

Servant of India

Editor : S. G. VAZE.

Office : SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY, POONA.

VOL. XIX, No. 22.

POONA—THURSDAY, MAY 28, 1936.

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

CONTENTS.

| | Page |
|---|------|
| TOPICS OF THE WEEK | 253 |
| ARTICLES :— | |
| Civil Liberty. | 255 |
| The Charge of Royalty. | 257 |
| REVIEWS :— | |
| Problems of Empire. | |
| By Dr. E. Asirvatham, M. A., Ph. D. | 261 |
| Mediaeval Socialism. | |
| By Principal D. G. Karve, M. A. | 262 |
| Shidzue Ishimoto. | |
| By Prof. M. V. Subrahmanyam, M. A., L. T. | 262 |
| Problem of Town-Planning. | |
| By Prof. K. D. Joshi, M. A., B. E., M. L. E. | 263 |
| Justice Under Muslim Rule. | |
| By Prof. S. R. Sharma, M. A. | 263 |
| SHORT NOTICES. | 264 |

Topics of the Week.

The Shahidganj Cases.

THE judgment in the Shahidganj cases—civil as well as criminal—was delivered by the District Court of Lahore on Monday. It may be recalled that these cases were the off-shoots of the communal rioting which took place in Lahore in July last in connection with the Shahidganj Gurudwara. The Gurudwara had within its precincts a structure which the Muslims claimed to have been a mosque in which they had the right to offer prayers. The Sikhs for their part stoutly denied the claim, and as if to make short work of all possible trouble for themselves in the future over the disputed mosque, demolished the structure overnight. To the Muslims this was nothing short of an act of desecration. In due course they resorted to legal action as a means of getting the alleged wrong righted.

AS can be easily seen, everything in this affair hinged upon the question of ownership of the mosque. Did it belong to the Sikhs or the Muslims? If it was held to belong to the Sikhs, the expediency of their action apart, no blame would legally attach to them for pulling down what by rights was their property. In the other event they would have made themselves civilly liable for trespass and criminally guilty of an act of desecration. But the District Court has held the Muslim ownership of the Pir Kakushah tomb in the Shahidganj Gurudwara as not satisfactorily proved. The acquittal of the eleven Sikhs charged under section 297 of the Indian Penal Code was the necessary corollary of this decision on the cardinal point.

THE judgment says that the subject matter of the suit was originally a mosque dedicated for prayer so far back as 1722. Forty years later its ownership came to be transferred to the Sikhs, since when it has not been in use as a Muslim place of worship. Before the Sikh Gurudwara Tribunal the Muslims tried to challenge the Sikh ownership of the property in dispute; but their claim was dismissed. Other attempts on their part in the past to establish their claim to the property are stated to have failed in like manner.

NOR, so far as one can see from a telegraphic summary of the judgment, were the Muslims able to satisfy Mr. Sale, the District Judge, either that somebody was buried in the alleged tomb or that somebody was the saint Pir Kakushah. The site may at one time have been a tomb; but to bring home the charge of wounding the religious feelings of the Muslims it was necessary to prove, not that it might have been a tomb in the remote past, but that it was as a fact a place of worship at the time the alleged offence took place. This point, the Judge held, the Muslims had not succeeded in establishing. It remains to be seen whether the District Court's judgment would be accepted as the last word on the subject by the Muslims.

"Imperialism Brings its own Punishment."

THE serious restriction of civil liberty in India involved by the existence of the statute book of what are generally known as repressive laws elicited strong condemnation at the hands of speakers at a public meeting recently organised by the India League in London. Prof. Laski, e. g., said :

It is the very negation of statesmanship to try to win by force Indian opinion and moral partnership between the two people. Does British public opinion know what is being done in its name in India? People have been put into prisons and many of them are in concentration camps. We are horrified enough when we read what Herr Hitler is doing, we are horrified enough when we read what Sgr. Mussolini is doing, but we do not take pains to acquaint ourselves with what is being done in our name in India. If British people had a sense of their responsibility to India, the India League in this country would not have been a small organization as it is today.

The truth of the matter, according to Prof. Laski, is that imperialism brings its own punishment. He then went on to say :

All that we know in this country is that the White Man's Burden here and elsewhere is to be borne by the black man. The massacre of Amritsar in 1919, the refusal of the British Government to concede to the Indian people their demands, all these things reveal to me, and I hope it reveals to all of you here, the plain fact that no people is good enough to be in charge of another people. Another fact that is revealed to me is that you cannot co-operate, as we are co-operating, with such methods.

abroad without sooner or later being habituated to them at home. The policies that are successfully pursued abroad by the British Government can be pursued at home. The more habituated we become to the use of this method of governance abroad, the more convinced the Government becomes of the utility of such methods at home. Be sure that people who become callous to the freedom of Indians will, sooner or later, become callous to the freedom that we have here at home. In my judgment we ought to be realistic about the problem.

