from the Act. The book is written in simple and lucid English and replaces as far as possible all the legal jargon of the Act by expressions intelligible to all.

For the convenience of those who wish to keep and consult the book as a concise edition of the new Act, every part of it has been placed in the order of the corresponding part of the "Government of India Act, 1935."

The book aptly justifies its sub-title of "How India will be Governed", giving briefly a really useful synopsis of the new constitution with a running commentary wherever essential.

P. R. K.

WOMAN OF THE FUTURE. BY MARGARET SANGER. (Birth Control International Centre, London.) 1934. 18cm. 32pp. 6d.

THOUGH the book purports to be an essay by Margaret Sanger, more than half of it is occupied by a Preface by Michael Fielding and a life-sketch by Mildred Adams, both highly appreciative of her work in popularizing the birth-control movement, though she is admittedly not the pioneer as some people imagine. In her paper, she claims that no woman's movement in any country can keep itself aloof from sex reform and birth control, since "woman's bondage in the past as well as to-day is based solely on the biological task of child-bearing. Consequently until that function is under her complete control, woman can never hope to rise to the heights of her own spiritual destiny." If knowledge of birth control is denied, the result is abortion.

It is the opinion of competent medical observers during the last twenty-five years that there are more criminal abortions performed in the United States than in any other country in the world. The total of abortions, which does not include the number of those brought about by drugs and instruments used by the pregnant woman herself, has been estimated to top 2,000,000 per year. . . . Only through birth-control will women gain control of their bodies and develop their souls. . . . Only through a new consciousness of birth can humanity at large ever extricate itself from the man-made muddle in which it is grounded to-day.

R. D. KARVE.

Miscellaneous.

A GREAT SERVANT OF INDIA.

GOPAL KRISHNA DEVADHAR whose loss the whole of India mourns to-day may well be looked upon as one of the pioneers of the modern form of social service in India. The Social Service League of Bombay will cherish his memory as one of its founders whose services contributed in no small measure in building up the institution in the early stages of its growth. While others too cooperated in laying the foundation, it was Devadhar's dynamic personality that inspired his numerous co-workers to found a body dedicated to the pursuit of social service and especially the amelioration

of the condition of the working and depressed classes. This was in the year 1911, six years after Devadhar became one of the original members of the Servants of India Society and had pledged himself to dedicate his life to the service of the country. Devadhar's connection with the League continued until the last, but owing to his having transferred his sphere of activities to Poona and with the extension of these activities all over India he had ceased to be directly associated with the League. All his life, however, Devadhar remained a social servant, first and last, making the pursuit of social service in the widest sense his prime interest. In organising work for the relief of suffering he had few equals, and for a period of thirty years there was no major calamity occurring in India, the ravages of which he did not seek to diminish by organizing missions of relief, composed both of men and women. The cause of the depressed classes he acclaimed as his own, and by example, by precept, by service, he faithfully carried out the behest of the founder of the Servants of India Society that a member of the Society should recognise no distinction of caste or status both in the performance of his duties and in his daily life. In fact, the lower down the people in the scale of society the greater was his attachment to their cause, and the more intense his zest for their service. Social service has had numerous adherents in modern India, but Devadhar towered above these all, first because of the range of his service to humanity but more because of the spirit of humility which animated him throughout his public career.

The All-India Women's Conference at its recent session held at Trivandrum paid a well-deserved tribute to Mr. Devadhar's services to the cause of women's emancipation. These services were indeed unique, for great as has been the contribution made by

several eminent men to the cause of women's progress in India, from the point of view of practical achievement, Devadhar's work at the Poona Seva Sadan is of outstanding merit. This work had very humble beginnings, but the Poona Seva Sadan was fortunate in having at its head in its formative stages such distinguished personalities as Mrs. Ramabai Ranade and Devadhar. This last quarter of a century has witnessed the institution grow from strength to strength under Devadhar's inspiring leadership, and today it is a vital force in the social life of Maharashtra. For the status it has acquired and for the splendid edifice that has been built up no one laboured harder than Devadhar, although he always loved to share the credit with his co-workers, especially the pioneer women workers, without whose loyal support and devoted services he too could have made little progress. Institutions there are in plenty, even in India, with vaster resources and with a galaxy of talent at their beck and call; but few there will be that can compare with the Poona Seva Sadan in the extent of the transformation, both social and economic, that its activities have wrought among the women of Maharashtra. What is noteworthy is that all this has been achieved on the basis of organised self-help and that charity has been directed merely to the devising and discovery of suitable avenues for the employment of the latent talents of the women of the province. If Devadhar had lived longer he would have seen to it that this truly beneficent work was extended to all the nooks and corners of Maharashtra and that it reached all the strata of society. The task that he failed to complete it should be the duty of his co-workers to carry to fruition, with the willing assistance and support of those vast sections of the community who mourn his loss and who would wish to see his memory perpetuated in some tangible form.—*The Social Service Quarterly.*

SUPREME FOR YEARS SUPREME TO-DAY— QUALITY ALWAYS TELLS



Mysore Sandalwood Oil B. P. quality, the finest in the world, is perfectly blended and milled by a special process with the purest ingredients to make.

Mysore
Sandal Soap

"It's good through and through
to the thinnest water"

Available Everywhere.

GOVERNMENT SOAP FACTORY,
BANGALORE.