

# Servant of India

Editor : S. G. VAZE.

Office : SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY, POONA.

VOL. XIX, No. 17. }

POONA—THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1936.

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

## CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK ... ..	193
ARTICLES :—	
The Congress Session ... ..	196
Observance of Law and Revision of Law ...	197
Fifty Years of the Congress. By R. G. Pradhan ...	199
REVIEWS :—	
Baroda. By Dr. E. Asirvatham. ... ..	200
The India That is India. By P. A. S. ... ..	201
Mercantilism. By Prof. T. M. Joshi, M. A. ...	201
Problem of Broadcasting. By R.E. ... ..	202
Communism. By Prof. R. V. Oturkar, M. A. ...	203
SHORT NOTICES. ... ..	204
BOOKS RECEIVED. ... ..	204

## Topics of the Week.

### Change of Viceroyalty.

THE public in India do not take over much interest in the personality of the Viceroy these days. To a limited extent Viceroys can of course leave the impress of their individuality upon the administration, but for the most part they are but cogs in the machine. Lord Willingdon was particularly so. Whatever liberal sympathies he might have had, they were crushed out while enforcing the iron policy of Sir Samuel Hoare. Of constitutional questions he had little understanding, and he took little interest in them.

THE new Viceroy, Lord Linlithgow, is a man of much greater intellectual stature, and even if he were imbued with larger sympathies for India's political aspirations than he can justly claim he would be able to achieve little in the way of allaying the grave discontent that stalks the country. Nothing could be more illusory than his hope to lessen popular discontent by implementing the new constitution. Sir Chimanlal Setalvad and Mr. Jinnah have done well in disabusing his mind of this notion.

THE Viceroy says in effect: "Whatever your doubts and objections to the constitution might have been, it is now passed. Put your doubts and objections on one side therefore, and work it for what it is worth. For, after all, the constitution is of the joint making of India and Britain." Sir Chimanlal and Mr. Jinnah contest every one of these propositions. They say that the constitution is a *dictat*; that the Indian people bear no responsibility of any kind or degree for it; and that if they will work it they

will work it in such a way that Lord Linlithgow would consider non-co-operation preferable to it.

### MR. JINNAH says :

Surely, His Excellency must have some information that the scheme of so-called provincial autonomy is not acceptable to the people, and that "the natural crown" of all-India Federation has been totally condemned by every section of public opinion. His pronouncement amounts to this: "The British Parliament has forced the constitution upon India, and therefore, we must accept it." It is not a question of doubts nor half-heartedness. It is not a question of this or that element in the plan of constitutional reforms which Parliament has forced upon us. It is a vital and a fundamental difference of basic principles with regard to the central scheme. And the opposition to the provincial scheme is to the most highly objectionable features which render real autonomy nugatory.

### Liberals & the New Constitution.

THE U. P. Liberal Conference which recently met at Fyzabad has declared its "strong condemnation of and opposition to" the new constitution in no uncertain terms. Nevertheless it has called upon public-spirited persons to take part in the elections. If the constitution is so bad, why try to work it by entering the legislatures set up under it? it may be asked. An explanation of this seeming inconsistency in its attitude is given in the resolution itself passed by it.

IT is not as if the Liberal party is opposed in principle to a policy of boycott of the legislatures. It is all a question of what is feasible and practicable. Left to itself the party would have preferred a boycott of the "reformed" legislatures. At the same time it knows equally well from past experience that "an effective boycott is an impossibility." There is also the danger of reactionaries and communalists getting into seats of power and using their opportunities to the detriment of national interests. This danger too must be guarded against. It is considerations such as these that have impelled the Liberal party to desist from adopting an attitude of non-co-operation in the working of the Hoare constitution. But its co-operation is not by any means intended to perpetuate this utterly unprogressive constitution. If any Liberals are so fortunate as to succeed in the election, they would be expected so to plan their work in the legislatures as to secure the replacement of the new unacceptable constitution by one in accord with popular wishes.

MR. CHINTAMANI who moved the resolution in a vigorous speech made no secret of his preference

for a boycott of the legislatures "if that could possibly be organised." Proceeding further, he said :

The Liberal Government in England in 1906 proposed a measure called the Irish Councils Bill as a substitute for the full instalment of Home Rule to which the Liberal party had been committed and which the Irish Nationalists had been demanding. A Convention was held in Dublin of all Irish nationalists which unanimously recorded a resolution for the rejection of the Bill that was offered to Ireland. That resolution was taken seriously by his Majesty's then Government and they withdrew that Bill immediately and both parties waited for a propitious moment for the introduction of a full Home Rule Bill. If conditions in India were anything like what they in Ireland were at that time, if they could see any chance of an effective boycott of the coming legislatures, he did not in the slightest degree hesitate to make the confession that he would have strongly advocated to the Liberal party a policy of boycott. Their resentment at the insulting nature of the new constitution was so strong that a boycott would not only have been the manliest but also the most useful course.

#### Waste of Public Money.

THE banquet given by the Indian Princes in honour of Lord Willingdon at Delhi was held in a shamiana specially put up for the occasion. The Imperial Hotel where the banquet was arranged boasts of more than one spacious hall; but Lord Willingdon's princely hosts rejected them in favour of a shamiana. It was used only for a couple of hours but is said to have cost as much as Rs. 10,000 ! Writing in the *Bombay Chronicle* under the above caption, Prof. K. T. Shah passes the following criticism on this extravagance on the part of the Princes. He says :

But who cares for such trifles? The tax-payer in the Indian States has no voice; and when the natural guardians of his interests—the Maharajas—are themselves the chief actors in this extravaganza, who can defend them? And think of his money being wasted in such ways! Even the Indian National Congress seems yet to be apathetic towards the conditions in the Indian States.

#### "Window-Dressing" in State Accounts.

NOTICING the Jamkhandi State administration report last year we drew pointed attention to the high proportion—15 per cent.—which the palace expenses bore to the total revenue of the State. It had also been pointed out by us that if items of expenditure which should legitimately have been debited to the palace account, but were not, were added to the expenses charged to the palace, the proportion would actually be found to be still higher. The budget that was presented to the State Legislative Council last week does not happily provide for any increase in the ruler's privy purse. But instances of subterfuges adopted with a view to preventing the palace expenditure appearing excessive were given in the course of the budget debate by non-official representatives in the Council.

THE thread ceremony of the ruler's son seems to have been celebrated in the course of last year. There can hardly be any question that the ceremony was a purely personal affair of the Rajasahib and any expenses incurred on its account should consequently have been borne out of the ruler's privy purse. But, strange to say, the expenditure on account of the ceremony was included under the head "charities." By a similar process of queer reasoning the expenses connected with the Governor's visit were also put down under the same head. These instances

show that the compilation of the State accounts is not based on any recognised system of accounting, but seems designed with the sole purpose of making the figure of the ruler's personal expenses appear less imposing than it really is. This kind of "window-dressing" would land the management of a business concern in serious legal trouble, but is resorted to with impunity by the generality of the princes!