Indian Temperance in England.

THE good work that is being done in England by the Anglo-Indian Temperance Association in arousing public interest in the problem of Indian temperance is unfortunately not widely known in this country. At a recent meeting of the Association a report on the temperance position in India by Rev. Anderson was read. Mr. Grubb writing in the *Hindu* characterises the position described in the report as "very unsatisfactory." This cannot cause any surprise to those in India who know from their study of provincial excise reports that the increased facilities for obtaining drink that are being provided in different provinces can by no stretch of imagination be looked upon as conducive to temperance. It is however somewhat comforting to learn that the question will soon be raised in Parliament by Lord Clwyd, the President of the Association. Equally reassuring was the promise conveyed in a letter from Mr. C. Rajagopalachari that the Prohibition League will not be allowed to die but will shortly be turned into an active organisation.

THE re-introduction of the outstill system in Bihar and Orissa after a lapse of nearly twenty years has greatly upset temperance workers in England. Miss Lester who was recently in India in connection with the Women's Conference made firsthand inquiries into the matter. She was told by one who has a close acquaintance with excise problems that the system "is considered a greater calamity than the earthquake of 1934." Dr. Mann whose interest in Abkari matters is not ephemeral describes the step as "most retrograde." That the revival of such an evil system should have been possible with popular ministers controlling excise policy is a source of much disquiet in India as well as in England, as is evident from the proceedings of this meeting.

Education in India.

IN his report on Indian Education for 1933-34, "considerable improvement" in the educational position is claimed by the Educational Commissioner with the Government of India. It is interesting to examine with the aid of statistics given in the report itself how far this complacent view is justified. The first thing to note is that the rise in the level of literacy is only fractional, literacy having gone up only by 12 to 4.85 per cent. of the population. The number of educational institutions as also that of scholars no doubt shows an increase, but it is by no means such as to support the above claim. The increase in the former case amounted to less than 1,500 and that in the latter to a little over three lakhs. It is undeniable that all this means some, though very slight, advance on the state of things existing at the beginning of the year; but to describe the position as a considerable improvement seems to be straining the meaning of words.

ANOTHER test to judge of the correctness or otherwise of the claim can also be applied. Was something

substantial done to promote mass education? Did compulsory education make any progress worth the name? In this case too the reply has to be an emphatic no. Far from registering any advance, considerable or otherwise, it actually recorded a set-back. The number of urban areas under compulsion was 158 during the preceding year but decreased by one in the year under report. The decline was more marked in the case of rural areas and consequently in that of villages under compulsion. Compulsion was in force in 3,384 rural areas in the year under report as against 3,489 in the previous year, while the number of villages under compulsion went down from 8,102 in 1932-1933 to 7,303 in 1933-1934. Previous reports used to give the relevant statistics for the preceding year alongside those for the current year, which used to facilitate reference. It is noticed that this convenient practice has been discontinued in the compilation of this report. Can anybody be blamed if he drew from this the inference that the discontinuance was in order to make it difficult for the public to get at the real position?

IT is in the fitness of things that the report makes a reference, however slight, to the problem of educated unemployment, which may without exaggeration be described as a political danger. In dealing with it, the writer argues in favour of a deliberate restriction of numbers by such means as raising the standard and cost of education. It need not be said that the suggestion would not command universal acceptance. Reference is also made to "much closer co-operation between the industrialists and those responsible for training school and college courses," and the provision of a "much larger amount of practical manual work in both general and professional institutions and of the introduction, if possible, of a system of business apprenticeship coupled with school and college training" suggested. The next report will, we hope, tell us something of the success achieved by the authorities in exploring the possibilities of this remedy.

Municipalities in Bihar.

WITH nearly half a dozen supersessions and with the management of two of the most important municipalities, viz. Patna and Cuttack, in the hands of Government we are afraid we cannot describe the working of municipalities in Bihar and Orissa during 1934-35 as progressive or even satisfactory. And, be it noted, this is by no means the least unsatisfactory feature of municipal administration in the province. The public as a whole seems to be so full of disgust at the manner in which municipal affairs are generally mismanaged by elected councillors that in one case in which the period of Government management was about to be over Government was actually implored to continue in the saddle! The mentality illustrated by this incident is greatly to be deprecated, for it lays the axe at the very root of the principle of local self-government which is that the people should utilise local bodies as a training ground for self-government. It may be that their management of municipal affairs may not be as efficient as that of the Government; but that is no reason for requisitioning Government assistance to a greater extent than is warranted by the needs of the situation.

THE educational expenditure by municipalities is found to have increased by Rs. 23,000 to nearly Rs. 4½ lakhs. But let nobody delude himself with the notion that the increase had anything to do with municipal activities in the direction of expansion of educational facilities. It was in a way forced on them by the ravages of the disastrous earthquake,

rendering reconstruction of school houses absolutely necessary in some cases. It is these building operations that make the educational expenditure on the part of municipalities larger than in the preceding year.

* * *

THE Patna Municipality is reported to have devoted special attention to the education of the children of the depressed classes. To this end it financed five primary schools specially intended for

them. We are at a loss to know whether its example is to be commended or condemned. We hope the Municipality is not unaware of the trend of progressive opinion in these matters, which is in the direction of promoting the admission of Harijan children into common schools rather than maintaining special schools for them. It follows that any departure from this wholesome rule will have to be supported by specially sound reasons. We trust that there existed such special circumstances in this case.

CIVIL LIBERTY.

IN his autobiography Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru explodes in indignation with all non-Congress parties for being utterly indifferent to Civil Liberty. When in the years between 1930 and 1932 the civil disobedience movement was on and when those who took part in it were subjected either to a wholesale denial or a drastic curtailment of civil liberties, the Responsivists and Liberal parties remained passive spectators of the terrific campaign of repression that was inaugurated at the time and in fact lent their support to it. This is Pandit Jawaharlal's allegation about the non-Congress parties in India. Indeed, the Pandit's condemnation is more comprehensive than this, for he includes the British Liberal and Labour parties in it too. But we need say nothing for these parties, and we refer to his grave charge against the Responsivist and Liberal parties here only because it has a bearing on the Civil Liberties Union which he wishes to form.

It is not the Pandit's complaint that the Responsivist and Liberal parties did not take part in the civil disobedience movement. He can understand these parties not favouring direct action, for, according to him, they are sticklers for law, whatever it be, whether moral or immoral. What he fails to understand and what he finds fault with them for is their not raising their voice in protest against a vindictive use of power by the executive against the soldiers of civil disobedience or against the trampling out of civil liberties even of those who were not connected with the movement but who wished to engage in normal and perfectly lawful and peaceable political activities, including their own. They were so dismayed by what was happening that, in order to save their own skins, they not only did not stand up for those who were ruthlessly put down but actually placed themselves on the other side of the barricade.

The Pandit's own words may be quoted :

The 'Governmentarians' of the pure variety did not matter much, for their first article of faith was subservience to the State authority, whatever it was. But even the Liberals and Responsivists accepted the ideology of the British Government almost completely, and their occasional criticism, such as it was, was thus wholly ineffective and valueless. It was well known that they were legalists at any price, and as such they could not welcome civil resistance. But they went much further, and more or less ranged themselves on the side of the Government. They were almost silent and rather frightened spectators of the complete suppression of civil liberties of all kinds. It was not merely a question of civil disobedience being countered and suppressed by the Government, but of all political life and public activity being stopped, and hardly

a voice was raised against this. Those who usually stood, for these liberties were involved in the struggle itself, and they took the penalties for refusing to submit to the State's coercion. Others were cowed into abject submission, and hardly raised their voices in criticism. Mild criticism, when it was indulged in, was apologetic in tone and was accompanied by strong denunciation of the Congress and those who were carrying on the struggle.

In Western countries a strong public opinion has been built up in favour of civil liberties, and any limitation on them is resented and opposed. (Perhaps this is past-history now.) There are large numbers of people who, though not prepared to participate in strong and direct action themselves, care enough for the liberty of speech and writing, assembly and organisation, person and press, to agitate for them ceaselessly and thus help to check the tendency of the State to encroach upon them. The Indian Liberals claim to some extent to carry on the traditions of British Liberalism (although they have nothing in common with them except the name), and might have been expected to put up some intellectual opposition to the suppression of these liberties, for they suffered from this also. But they played no such part. It was not for them to say with Voltaire: "I disagree absolutely with what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it."