IN the present case there was absolutely no justification for saddling the revenues of the State with expenditure on what was fundamentally a domestic affair of the Ruler, pure and simple. We are not sure whether the same can be said about the other item. But why in the name of common sense show the expenses connected with the Governor's visit as a charitable gift? Why fight shy of showing them separately as such? The tax-payer will then be able to appreciate the better how the revenues contributed by him are expended. But this wrong classification of the items of State expenditure has the effect of bamboozling him. The only way of putting a stop to such abuses is to institute a system of independent audit. If the States are unwilling to introduce the reform of their own volition, advice to that effect from appropriate quarters will, we may hope, not fail to achieve the desired result.

#### Nomination in place of Election in Fiji.

WE are glad that at the instance of the Hon'ble Mr. Sapru the Council of State has recorded its unanimous protest against the proposal to substitute nomination for election in the constitution of the Legislative Council in Fiji. It is also gratifying to learn from Sir Jagadish Prasad's speech that the Government of India have already represented to proper quarters the strength of Indian opinion against the reactionary move. It came out in his speech that the fear of Indian domination on the part of the non-Indian races inhabiting Fiji was the cause of the present crusade against election in that island.

ON a careful examination of the situation in Fiji, however the fear will be found to be lacking in foundation. In the first place it is necessary to remember that Fiji is a Crown Colony which conducts its administration according to the dictates of the British Government. This presupposes the existence of a Government majority in the local legislature. In Fiji, as our readers need hardly be reminded, the Legislative Council has a permanent official majority, 13 officials as against 12 non-officials, half of whom again are Europeans. It must be said to the credit of the Europeans that some of them are on the side of Indians in their opposition to the proposal of doing away with election. But in other cases they may be trusted to side with the Government and prove a tower of strength to it. In face of these facts it hardly needs saying that the fear referred to above is utterly groundless.

BUT the Government of India did not base their opposition to the proposal on this ground alone. Their plea also was the lack of trial for a sufficiently long period to the existing constitution. As is known to our readers, the present constitution was brought into operation in 1929, i. e. only seven years ago. The period is obviously too short to justify any modification if it is to be backed by reliable results of the working of the present regime. Both the considerations urged against the proposal by the Government of India will generally be looked upon as conclusive.

### Removal of Illiteracy.

A RESOLUTION was recently brought forward before the Council of State which asked for "immediate and effective steps" for the banishment of mass illiteracy. The resolution could by no means be said to have been moved in ignorance of the present constitutional arrangements under which provincial Governments are made responsible for the spread of education. But the mover represented the general public disappointment at the lack of progress made in the educational field by the provinces during the last fifteen years. And we suppose the resolution was no more than an attempt to draw the attention of the Central Government to the matter.

THE mover made full allowance for financial stringency being the principal cause of stagnation in regard to education. Even so he was unable to persuade himself that everything possible in the circumstances had been done by the provinces in order to lessen illiteracy. If they had been sufficiently keen on the point they would, he felt sure, have explored the possibilities of the diffusion of education with borrowed money. The Government of India too, given the will and the keenness, would, instead of taking their stand on their constitutional position, have run to the help of the Provincial Governments, by offering doles to promote educational progress rather than rural uplift. The view of the mover that any large-scale expenditure on rural uplift in the absence of mass education is practically a waste of public funds would be widely shared. His principal point was that a programme of educational expansion to be completed within a stated period should be drawn up and meticulously followed. The only satisfaction he could get from the Government was a promise to send the proceedings to the Central Advisory Board on Education which was described by the Government member in charge as "a clearing house of ideas and as a reservoir of information."

SO much about the operative part of the debate. But we cannot conclude without giving our readers some idea of the interesting statistics with which the mover supported his case. The population of British India, according to the 1931 census, is 27.1 crores while the amount spent on education by Governments in India was about Rs. 13 crores, which works out at less than eight annas per head per annum. Even if to this is added the amount spent by local bodies on education, the proportion would not rise by another two annas. Now contrast with this the state of things in London where the London County Council is in charge of education. It is found that upon the education of 44 lakhs of people the Council spends as much as is spent by Governments and local bodies in India combined on the education of more than sixty times the number of people served by the Council, i.e. Rs. 38 per head as against India's paltry half a rupee!

### A Vicious Circle.

NO better—or worse?—specimen of thinking in a vicious circle can, we believe, be found than that furnished by Sir Philip Chetwode's recent utterance before the East India Association in London. It is commonly agreed that self-defence is a necessary concomitant of self-government. Indians are thus making no unreasonable or impossible demand when they ask that if the rights of self-government are to be conferred upon them, which is what the Hoare reforms are officially claimed to have been designed to do, they should be placed in a position to defend their country as soon as possible. The demand is

perfectly legitimate and honourable. And even Sir Philip Chetwode appears to admit the reasonableness of the position.

BUT when it comes to a question of translating into action his sympathy with Indians in their fight for self-government by accelerating the pace of Indianisation of the army or by reducing the number of British troops quartered on India, he takes a line contrary to that to which the above reasoning leads. Indianisation of the civil services? Have as much of it as you like. But do not take any such liberties with the Indian defence forces, he says in effect. If that is his attitude one fails to see how and when the vicious circle can be broken. His opposition to a quicker Indianisation of the military forces of India thus practically amounts to his opposition to the grant of self-government to India or at any rate is calculated to delay it as long as possible.

IF Sir Philip Chetwode means well by the Indian aspiration to self-government it is necessary that he should reconcile himself to a much more rapid substitution of British by Indian officers in India's military forces so as to complete the process within the shortest possible time. If he really wants Indians to have Swaraj, it is obvious that he must consent to a slackening of the British hold over the Indian army. If he shrinks from this the logical consequence of his position, his sympathy for Indian home-rule will have to be looked upon as only lip sympathy. Incidentally, his statement about India's military policy being influenced by the so-called Russian menace is sure to prove embarrassing to the present Commander-in-Chief who only the other day hotly contested a similar statement made by an Indian member in the Upper House of the Indian legislature.

### Flying in face of Facts.

INDIA is now in receipt of a yearly contribution of about Rs. two crores from the British exchequer towards the cost of her defence. For this she must thank the Capitation Tribunal, which after hearing both sides of the case made a recommendation in favour of a contribution but left the amount unspecified. The amount has since been fixed at the above figure by the British Government. The grounds justifying the grant of such financial assistance to India by the British treasury may be stated in the Tribunal's own words:

- (1) That the Army in India is a force, ready in an emergency to take the field at once, which does not exist elsewhere in the Empire, which is specially available for immediate use in the East, and which has on occasion been so used.
- (2) That India is a training ground for active service such as does not exist elsewhere in the British Empire.

INDIAN opinion has never regarded the contribution as adequate recompense for the obligations of imperial defence borne by her. A section of British opinion however thinks that in making this contribution Great Britain deals generously towards India. To Britishers of this way of thinking the advantages to the Empire of the maintenance of the Army in India as depicted by the Tribunal appear to be illusory or at any rate not solid enough to necessitate the contribution.

THIS view was recently represented in Parliament by Sir Edward Grigg in the course of the debate on the Consolidated Fund Bill. He was far

from sharing the belief of the Tribunal that the Indian Army would be available for use in an emergency in the East. Great Britain's responsibility for the maintenance of peace in India, in his opinion, forbade the possibility of the withdrawal of the army from India. And if, as in the war, the Indian Army was removed from India, he pointed out that it had to be replaced by Territorials. As for its value as a training ground for British troops, Sir Edward Grigg thought that the long distances which separated brigades of one and the same division greatly detracted from such value. He ended by asking that at least a part of the contribution be utilised towards improving the accommodation for the British troops in India.