Now we wish to say in the clearest possible terms on behalf of the Liberal Party, and if we may on behalf of the Responsivist Party, that there is not the slightest foundation for any of these statements and we wish to give a most unqualified and categorical denial to them. No flagrant instance of executive excesses either against Congressmen or non-Congressmen came to the notice of these parties which they did not protest against. They have always striven their best to maintain civil liberties in their integrity and, in doing so, they never took account of the fact that in some cases the men whose cause they espoused were their political opponents, believing that civil liberty was above and beyond party. That their protests were often ineffectual is not their fault any more than it is the fault of the Congress that its protest against the detention of Babu Subash Chandra Bose, for instance, has remained utterly ineffective. The point is, and we are concerned with no other, that they have never been behindhand in sternly opposing all wanton or arbitrary suppression of liberties, and we are sure that Pandit Jawaharlal can point to no important instance of high-handedness or oppression on the part of the Government in regard to which they assumed an attitude of neutrality or indifference. Pandit Jawaharlal will be almost shocked to hear that this paper quoted what Voltaire wrote to Helvetius as representing the Liberal attitude towards individual freedom, and the occasion for saying this was the Pandit's presidential speech at the Lucknow Congress. Whatever our own differences with the Pandit

may be, we said, in view of the rumours that were heard then of his impending incarceration, that we shall not brook any restraint being put upon his activities. Even the Liberals are sometimes capable of saying such things!

Pandit Jawaharlal says that if the Responsivists and Liberals ever screwed up enough courage to make a faint-hearted protest against the reign of terror of the time, they would always take care to neutralise its effect by condemning the movement which led up to repression, and this we suppose is really his grouse against these parties. But he must realise that to a certain extent this is inevitable. If people are roughly handled by the police while engaged, let us say, in salt satyagraha, it would be natural for those who do not accept the expediency of salt satyagraha to give expression to this sentiment while condemning police excesses. We suppose Pandit Jawaharlal himself, when called upon to protest against coercive laws of undue severity aimed at terrorists, will think it a matter of course to condemn terrorism, not so much to dissociate himself from it, but to make his argument full. For a protest by one who is opposed to terrorism will carry greater weight than a protest by one who is himself a terrorist. Similarly, when Liberals, in spite of their differences with direct actionists, protest against official excesses on the ground that, even in dealing with direct actionists, some decencies of conduct must be observed and civil liberties respected, they will carry greater conviction to the mind of their audience. And, in any case, even the Liberals are entitled to that individual freedom to protect which Pandit Jawaharlal wants to found a Civil Liberties Union. Even they must have the liberty to express their opinion about the movements in the country, whether the opinion be right or wrong.

It must be also remarked that civil liberty itself has its own limitations. The rights of the individual have to be reconciled with the powers of the State. Where exactly the line should be drawn, to which point the individual may follow his own will and at which point he may be rightfully coerced by the State against his will, is difficult to determine. We are ourselves for enlarging the scope of individual freedom of action and of limiting the scope of external restraint as much as possible, but anyhow civil liberty is not absolute, entirely unqualified by any other considerations. Keeping this in mind, what is the duty of the defenders of civil liberty in face of a civil disobedience or non-co-operation campaign in the country? A writer has said, in impressing on the people the need for jealously guarding civil liberties understood in a wide sense, that civil liberty cannot protect against peaceful coercion. And when such a movement of non-violent coercion or civil disobedience is started, all one can do is to appeal to the Government, first, to change their policy so that patriotic citizens may not be driven to adopt desperate remedies; secondly, to treat those who court imprisonment with humanity; and thirdly, to use just those powers of restraint which are absolutely necessary and no more. All these things the Liberals and Responsivists have done whenever the

need arose. It would not be possible for them to urge anything more. If it is claimed that their concern for civil liberty demands that they should ask the Government to leave the people free, whatever the circumstances, to do just what they please, it is a libertarian view of civil liberty which is not justified.

In order that the proper bounds of civil liberty may be understood, we would suggest that the proposed Civil Liberties Union should not take up merely political questions where the people come into conflict with the Government, or where Indians come into conflict with Europeans, but that it should also take up communal, social, religious and industrial questions where one section of the Indian people comes into conflict with another. Those who argue in political matters that the individual is everything and the State nothing will, as soon as they face social questions, set stern limits to individual freedom and allow a wide range for State action. In fact, we are afraid that the pendulum will then swing too far the other way. It will then be our duty, we expect, to press the claims of individual freedom upon the attention of our countrymen. Pandit Jawaharlal in Poona frankly admitted, with the object of justifying his criticism of the Responsivist and Liberal parties by saying that it really extended to all political parties including the Congress, that Congressmen do not understand the value of civil liberty as such. They happen, he said, to be the loudest in crying out against encroachments upon civil liberties now only because they are the sufferers themselves. But in their conduct they show no respect for civil liberty as a principle. This was abundantly proved at the time of the non-co-operation movement when wholly reprehensible attempts were made to coerce those who were opposed to them into conformity with their non-co-operation programme.

Indeed, what Pandit Jawaharlal says of Congressmen is of very general application and the phenomenon which he notes of those who suffer from violation of their civil liberty themselves encroaching upon the civil liberty of others when they get the chance is found almost everywhere. An American writer has well put this point, and it deserves earnest consideration at the hands of those who are solicitous of civil liberty in its true sense. He says:

First, few people care about civil liberty either for themselves or others, and the few who do care fight for their own liberty and not for the principle. Wherever in our history the issue has been sharply raised it has been raised by some group endeavouring to express itself against opposition, scarcely ever by men who held the creed nobly defined as "the willingness to die for the right of another man to say what you believe false and dangerous." Civil liberty has offered just another field in which factions have contended; and when one side won liberty, it meant not that they had re-established their rights in a permanent covenant but merely summoned enough power to force their opponents to let them do what they wanted.

The birth of the nation proved this; our forefathers were not abstract libertarians except for the rare philosopher like Jefferson. There was indeed a wide interest in liberty, an interest wider than has ever existed since, but an interest of a very utilitarian kind. The people wanted their liberties; first because they had found them useful in escaping from a tyrant, second because they needed them to run their experiment in government. . . . The founders took no thought to protect one part of the people

against another except in religious opinions; or the minority against the majority; or any political movement against the power of the party in control.

These early Americans were realists. Their own indifference to their new Bills of Rights proved this. They granted no unusual liberty to those who dissented from the will of the Revolutionary States. The ink was not dry on the sonorous phrases when they began to persecute their neighbours who wished to remain Englishmen. Nor could the Quaker pacifists of 1788 plead "religious liberty" to save themselves from being drafted into the Continental armies to fight for liberty!

It would be well if Pandit Jawaharlal would issue a memorandum in connection with the Civil Liberties Union defining civil liberty in broad out-

line, for it is very necessary that the people should be educated in the true conception of civil liberty. The Liberals have always taken up a strong stand for this conception, and they will always do whatever it is possible for them to do for protecting civil liberty against encroachments from whatever quarter, whether it be a high-handed foreign Government or vested interests entrenched behind the foreign Government or an insolent majority of our own people in social or political power. Liberty needs to be defended from all these, and the Liberals will do their bit in this matter.

THE CHARGE OF ROYALTY.

I

THE occasion of fixing the Civil List of His Majesty King Edward VIII affords a good opportunity for inquiring into the principles on which the British Parliament makes provision for the expenses of the office of the Crown and of the maintenance of the King and the Royal Family and for comparing them with the principles, if any, on which our Indian Princes proceed in making demands upon the State exchequers.

The first thing to be noticed about the Indian States is that the rulers of these States keep their private lands to themselves. The income of these lands is not brought into the State accounts. No one knows what the income is; much less is it possible for anyone to know how it is spent. The accounts are never published, and it would be *lese majeste* for any subject of the ruler to show the least curiosity to know what private income the ruler has and where it goes. It is the affair of the ruler himself to do what he likes with his estates; the State as such has no concern with it—except to pay the salary of the official or officials who administer the estates.

Nor does the ruler take the income of his private lands into reckoning when he makes raids upon the State treasury for the maintenance of his honour and dignity as head of the State or for the maintenance of his household. All the expenses on this account, whether of a private or public nature, have to be borne by the State treasury, his private income being just an extra, which he can either squander away or invest as he likes.

What amount he should take from the State treasury is determined by himself without reference to anyone. If in a State there is no representative assembly, the ruler of course has no one to consult with. But even where there is a sort of representative assembly, which occasionally is taken into consultation on some matters of policy, it is generally thought that the question of the expense incurred by the ruler upon himself or his family must lie altogether outside its jurisdiction. The representative assembly cannot discuss, much less vote upon, this expense. It may be large or it may be small; it may be well spent or ill spent. The representative assembly cannot question it at any stage. Indeed it can never know

how it is spent, and therefore any adverse criticism is out of the question. There are a few States, possibly half a dozen, where the rulers' privy purse (which of course is separate from the income which they draw from their private estates) is fixed at a certain percentage of the States' revenue. But, even in such a State, apart from the fact that the representative assembly has no voice in fixing the percentage, the subjects will never know how the money is actually expended.

Even the champions of the States' people's cause do not make it a plank in their platform to ask that the monies drawn by the ruler from the State exchequer for himself and his household be audited and published. All that they venture to ask for is that the ruler shall take no more than a certain percentage of the State income. They are quite willing to exclude this part of the State fisc from the purview of the representative assembly, and they only ask that the remaining portion be subject to its influence, or if they are so daring, to its control.

II

The notion is current even among our advanced politicians that it would be contrary to British usage to let the States' people have any voice in settling the rulers' privy purse or to ask for audited accounts to be submitted to them of these monies. Such a notion, however, is entirely unwarranted. For in England the King depends wholly upon Parliament's bounty, and Parliament is informed as to how the money voted by it is in fact spent. The only difference between its ordinary supplies and the supply on account of the King's establishment consists in this, that while the former are annually voted, the latter is voted at the beginning of each reign and remains in force during the whole reign. But it is true nonetheless that Parliament is as fully responsible for voting money for the King as for the nation. Parliament exercises its control only once in the case of each King; but the control is exercised in all its integrity.