It does not need very profound knowledge of Indian history to see that Sir Edward Grigg's statements have little relation to facts. As pointed out by the Under-Secretary Mr. Butler, the Indian Army was available for service in Eastern emergencies on more than a dozen occasions during the last seventy-five years. But even if we let alone the past, its value as a force handy for use in the East was only very recently proved in connection with the Italo-Ethiopian War, when an Indian regiment was despatched to Addis Ababa to serve as the guard for the British legation. How far it is useful as a training ground it is for the military pundits to say. And according to Mr. Butler, they are agreed in thinking that the Indian Army is invaluable even from that standpoint.

## THE CONGRESS SESSION.

IN reviewing the Congress session that closed last week in Lucknow, it is unnecessary to dwell at any great length on the presidential speech of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, for on the major issues of policy which were discussed by the Congress his views expressed in uncompromising terms in his speech exerted but little influence. It was as if a bargain had been struck between him and the Old Guard to the effect that they were to leave him free to talk and he was to leave them free to act. We understand that the Government has been very much disturbed by the whole of the speech. We could almost say that the older Congress leaders were no less disturbed by parts of it. But whatever view one takes of the speech as a whole or in parts, it is a speech the like of which every citizen must be free to deliver if he likes. We make this remark because one hears it said that Pandit Jawaharlal would be safely lodged in gaol if he continued to make such speeches in his presidential tour. So far as we are concerned, our own position is best described by what Voltaire wrote to Helvetius: "I wholly disapprove of what you say and will defend to the death your right to say it." In fact no one can help agreeing to a large part of the address, but whatever one's view-point may be, it is an address which at no point transgresses even in the least the proper limits of freedom of speech, and if the Government is so foolish as to put him under restraint of any kind it will draw upon its devoted head the bitter resentment of all sections of the community and its action will have consequences of which the range and magnitude no one can foretell.

We might have expected the older leaders of the Congress, because of Pandit Jawaharlal's speech, to understand better than they seem to do that the fight against the new constitution which they are pledged to carry on without compromise and without respite can no longer be a fight on purely nationalistic lines. The greatest mischief of the constitution is that it has created new vested interests and entrenched old ones and put them all between the progressive forces in India and the British Government, rendering it necessary for those who wish to give a fight to the British Government to battle with Indian vested interests in the first instance. The older leaders are no doubt at one with Pandit Jawaharlal in his desire to

end the constitution. He believes that the federation must somehow be dissolved. He favours contest in the coming provincial elections on the part of the Congress with the one object of creating deadlocks in them; but "the primary object of our creating deadlocks in the provinces and making the new Act difficult of functioning is to kill the federation." Pandit Jawaharlal's is of course a philosophy of scientific socialism, and a programme based on it "involves vast and revolutionary changes in our political and social structure, the ending of vested interests in land and industry, as well as the feudal and autocratic Indian States system." To this one can understand the older leaders of the Congress will not subscribe as a programme for the immediate present. But if they are earnest in their desire to scrap the new constitution, either by means of sabotage or by other less drastic methods, they must revise their old attitude towards the vested interests, for it is these vested interests—the Princes, the financiers, the landlords, the monopolists, the commercial magnates, the profiteers, the communalists—who will wield power under the constitution and against whom the constitutional struggle will have to begin, the representatives of the British Government standing outside the picture for the most part, though they will be at the back of the vested interests all the time.

The necessity for this radical change in the outlook of our politicians is not yet fully realised. It is required, not so much by the tenets of socialism or of any other creed, but by the circumstances of our political struggle. It is of course not meant that there will at once be a clean cut. An open rupture between the privileged classes and progressive politicians from the commencement will neither be possible nor desirable. It may be possible for some time to concentrate attack on the British Government by raising issues in regard to which even the vested interests have their own particularistic grievances and on which they will join with the progressives. But this cannot go on for long. At such manoeuvring two can play, and the British Government can any day outwit us in that. It has everything to give to the vested interests, and we have nothing. We shall soon find therefore that if the new constitution is really "a charter of slavery", to rebel against and to end, we shall have to

carry on a struggle both with the Indian vested interests and the forces of British imperialism, and indeed with the last through the first. Pandit Jawaharlal has expressed the inevitability of a conflict with the vested interests from his own socialistic creed. Speaking of the Congress, he says: "We are a nationalist organisation and we think and work on the nationalist plane. It is evident enough now that this is too narrow even for the limited objective of political independence, and so we talk of the masses and their economic needs. But still most of us hesitate, because of our nationalist backgrounds, to take a step which might frighten away some vested interests. Most of those interests are already ranged against us, and we can expect little from them except opposition even in the political struggle." But even those who are not socialists will, from the purely nationalist point of view, be compelled in the near future to revise their former attitude. This change of outlook, however, is apparent in few leaders of the Congress.

The best evidence of this is afforded by the contemptuous manner in which an amendment moved in the Subjects Committee on the question of the Indian States was dismissed by the Committee. It was a very modest amendment. It only asked that if and when a constituent assembly is instituted for framing a constitution after the people's heart it should include as representatives of the States the people in the States as it is meant to include as representatives of British India the people in British India. As Pandit Jawaharlal says, "that assembly will not come into existence till at least a semi-revolutionary situation has been created in this country, and the actual relationships of power, apart from paper constitutions, are such that the people of India can make their will felt." Frankly, a constituent assembly like this is possible only after a revolution, and time may never come to convene it in India. The Congress leaders would not have assumed a terrible responsibility therefore if they had declared to the States' people: "If we are in a position to set up a

constituent assembly, and if we at that time think of an all-India federation, you will certainly have the same place in the assembly as the British Indian people." One could understand the leaders hesitating when the States' people ask for active rather than moral support for themselves from the Congress in their struggle with the Princes. But no such responsibility have they to undertake in this instance, and yet the Congress is opposed to the demand. Why? Because it does not want to alienate the Princes. This policy of keeping in with the rulers of Indian States and all the other vested interests the Congress has received as a legacy from Mahatma Gandhi. Let the Mahatma use diplomacy if it is consistent with Mahatmahood. We, plain un-Mahatmic people, can have no use for the devious ways of diplomacy. Let us state our position clearly and unambiguously, and it will be a great public service if Pandit Jawaharlal will instil into older Congressmen some of his own candour and straightforwardness.

On the question of acceptance of office delay was not really necessary, but the delay of a few months will not matter much. The trouble is that some of those who are for accepting office often are for a policy of resignation though they speak the language of opposition. If opposition is really and seriously meant acceptance is decidedly the better policy. It will enable us to offer effective opposition and at the same time bring about improvement in certain directions. But even here the Congress shows itself unnecessarily afraid of public opinion. It has not only remitted the decision of this question to the Congress executive, but it has even rejected the proposal which would have required a decision of the question before provincial elections. This proposal at any rate ought to have been readily welcomed. Anyhow we are sure that if in the Congress there are any influential leaders who are for working the constitution for what it is worth without bothering about substituting a better constitution for it, they will not have their way. We are satisfied that the Congress will orient for opposition.

## Observance of Law and REVISION of Law.

**WE** in India should fully understand the true inwardness of Herr Hitler's Rhineland coup and place before our rulers in the plainest terms the lessons which they may draw with great profit to themselves from this German move. In re-occupying the demilitarised zone with troops Germany has broken the Treaty of Versailles. There is no denying it. Hitler himself makes no bones about the breach; he is in fact proud of it. He has sworn to tear up all the unequal terms of peace one after another. France no doubt believes that the demilitarisation clauses of the Treaty err on the side of over-generosity to a vanquished foe. She had at first demanded a complete separation of the Rhineland provinces from the rest of Germany, but was persuaded later to abandon this claim in favour of occupation of the zone for fifteen years and its demilitarisation subsequently. It should be

noted that this demilitarisation arrangement was to be a permanent one. There was no time limit for this; it was, as Mr. Eden said in the House of Commons debate on March 26, "an enduring undertaking." Germany was forbidden by the Treaty of Versailles, not for any specified period of time, but in perpetuity, to station her own troops on her own soil. And if all treaties are holy, Germany could never again aspire to defend the whole of her country herself. France must have thought when the Treaty was made that the permanence of demilitarisation of the Rhineland zone had once and for all removed the German menace; in fact, however, it has brought the menace much nearer. It is in the nature of things impossible that such a one-sided and unjust arrangement can last for ever. If it cannot be changed in the normal way it will be changed in the abnormal way.

Interested politicians may strike up a pose of superlative virtue and express holy horror at the brusque and unceremonious repudiation of a solemn treaty by Germany, but we must learn to look at this matter in proper perspective. France at once raised the cry of sanctions against Germany, financial and economic sanctions to begin with, and military sanctions later. She objected to negotiations being opened with Hitler until he had withdrawn from the demilitarised zone the forces which he had moved into it, contrary to the obligations of the treaty. France who had done all she could to prevent even economic sanctions of a somewhat drastic character being applied against Mussolini and who had nearly blackmailed Abyssinia into a surrender to him when Abyssinia was giving a good fight single-handed now came forward to plead for the imposition of the most stringent sanctions upon Germany in order that international law should be upheld. Sir Austen Chamberlain said that the question at issue in this matter was not the small question of the demilitarisation of the zone but the large one of whether Europe was to be governed by the law of force or the force of law. And in order to help in substituting the force of law for the law of force or world order for anarchy in this particular matter it was proposed by Britain that the demilitarised zone should in the interim period be policed by an international force, which was to consist partly of Italian troops. That is to say, a greater criminal was to be appointed to bring to book a lesser criminal. For, after all, Hitler, if he has committed an offence against international law, has done so only by undertaking the defence of his own country; but Mussolini has invaded another country and is carrying on aggressive war against it. Those who speak of international morality must make a clear distinction between the two cases. Sir Archibald Sinclair, the Leader of the Liberal Party in the House of Commons, put this point very clearly in the debate. He said:

It would be a mockery of the rule of law when Italy, with armies 300,000 strong, is invading the territory of a fellow-member of the League, when her airmen deliberately bomb and machine-gun British, Swedish and Abyssinian Red Cross units, and use gas and incendiary bombs against open towns many miles behind the front line, that Italy should be designated as the instrument of justice to correct Germany, whose Government has indeed broken a treaty, but only to the extent of sending troops into its own territory. Two offenders against the Covenant of the League and the law of nations stand at the bar of world opinion. Justice demands that the worse and earlier offender should at least be compelled to submit to the law, and to withdraw his troops from the territory he has invaded, before he is employed as a warder to hold the other offender in custody.

But the real point that we wish to bring to the attention of our readers is a different one. It is contained in another passage of Sir Archibald's speech. He declared:

No effort to substitute the rule of law for anarchy in international relationships can possibly succeed unless there is a fundamental basis of consent, unless there is recognition of the equal rights of all nations, unless justice is meted out with an even hand to all who are within the reach of the

law and unless constitutional means exist and are used for the peaceful revision of obsolete treaties. It has been made abundantly clear in the last 10 or 15 years that Germany will refuse that fundamental consent to the rule of law unless she obtains equality of rights and treatment from the League. Germany is already breaking the shackles of Versailles and we ought to have struck them before now. No system of law can preserve the *status quo* or can be immune from the laws of growth and change. The League must prove itself capable of revising obsolete treaties.

This is an eternal truth. If law is to be observed, whether national or international, it must be based upon justice and at any rate it must be capable of easy amendment by legal means in order that any existing injustices may be removed. If it is based upon injustice or if avenues of revision are blocked, it will be set aside, however loudly legal purists may cry out against it in agony. The Versailles Treaty is full of shocking injustices. No one will care to defend it at this time of day. Mr. Lloyd George once again confessed in the House of Commons that the only defence of the Treaty was that at the time it was made France would accept nothing less. He said:

For that reason it was a compromise. It was recognised that a good deal of it would have to be revised, and what is always forgotten is that there are provisions in the Treaty itself for revision. It was contemplated that the Reparations Clauses—France could not have accepted anything more moderate at that moment or the Government would have been thrown out—should be reconsidered from time to time. The same thing applies even to boundaries and to several other provisions, and with regard to mandates. All these things it was contemplated would be revised from time to time, and there is a provision in the Treaty to cover revisions. I only wanted to make clear that in order to show that you cannot treat this as if it were Holy Writ, or as if it were a document which, even at the time, the persons who drafted it and signed it felt that it was a final decision upon the controversies in Europe and in the world.

Provision for amendment—and easy amendment—is thus an integral part of a good law, and those who do not make such provision have no moral right to complain if illegal means are used to attain the legitimate objects which are unattainable by legal means. The Covenant of the League contains a provision for peaceful change, but it is a provision which it is not easy to bring into force and has never in fact yet been brought into force. Article 19 which provides for treaty revision requires unanimity of all the member States, and the vote of the State whom the proposed revision will affect adversely is enough to block the process of revision. This is an insuperable difficulty and so long as unanimity is required, Article 19 will be of little effect. The propaganda for a reasonably easy and effective machinery for adjustment has, however, made so profound an impression upon world opinion that France, which is the most fanatical among standpat nations, has now proposed in her memorandum replying to Germany's peace plan the abolition of the unanimity vote at present needed by the League for the revision of treaties in favour of a two-thirds majority vote. What will happen to this proposal we do not know, but that France of all countries should put it forward shows how profound a change has taken place in the trend



of public opinion. If the proposal is adopted it will mean in practice that the States who are members of the League will give up to a certain extent their rights of sovereignty, and will bind themselves to agree to a change desired by two-thirds of the members even if it be unacceptable to themselves.