After the demise of King George V, for instance, the House of Commons appointed a Select Committee consisting of all parties in the House to settle the Civil List of the present King. To this Committee

were supplied not only an account statement of the late King's Civil List during his reign from year to year, showing under what heads the money was spent (and this statement is published with the Select Committee's report), but tomes of other detailed information. Mr. Pethick-Lawrence, a representative of the Labour Party on the Select Committee, who is a critic of certain features of the Civil List recommended by the Committee, handsomely acknowledged in Parliament that the Committee was afforded every facility for carrying out the inquiry in a thorough manner. "We regarded it as our duty," he said, "to ask for a great deal of information, and it is only right to say that that information was frankly accorded to us." The Committee's report has been adopted by the Commons. It will later be embodied in a Bill, and the Bill will be thrashed out by Parliament in the usual manner, and only when it passes will the Civil List take effect.

The most important thing to note about the Civil List of British Sovereigns is that they do not hold any private lands. All such estates they have surrendered to the State. Every Sovereign at the beginning of his reign approaches Parliament for the Civil List and does so on the ground that the Crown has surrendered all private lands and all hereditary revenues. He says to Parliament: "Surrender is made of the revenues of the Crown Lands, and in consideration thereof the Crown relies upon Parliament to give a proper amount for the maintenance of the dignity of the Crown." The whole idea of the Civil List is that the King gives up his Royal demesnes and all other revenue in return for adequate provision being made by Parliament for the expenses of the Royal establishment. He first places his Crown possessions at the disposal of Parliament and, having denuded himself of all Crown property, relies on the generosity of Parliament to supply the needs of the Crown. In his message to Parliament of 10th March concerning the Civil List, King Edward VIII says: "His Majesty places unreservedly at the disposal of House of Commons those hereditary revenues which were so placed by his predecessor," &c. If he could hang on to his estates as our Indian Princes do, he would obtain, without going to Parliament, at least thrice as much as what Parliament would give him. For in 1935 the net revenue that the Crown Lands yielded was £1,320,000 (and this revenue grows every year) and the net receipts of other branches of hereditary revenue were £108,146 last year. But all this was paid into the exchequer. King Edward VIII surrenders this, and Parliament proposes to give him only £433,100 instead, of which as much as £119,000 will remain undrawn for some years.

From the lands surrendered the Duchies of Lancaster and Cornwall are excepted on technical grounds. The official view is that these lands are not Crown Lands in the special sense of the word. It is held that the two Duchies represent private property like the property that the King may purchase from any savings from the Civil List. The Duchy of Lancaster came to the Monarch through the marriage of John O'Gaunt

in 1331 with Lady Blanche, who was the daughter of the third Duke of Lancaster, and the Duchy of Cornwall came to the Duke of Cornwall at the time of the Black Prince, subsequently created Duke of Cornwall, to whom it was handed over by Edward III after he had succeeded his brother, John of Eltham, in 1336, the original owner of the estates. The manner in which the King came into the possession of the estates of the Duchy of Lancaster and the Prince of Wales in his capacity as Duke of Cornwall into the possession of the Duchy of Cornwall affords justification, it is maintained, for treating these two properties on a different footing from the Crown Lands. This view is hotly contested by others, but whether the view be correct or not, it should be understood that the revenue yielded by these properties is taken into account in fixing the Civil List. It is not as if the Civil List by itself is considered adequate for the needs of the Royal Household, and that the revenue of the Duchies is additional. The Civil List is so fixed that it will be sufficient only when the revenue of the Duchies is counted in. The net revenue of the Duchy of Lancaster, for instance, in 1934 was £85,000, and that was paid over to the late King's Privy Purse, and his total Privy Purse allotment of £110,000, one of the items in the Civil List, was reduced by that amount, in so far as the Exchequer was concerned. Even if these Duchies are regarded as private property of the Royal Family, their revenues count toward the Civil List, and are not additional to the Civil List, as the revenue of the private lands of the rulers of Indian States is additional to what they derive from the State treasuries.

III.