Now we are in a position to draw the moral for our rulers. The new constitution which they have passed for India is, besides being gravely unsatisfactory, unalterable by constitutional means. No change in the constitution which any federating State thinks will react injuriously upon itself can take effect in that State, however large may be the consensus of opinion for it among other units of federation. There are certain other changes like the transfer of the Army to popular control which will require the consent of every federating State. The rule of unanimity will be as rigorously in force in such matters in India as it has been in the League of Nations, and in India it will have no more promising results than it has had in the League. It reflects little credit upon our Round Tablers that they did not point out this worst defect in the constitution with as much force as it deserved. Is a federation to be as loose as a league? A federation is a union and it must be more compact than a league. Even those members of the League of Nations who stand to profit most by the maintenance of the *status quo* now publicly acknowledge the need of making future revision easy. Is our federation to be sealed against all change? European States are prepared to subordinate their national sovereignty to the requirements and interests of the world community. Are not Indian States going to be made to subordinate their sovereignty, mostly illusory, to the common good of the nation? If constitutional amendment is made impossible, the makers of the constitution will in effect compel the Indian people to do what is happening now on the continent of Europe. If peaceful change is impossible forcible change will result, but change must come. No arrangement which is less than just can endure, however carefully you may ringfence it within the provisions of law. Those who desire peace, whether in national or international affairs, must so devise their law that it may become unnecessary to break through its provisions. The breaches of international law that are taking place in Europe are regrettable and perhaps even reprehensible, but they are inevitable. Conscription, rearmament, occupation of the Rhineland—these are the "trophies", as Mr. Churchill called them, which Hitler is bringing to Germany. In the last move "he organised a torch-light procession through a powder magazine, and there has nearly been a shattering explosion," to use the words of Mr. Lloyd George. All this is deplorable, but it is recognised now that the only way to avoid an explosion is to provide a lawful means of revision which would make resort to illegal means unnecessary. In India every tin-pot Cæsar of an Indian Prince is given the right of veto. It were much to be wished that the Princes and the British Government realised that to give opportunities of

constitutional amendment is as much to their interest as to that of the public at large.

### FIFTY YEARS OF THE CONGRESS.

IN this book\* the author has traced the history of the Indian National Congress from its foundation in 1885 till last year, when its Golden Jubilee was celebrated. The great part which the Congress has played in the political advancement of India is recognised on all hands; and a book relating its history and portraying the various phases through which it has passed was certainly a great desideratum. We, therefore, welcome this book and feel no doubt that it will be read with deep interest by all those who wish to know how the Congress has achieved its present commanding position in the national life of the country. Mr. Rajendra Prasad has contributed to the book an interesting introduction which will repay careful perusal. As he rightly points out, "the Congress has marched on from stage to stage, and covers practically every sphere of national activity. It is engaged in constructive work which is calculated not only to improve the economic condition of the masses, but also to create that self-confidence among them which can be born of work accomplished and which can enable them to win *Purna Swaraj*." The history of the Congress is, in fact, the history of the political and constitutional progress of India during the last fifty years, of her struggle for *Swaraj* and the fight she has been fighting for freedom and for her full national self-realisation. It is, of course, far from complete; many chapters will still have to be written, many a struggle will still have to be made, before the goal is reached. With moderate aims confined, in the beginning, to small administrative and constitutional reforms, it became an organisation with the definite object of winning dominion self-government and within recent years it has set before itself the ideal of *Purna Swaraj* or complete national independence. Recently it has given its earnest consideration to the economic problem of India, and also to such social problems of the first magnitude as the removal of untouchability. It seems certain that it will soon have a new orientation of policy which will aim not only at the political and constitutional reconstruction of India but also at a new economic order for her. What the ultimate evolution of the Congress may be, it is difficult to foresee at the present moment; but there seems no doubt that its objectives will expand more and more, embracing a more or less complete reconstruction of Indian society. The story of such an organisation with such a history and with such potentialities cannot fail to be highly interesting and inspiring; and Dr. Sitaramayya's book is a valuable contribution to the growing literature on the subject. It is no disparagement of the merits of the book to say that it is not a critical history of the Congress. The author has himself played no small part in the later phases of the development of

\* THE HISTORY OF THE CONGRESS, 1885-1935. By B. PATTABHI SITARAMAYYA. (Secretary, Congress Working Committee, Allahabad.) 1935. 21cm. 1039p. Rs. 2-8-0.

the Congress and his identification with its activities perhaps incapacitates him for the task of writing an impartial and critical history of the Congress. Moreover he is such a devoted admirer of Mahatma Gandhi that he has nothing but praise for whatever that great leader has said and done ever since the Congress chose him as its leader. A reader who wishes to find in the book a critical estimate of the policies, methods and doings of the Congress and of Mahatma Gandhi will be disappointed. Again, we must say that the book is not so well-written as it might have been. Many a page bears impress of hasty writing. Some of the details could have been omitted with advantage. In some places, we find an excess of sentimentalism and a lack of fairness. Nevertheless, in spite of these limitations and defects, the book deserves to be read by all Indians and those non-Indians to whom the problem of India makes an appeal.

With the inauguration of non-co-operation in 1920, the Congress entered on a stage in its development, which at once drew the attention of the whole civilized world to its activities; and it is but natural that nearly three-fourths of the book should be devoted to the history of the Congress during the last fifteen years. In the first chapter which deals with the birth of the Congress, the author has done well in briefly reviewing the political organisations that had existed and worked independently in most provinces before the Congress was established. In connection with the genesis of the Congress, the author points out a fact which is probably not known to many people. As a result of the aggressively imperialist policy of England in the eighties of the last century, political discontent had become wide-spread throughout India, and, moreover, gone underground. Mr. Hume who took an initiative in founding the Congress had come into the possession of a mass of documents which showed that the people of India had become so thoroughly discontented with the British *Raj* that secret forces were actively working which were likely to explode into a national revolt. Mr. Hume saw that some safety-valve must be provided for this discontent and conceived the idea of bringing into existence an organisation which would afford a vent to it along constitutional channels. This fact explains why Mr. Hume took an initiative in organising the National Congress and why his efforts received the support of the then Governor-General.

The history of the Congress since the inauguration of the non-co-operation movement has been related by the author in great detail. In describing the movement for the boycott of the Simon Commission, the author, we regret to find, is not fair to the Liberal party. It is an indisputable fact that the idea of boycotting the Simon Commission was first broached and emphasized by Liberal leaders, and surely the Liberal party is entitled to credit for it. But the author narrates the story of the boycott of the Commission in such a way as to leave upon the reader's mind the impression that the Liberal party does not deserve any particular credit for it.

On the whole, the book is a readable history of the Congress; but, in our opinion, it is not a first class performance. An excellent history of the Congress is yet to be written and we hope that a master historian will soon arise and give such a history to the world at no distant date. As we are writing this, the Lucknow session of the Congress has just concluded its deliberations; and we feel pleasure in expressing our view that they assure for the Congress and for India a still more glorious future and a reasonable certainty that our struggle for 'full Swaraj' and for a sound social and economic system will be crowned with success. If the ideal of the Congress is unflinchingly and courageously pursued, if Hindu-Moslem unity is realised, if the masses are aroused to a consciousness not only of their present helpless condition but also of their national obligations, and of the strength innate in them that only needs to be awakened, and if the leaders of India work in a spirit of harmony and absolute selflessness and endeavour to endow their motherland with a well thought-out political, social and economic order, we for one are confident that this great national organisation will succeed in the fulness of time in accomplishing its great patriotic national aims. As one reads this book and ponders over the struggles through which we have passed, the sacrifices we have made, the sufferings we have undergone, there is no reason to doubt that the mission of the Congress will come to an end only with complete victory. Great Britain may have her own policies and methods in dealing with Indian situations as they arise. Nevertheless, British statesmen may well turn to the pages of this book, and draw from them the lesson that it is only by recognising and satisfying India's just and legitimate claim to determine her own political and economic order that the relations between the two countries can be placed on a friendly and peaceful footing. We have not failed to point out the defects of this book; and yet we have pleasure in acknowledging that Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya has rendered a distinct service by writing it. It is a book which ought to find a place in every library and in every Indian-English-knowing home. A smaller edition of the book dealing with the main events in the history of the Congress and written in a less florid and more attractive style will be most welcome.

R. G. PRADHAN.

## Reviews.

### BARODA.

BARODA. By INDRA DATT. (Saraswati Press, Lucknow.) 20cm. 1936. 266p. Re. 4.

I HAVE much pleasure in commending this little volume to students of Indian politics, particularly to those who are interested in the relations between Indian States and the British Government. The book contains a full account of the political history of the Baroda State during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries as well as a detailed statement of the ways in which the power of paramountcy has been exer-



oised by the Government of India during the exceptionally long reign of the present ruler. The author's sympathies seem to be altogether on the side of the Gaekwar, for whose ability and devotion to his people he has great admiration.

The last three chapters of the book are of particular value to students of political questions inasmuch as they give an intimate glimpse of the control exercised by the British Resident in Indian States and the direction along which such control is exercised.

It is to be regretted that the author has not given us a study of the political organisation and administration of Baroda, but this deficiency he has promised to make good in a subsequent volume whose appearance readers of the present volume will watch with keen interest.

The writer possesses an easy style of writing which makes the reading of his book a great pleasure. It is very much to be hoped that mistakes of spelling which have crept into the book in spite of the author's carefulness will be removed in subsequent editions.

I congratulate the author on his production and wish him the greatest possible success in his endeavours to bring to light a phase of Indian political life and administration which is little known to the average student of Indian affairs. I trust that the author's study of Baroda will be followed by similar studies of other principal Indian States and that all such earnest efforts will make for a friendly understanding and cordial relations between Indian India and the rest of the country in the New India which is breaking upon us to-day.

E. ASIRVATHAM.

## THE INDIA THAT IS INDIA.

THE INDIA THAT IS INDIA. By ELIZABETH SHARPE (Luzac.) 1934. 21cm. 110p. 3/-

IN reading this book we feel we meet an old and much esteemed friend. India knows well the author already as an able expounder of her abstruse philosophy to the West. Many of us have read her book on Yoga. In the present volume which she justly entitles "The India that is India" she explains to her countryman the meaning of many of those Indian customs and ideas which to the European are bound to be puzzling and not a little funny.

The book touches many sides of Indian life and describes all grades of the Indian population. We have here the Maharajah described by the side of the field-labourer; the Sadhu portrayed side by side with the rogue and the coxcomb. We get a peep into the zenana and the Maharajah's courtyard and into the bazaar of a provincial town, the cave of the hermit and the sanctum of a Jain temple. Betel-chewing and breast-beating are as minutely described as the Radha-Krishna cult or the worship of Sakti. One wonders how so much information could be conveyed in so few pages.

A greater wonder is this that the book often raises questions of abstruse philosophy and yet reads like a novel and is exceedingly lucid. The secret is, as always in such cases, that the writer knows the subject thoroughly. Unlike many others of her country that have written on India, she has not set herself the theme first and then gone about collecting materials for her thesis. She has first seen and felt what she writes about. Besides, she writes only for conveying information. She has no special pleading to make or thesis to support such as the unfitness of India for self-government or the hypocrisy of "the

professional agitator." She could therefore see the other man's point of view and write with imaginative sympathy. Speaking of the zenana lady, she feels well warranted in saying:

Western standards of happiness, unhappiness, are not the appropriate ones for judging the happiness or unhappiness of the East. The Indian lady, in her own way, is on an average, far happier than the more independent Western woman (p. 29).

Look at this passionate plea for a dispassionate interpretation of hoary custom:

One cannot judge off-hand as to the worthlessness of certain strange, even repellent symbols or rituals; for many a lost thread to ancient esotericism can often be found again tangled and broken, running through the old rituals old-time faiths (p. 52).

A Sanatani, out for defending ancient customs against the modern reformer, cannot make out a better case for the side he has espoused.

Such a keen observer and candid judge as Miss Elizabeth Sharpe cannot but see, and seeing condemn, absurdities wherever they may exist. She administers a well deserved and much needed reprimand to the Indian nose-blower:

At several schools, there is an allotted time for the blowing of noses, and every boy in the school leaves his class, blows his nose between finger and thumb—violently or temperately—anywhere, and every finger and thumb, then, wipes itself automatically on the nearest wall or post (p. 63).

So again to the spitter of betel juice:

The writer once saw the platform of a station before a Prince's saloon thoroughly swept and cleared, and a few minutes afterwards a band of young men pass by who, without any consideration whatsoever, spewed streams of betel juice from out of their mouths on to the freshly cleared platform (p. 64).

There is in all Miss Elizabeth Sharpe's utterances a refreshing candour rare in books of the kind to which they belong. "The India that is India" is a volume that is particularly full of the Beauty of Truth.

P. A. S.

## MERCANTILISM.

MERCANTILISM. 2 vols. By ELI F. HEKKSCHER. Trs. by MENDEL SHAPIRO. (Allen & Unwin.) 1935. 24cm. 472p. & 419p. 21/- each.

EUROPEAN economic policy, from the end of the Middle Ages to the age of *laissez faire*, was described by Adam Smith as "the commercial or the mercantile system." In his criticism of that system, Smith laid stress on its monetary and protectionist aspects. Since that time economic historians have discovered other aspects, and the present work is a complete and careful analysis of the various aspects of Mercantilism. The author views Mercantilism in five aspects. Firstly, following Schmoller, he conceives Mercantilism as 'a unifying system' and works out this conception in the first volume. He first describes mediæval economic policy of which the chief characteristic is declared to be "particularism." This characteristic was seen in the gild policy, in the system of private tolls on rivers and highways the confusion of weights, measures and coinage. In the course of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, these 'particular' tendencies were replaced by the unified control of the State over the entire field of economic policy. In this process of unification, the parts played by the English monarchy and by the French Minister Colbert are clearly brought out. The treatment of this phase of mercantilist policy is

exceptionally elaborate and contains, among other things, an excellent account of the development of business organisation in England and on the Continent.

The second volume is devoted to the other four aspects of Mercantilism. Here first the mercantilist ideal of "State power"—already made familiar by Cunningham—is analysed. It is shown that in Mercantilist policy, "power" is regarded as an end in itself, while in *laissez faire* it is looked upon as a means to a larger end. The methods for attaining this ideal—military, political and economic—are then described, and among these an important place is given to the Protectionist System, aimed at securing an export surplus, and, consequently, an inflow of 'treasure'. It is here shown that the transition from the mediæval policy to mercantilism reflected the change of attitude towards commodities. Mediæval policy was based upon the consumer's point of view; it was, therefore, a policy of cheapness, a policy of 'provision'. On the other hand, Mercantile policy was based on the producer's point of view and hence it was one of 'dearness,' of protection. The ultimate aim of the protectionist policy was to secure an export surplus; but, it is maintained, this was not primarily due to the desire for attracting precious metals. Selling—especially exporting—was regarded as an end in itself, and the excess of sales over purchases, in the case of the individual as well as the nation, was regarded as a sign of prosperity. Such a nation, in a slightly refined form, still persists, and dominates the trade policy of enlightened nations today.