As the Civil List is settled once for all at the commencement of each reign and continues in force during the whole of the reign without alteration, not only are the immediate needs of the King and his family taken into consideration in fixing the size of the List, but the needs that may arise in the future in the King's life-time have also to be taken into account. The present King is unmarried; the contingency of his marriage has thus to be kept in view and provided for. Thus, although the Civil List is so fixed that it will be sufficient to meet both present and future needs, it is laid down that he cannot spend the whole of the amount for so long as some of the needs provided for have not actually arisen. The Civil List is not a lump sum which the King can apply to whatever use he likes. King Edward VII and George V were given a Privy Purse of £110,000 each, and the same is proposed for King Edward VIII. But this includes a provision of £33,000 for the Queen. Similarly, the £134,000 allowed for disbursing the salaries of the present King's Household, etc., includes a grant of £7,000 for the Queen's personal staff. These two amounts, or £40,000 in all, though sanctioned, will be liable to be paid only when the King marries, and not till then. He will be paid less to that extent as long as he remains single.

Who are the relatives of the King that are provided for in the Civil List? First, the Dowager Queen who is paid an annuity of £70,000. King George V's Civil List, as King Edward VII's, provided for this amount, and that will be paid to Queen Mary. It is proposed also to make similar provision in King Edward VIII's Civil List, to be used if his future Queen should survive him. Second, the Prince of Wales, to whom is given the revenue of the Duchy of Cornwall, which is supposed to belong to him as Duke of Cornwall. Third, the Princess of Wales, to whom was allotted, under King George V's Civil List, an annuity of £10,000 during her marriage and of £30,000 in the event of her surviving her husband. The provision proposed to be made in the present King's Civil List for the future Prince of Wales and Princess of Wales will be described below. Fourth, the younger children of the King. They were provided for in King George V's Civil List, and are proposed to be provided for in King Edward VIII's Civil List, at the following rate: an annuity of £10,000 for each son on attaining the age of 21 years and a further annuity of £15,000 for each son on marrying, and an annuity of £6,000 for each daughter on reaching 21 years or marrying.

No provision is made in the Civil List for any other members of the Royal Family. At one time grandchildren too were provided for, but that practice has now been definitely abandoned, "the principle," as the Select Committee says, "that the provision for the grandchildren of the reigning Sovereign should be made out of grants adequate for that purpose which had been assigned to their parents being now well established." Thus no one belonging to the Royal Family has now any claim on a share in the Civil List except the King and Queen, Queen Mother, Heir Apparent and his wife, and the younger children of the King. The inclusion of the younger children in the Civil List is disliked by many. Sir Charles Dilke took exception to it when King George V's Civil List was considered in 1910, and it goes without saying that the members of the Labour Party opposed it then. Mr. Keir Hardie said on this occasion: "When the sons of the present King come of age, with the exception of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, surely they can find ways and means of serving their country and earning their salaries, without becoming, as was said on a former occasion by a very distinguished Member of this House, recipients of outdoor relief. What this proposes is that we should provide for members of the Royal Family an income to enable them to live a life of luxury, ease and idleness. [Several Hon. Members: 'Withdraw.'] Is not that a correct statement? What we are proposing is to provide an income for members of the Royal Family without asking any service in exchange. That statement will not be disputed. It cannot be disputed."

There were many abuses connected with the Civil List in the past, which in course of time have been corrected. King George III was given, as was said by Mr. Balfour in 1910, a "gigantic Civil List." "Our old Nobility" says of this Monarch: "The Ministry had to demand of the House £500,000 for

the payment of the King's debts." Similarly, the Commons had to pay the huge debts of George IV as Prince of Wales. It is recorded: "George, Prince of Wales, son of George III, handsome and clever, but a liar, a spendthrift, and a debauchee, like all the heirs apparent of his house, applied to Parliament to pay his debts, amounting to £250,000 which Parliament paid. . . . In 1796 the Prince incurred fresh debts amounting to £700,000, which were also paid by Parliament." But such infamous proceedings happily belong to a distant past. Mr. Pethick-Lawrence, while urging changes in the Civil List proposed for the present King, was glad to bear testimony to the great improvement that has since been effected. He remarked: "Speaking for myself, and I believe for those of my colleagues who served on the Committee, I was satisfied that the waste and extravagance and the emoluments of sinecures which were characteristic of courts in days gone by, had to a great extent been eliminated. If there are still any economies to be effected advantageously, I believe they are small in extent and will not make a great deal of difference to the total amount."