The monetary aspect of Mercantilism is treated at great length. In this connection the identification of money and precious metals with wealth is shown to be common among Mercantile writers, but it is shown that certain writers, especially Sir William Pelly, were aware of other forms of wealth. The connexion between the desire for precious metals and the desire for increased monetary circulation is brought out, and the general inflationist tendency is made clear, and evidence is adduced in order to show that Mercantilist writers held a crude 'quantity theory' of the value of money.

The last aspect—Mercantilism as a conception of society—is an original theme. Here it is maintained that Mercantilist social ideas were not different from that of the age of *laissez faire*. Mercantilist writings reveal a definite moral attitude towards economic policy; and this, coupled with an irreligious outlook and a crude utilitarianism, marks off Mercantilist social thought from the Mediæval.

To the students of the history of economic policy and thought, these volumes are remarkably instructive.

T. M. JOSHI.

### PROBLEM OF BROADCASTING.

**WHAT TO DO WITH THE B. B. C.** By RAYMOND POSTGATE. (The Hogarth Press.) 1935. 20cm. 68p. 1/6.

**BROADCASTING AND A CHANGING CIVILISATION.** By ERNEST H. ROBINSON. (John Lane.) 1935. 20cm. 3/6.

THE two books under review deal with broadcasting in Great Britain and are very timely on account of the labours of the Ullswater Royal Commission on broadcasting in that country. There can be no two opinions in regard to the remarkable success that has attended the efforts of the British Broad-

casting Corporation in rapidly building up broadcasting in Great Britain. The BBC has served the British public well. Its organisation as a national monopoly of the public utility type along with its loosely defined and therefore flexible constitution has endowed it with the necessary initiative, independence and authority to forge ahead, free from the red tape and delay of a regular government department and the paralysing effects of profits, dividends and fees inevitable in the case of private commercial enterprise.

Mr. Postgate's book contains a sharp and vigorous criticism of the BBC policy and its conduct of the service. It is really extraordinary that the financial transactions of a popular national organisation with annually increasing revenues of millions of pounds should be presented to the public in four pages of its annual publication with but few details. Mr. Postgate calls this a financial scandal and insists that the BBC should be compelled to make its published annual financial statement as meticulous a document as that of a department of state; and that the methods of recruitment of personnel, salaries and conditions of service, internal administration, selection of really capable governors etc. should all be such as will entitle it to the public confidence and goodwill, free from disquieting charges of autocracy, favouritism, etc.

Mr. Postgate complains strongly against the censorship on the part of the BBC and gives a few examples which came prominently before the public eye. His comparison of the quality and variety of the BBC programmes with those of the U. S. A. and Russia is not always favourable to the BBC. Chapter V contains a brief discussion of the different types of public and private broadcasting systems, as they exist in Russia, Great Britain, the U. S. A., Holland and France. The author is obviously in sympathy with the pragmatic use of radio as an effective mechanism for the defence and progress of the Soviet state and the Soviet industry in Russia by the Russian leaders. He concludes that "it is not the BBC system that is wrong, but the persons who operate it" (p. 52).

In his estimate of the future of the BBC, the author's picture of its dominance over the press is amusing and slightly extravagant. He advocates rediffusion over wires in preference to individual ownership of receivers. He is not very optimistic about the spread of television as a nationwide service on account of the economic condition of the British working class. The conclusions of the author summarised on pages 67-68 should be compared with the recommendations of the Ullswater Commission published recently.

Mr. Robinson's book has a more ambitious title. Opening with a passing glance at the origin and development of broadcasting, the author endeavours to assess the uses to which national broadcasting has been put and its effects in various directions.

It is pointed out that broadcasting has increased popular interest in music and raised the general level of enjoyment and appreciation of it throughout the community; but due to the long programme days and the variety of programmes, there are a smaller number of persons willing to undergo the trouble and discipline of learning music for themselves by study and practice. The proportion of serious to light and other music depends upon the taste and cultural development of the various strata of the community and varies somewhat from one country to another. The quality of the receiver too has some bearing on the question.

Radio drama has its own special problems as in addition to their usual roles, sound and voice have:

to do duty for the various functions of the sight in a theatre, such as scenery and settings, make-up and gesture and illumination and audience. Plays and scenes have to be specially written and technique and conventions evolved and understood before radio drama (sound alone) can be a source of enjoyment to the many.

The author approves of the policy followed by the BBC in regard to religion. Mr. Robinson agrees also with the policy and conduct of educational broadcasting by the BBC and emphasises the need for education for leisure, particularly in relation to the unemployed.

The importance of broadcasting in international relationships cannot be exaggerated; wisely used, each nation can co-operate in promoting mutual sympathy and understanding amongst the nations by the spread of correct and accurate knowledge of the ideals, ideas, thoughts and actions of each other. Propaganda in this direction is a duty and a responsibility laid on all. But broadcasting has been and is being daily prostituted for spreading, covertly or openly, lies and calumny, suspicion, misunderstanding and hatred. No wonder radio has helped to make war and threat of war the order of the day.

Mr. Robinson is not a very reliable guide. It requires a more critical, detached and discriminating writer to do justice to the labours of the BBC and the success that has attended its efforts. We have to go elsewhere for a fair and accurate presentation of the ideals, ideas and motives underlying the policy and actions of non-British broadcasting systems, such as those of Russia, the USA and Germany. Take for instance such statements as "The United States is, fortunately for the world, the only country which has so far developed a definitely low-brow broadcast" (p. 45), "German propaganda is hypocritical" (p. 111).

There is a considerable amount of mere hot air on irrelevant politics and economics; it is surprising to find phrases like "complete preventative" (p. 25), "high-brow", "middle-brow" and "low-brow" (chapter III), "generalness" (p. 131) and "bilingual persons" (p. 139). There are passages like "Broadcasting is spreading up education, giving not only crumbs but whole slices of bread" (p. 77). "The adult must be led blindfold to the fountain of knowledge and encouraged to drink by the promise of entertainment". What does the author mean by the "cross section of an educational system" (p. 84)?

RE

### COMMUNISM.

**COMMUNISM AND A CHANGING CIVILISATION.** By RALPH FOX. (John Lane the Bodley Head.) 1935. 20cm. 156p. 3/6.

THIS is a vigorous reply to people who seek to establish "pure democracy" by parliamentary victory. The author reviews the spread of the communistic movement throughout the world, particularly after the close of the last world war, and answers the objections often raised against the movement. In the last chapter he has pointed out to the British worker that it is in his interest not to stand out against the tide of growing communism and briefly explains the possible condition of Great Britain under a communistic regime.

The theoretical aspect of communism has not been dealt with in this book. We therefore do not meet with any elaborate discussion on either surplus value theory or the materialistic interpretation of history. Such a discussion has often proved more academic than real. As Ramsay MacDonald has pointed out in his "Socialism: Critical

and Constructive" some time back, "Marx has proved greater than Marxism" A fallacy or two in the communistic dogmas is not going to stay the onward march of the communistic movement and the growing popularity of Marx. Marx was born in 1818, but communism as a motive force of the political and economic movement began to be felt from 1918, i. e. soon after the Great War. What the year 2018 is going to witness is too difficult to imagine; but the author states nothing more than a fact when he says:

The refutation of Marx has for generations been almost an obligation for the militant university professor; yet so far not one professor has ever set himself the task of examining the interesting paradox that the more Marx is refuted the stronger grows the influence of his ideas and the more widely spread and deeply rooted they become (p. 11).

Explaining the teaching of Marx, the author points out that production is in its very essence a social act, but exchange and appropriation continue to be individual acts through which the social product is appropriated. Under these conditions the machine may work wonders but it cannot feed millions so long as it remains the private property of the few. The individual appropriation brings about concentration of capital and creates monopolistic conditions. Labour also as a force simultaneously gathers together under the same roof. At last the contact between the concentration of capital and socialisation of labour grows so acute that the inevitable breaking point comes when "expropriators are expropriated."

The author however is careful to point out that the inevitability of the movement does not mean that capitalism is automatically doomed to disappear. As Stalin once remarked, the victory of the revolution never comes by itself. It is necessary to prepare for it and win it, ultimately reaching the aim of world communism. Proceeding to give a concrete example of what a world communism would easily achieve, the author refers to Lenin's proposal made in 1922 of constructing an electrified super trunk line from London to Peking and says that "the victory of the Chinese Soviets on the one hand and the German Revolution on the other will be necessary before this plan can be brought to life." (p. 89) The trend of events in Germany however is evidently pointing not in the direction of communism but the opposite. In a fine passage in the chapter on "National and Colonial Questions" the author has summarised the achievements of British capitalistic imperialism in India.

The essence of the book lies in its chapter headed "From Capitalism to Communism". Unhappily here the author has fallen in line with the other communist writers who speak with vigour but whose arguments are not always sound. The author says on p. 115: "Capitalist democracy is recognised as being only a concealed form of dictatorship." It may be convenient for the communists to make this assumption. The author refers to a few illustrations by which he seeks to show that there is no equality under capitalism. He is of opinion that when capitalism was combined with free competition it might have been possible for the workman to bring about a revolution by peaceful means but with the development of monopoly capitalism, which the author seems to regard as identical with imperialism that hope, according to him, is moonshine. "Fascism", says he, "is the logical development of the democratic rule of the bourgeois." In another place the author proceeds to argue that "universal suffrage is compatible with the worst form of dictatorship (p. 107) because the very basis of parliamentary democracy is the political unconsciousness of the masses."

Finally the author sums up the whole argument by saying that "it is clear to all now that capitalism is rooted in violence, exists by violence and can only be destroyed by violence" (p. 119).

Not a few would emphatically say that it is not so clear to them. It would of course be in keeping with the traditions of communists if the author were to retort by saying "Yes, it cannot be clear to those who refuse to think straight". Mistakes in the working of democracy in the past have led men to be suspicious about it. Yet it may be asked: Are those defects beyond rectification? Can communism, where individual will and freedom in the choice of course of life will be much more restricted, be the only beneficent alternative? Is the world after all so advanced as to allow the stimulus of self-interest and private property to go overboard and to turn the army of workers into disciplined, altruistic, sincere, set of individuals? In a country like Russia communism may have been for a time successful. It may not even be the dangerous thing it is usually made out to be; but there are many who do think that it cannot be a panacea for the present-day world problems in all countries, especially in a country of small peasant proprietors such as India is.

R. V. OTURKAR.

### SHORT NOTICES

**LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION.** By S. R. RANGANATHAN. (Madras Library Association, Madras.) 1935. 22cm. 673p. 12/6.

THIS book is an organized description of the whole range of duties connected with libraries. Its chief value lies in the organization of the enormous material, rather than in the elaborate description of the minutest "job" of a library assistant. As the author himself says, the book is not to be read with a view to copying his or any other system in its entirety. Many of the routine processes which are described in the book may admit of variant practices. The author has, however, never set himself the task of furnishing a ready-made system of library administration. Rather, his goal has ever been to make plain the plan that must lie behind a bewildering mass of detail. The more fully the plan is understood and appreciated, the heartier and better the work of all engaged in the organization. The book is thus of greater value to the chief librarian than to the assistants, though to them also, the lucid description of their duties given in the book cannot but be of immense value.

The author divides his work into two sections, technical and non-technical. As rightly observed in the introduction, the want of a good book describing general office administration makes necessary the inclusion of the non-technical section in a technical book. In the first section the author gives a systematic description of the different library processes, book selection, book ordering, their collation, classifying and cataloguing, shelving, etc. Each process is treated in a separate chapter. The plan of the chapters is uniform. Firstly, we are shown that each process is a composite of several jobs; we are told next on what principles these should be classified; next comes a description of each of the several jobs followed by suggestions to the principal supervisor to correlate the work of his assistants so as to ensure the maximum efficiency. A description of the forms, registers and files concludes the chapter.

Rao Sahab Ranganathan has a flair for analysis that almost amounts to genius. At the same time he has a firm and comprehensive grasp of the problem analysed, which, with a liveliness of neat expression, serves to prevent the readers from getting confused by the details.

The paragraphs are numbered on the Colon system of classification. The notation is irritating to those who have not mastered the Colon scheme. Apart from the question of the merits of this scheme, it surely impairs the value of the book as a self-contained unit when knowledge of the Colon scheme is made an indispensable prerequisite.

With the exception of this notational encumbrance, the book is a masterly analysis of the librarian's craft and the ideals of good librarianship given to the world in the author's Five Laws of Library Science are likely to be realized the more readily by its perusal.

T. D. WAKNIS.

**MAN AND WOMAN IN MARRIAGE.** By C.B.S. EVANS. (John Lane.) 1935. 22cm. 79p. 5/-

IF we ignore the fact that, as Dr. Norman Haire says in the preface, the author has mixed up science, sentiment and religion, the book should be on the whole very useful to people brought up in complete ignorance of sex. His opinions will certainly shock people who consider sex a necessary evil or those who imagine that sex should be used for procreation only. He says on p. 28: "When an individual is exhausting himself or herself by too frequent intercourse, Nature automatically slows one down by lessening the desire and withholding the full physical support necessary to function normally. For this reason it may be said that relations can safely be had as often as they are desired." The only exception to this, according to him, is the menstrual period, as intercourse during this period may produce "cramps for that month and more pain the succeeding month." But here the editor says in a footnote that that is not his experience.

The author has very strange ideas about animals. In recommending preliminary courtship or "fore-play," the author calls the inconsiderate husband 'animal-like'. Really speaking, preliminary courtship is the rule among animals and men can learn a great deal from them. Again he thinks animals copulate for procreation only and they get no pleasure from the act. One must be extraordinarily unobservant not to notice that all animals are pleasure-seekers. He says they only satisfy a need. But the satisfaction of a need is in itself a pleasure.

He does well to emphasize the point that all pleasure is derived by a stimulation of certain nerves and there is no basis for considering sexual pleasure lower than any other, music for instance.

R. D. KARVE.

### BOOKS RECEIVED.

#### I. L. O. STUDIES AND REPORTS.

- International Survey of Social Services 1933. Vol. I. (M. 13.) 1936. 24cm. 710p. 15/-  
 The Rural Exodus in Czechoslovakia. (K. 13.) 1935. 24cm. 170p. 5/-  
 The Migration of Workers. (O. 5.) 1936. 24cm. 205p. 6/6  
 The I. L. O. Year-Book 1934-35. Vol. I. and Vol. II-Labour Statistics. 1935. 24cm. 560p. and 252p. 12/6 & 4/-