IV

The spirit which animates the present King in dealing with this question is best seen from the manner in which he proposes to deal with the revenue of the Duchy of Cornwall, which amounts at present to £104,000. This revenue will be vested in the King till he marries and has a son, and till the son attains his majority. The King could have allowed the revenue to accumulate for all this long period to the credit of the future Prince of Wales, and have insisted upon his pound of flesh in the form of a full-sized Civil List. Such things have happened in previous reigns. But King Edward VIII informed Parliament that the revenue from the Duchy of Cornwall should be used to reduce his own Privy Purse. The Duke of York, Heir Presumptive, will have in the interval to perform the duties expected of the Prince of Wales, and for this reason the King desires that an annual sum of £25,000 should be paid to the Duke out of the revenue of the Duchy in addition to what he would be entitled to get as a younger son of the late King under the terms of King George V's Civil List. The balance would be round about £79,000 a year. This will not be kept year after year for the use of the future Prince of Wales, but will go to relieve the King's Privy Purse, which will be £77,000 till the King marries. The remaining £2,000 of the balance will be applied to the relief of the other parts of the Civil List. By his own wish the King has arranged that the fact that the Duchy will be vested in himself shall not operate to increase the amount of his Civil List. After a son is born to the King, a change will become necessary in these arrangements, but we need not go into all the details. It would be enough to say that a sum of £10,000 would be set apart every year for the future Princess of Wales during the minority of the Prince of Wales, and the amount so accumulated is to be used to meet the charge that the Civil List usually

bears on account of the Princess of Wales. King George V's Civil List provided for an annuity of £10,000 for the Princess of Wales during her marriage and an annuity of £30,000 if she should survive the Prince of Wales. Such a provision will not be made in the present King's Civil List, and to that extent the burden on the Civil List will be lessened. The solicitude shown by the King in this matter is really touching. The Select Committee was informed "that His Majesty, in proposing the above arrangements, had two considerations in mind: that the accumulation of the total revenues of the Duchy (of Cornwall) during the minority of the Duke would provide at his majority a capital sum in excess of his reasonable requirements, and that, in the circumstances of the case, these accumulations would have been made in part at the expense of the Exchequer." Another noteworthy thing is that the revenue of the Duchy is subject to the payment of Income Tax and Sur-Tax, and at current rates the amount of tax would be as much as £45,000. Indeed, the King was liable to pay Income Tax (the official way of putting it is that the King voluntarily paid Income Tax) on his own Civil List till 1910. In fixing King George V's Civil List Income Tax was first abolished, but it was done only in consideration of another burden newly placed on the Civil List, viz. that of the expense of the King's State visits to foreign countries and the expense incurred by the State in entertaining foreign sovereigns.

V.

There are some other matters of detail which, though of minor importance in themselves, are of very great significance to us as showing with what minute care all things connected with the Civil List are examined. In the King's Household there are three officers, viz. the Treasurer, Comptroller and Vice-Chamberlain, who, though their salaries are borne on the Civil List, are not so much Court officials as political officers who perform duties analogous to those performed by the Junior Lords of the Treasury. The Select Committee, therefore, recommends that their salaries should henceforward be transferred to the Parliamentary Vote. If this is done the salaries would naturally come under the control of Parliament, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Neville Chamberlain, therefore, thought it necessary to say that the transfer of the salaries of these officers to the Estimates "does not necessarily mean that the salaries will remain at the figure at which they have hitherto stood." Another question relates to the amount spent in keeping the Royal Palaces in repair. In Edward VII's Civil List £47,000 was provided annually for the upkeep of Palaces, and the amount was divided between external works and internal works, £27,000 being allotted to the former and £20,000 to the latter. In considering King George V's Civil List Parliament decided that the amount of £27,000 provided for external repairs should be withdrawn from the Civil List and brought under Parliament's cognisance. Since then

the figure appears annually on the Estimates and it is now possible, as Mr. Lloyd George, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, explained, "for any Member of the House to ask questions on the subject in the course of the year, or for the House to debate fully every subject which is relevant when the Motion is put from the Chair that the sum of £27,000 be voted." Mr. Keir Hardie then suggested that expenses of the other part of the upkeep, viz. interior repairs, should also be similarly placed on the Estimates. This is now proposed to be done, and the charge of £20,000 also will be transferred from the Civil List to the Civil Votes. It would be a fixed grant, any unexpended balance out of which would be allowed to accumulate for future expenditure, but it would be subject every year to Parliamentary criticism and control.

Only two other matters need be noted here. First, King George V's Civil List allowed £193,000 every year for the "Expenses of His Majesty's Household", which is one of the six classes into which the Civil List is divided. In fact, however, the King by careful administration reduced actual expenditure on this head to about £134,000 in a normal year. And King Edward VIII has signified his wish that the economies made by his father should go to the benefit of the Exchequer, and not to his own benefit. The Select Committee has not proposed to give to the Exchequer the full benefit of the economies effected in the late reign, but to make a reduction of £46,200 in this class of expenditure on account of these economies. Secondly, in every Civil List £8,000 a year was set aside for "unappropriated" items of expenditure, and since 1922 an average amount of £2,500 was annually spent by King George V from this head to meet expenditure on subscriptions to charities in excess of £13,200 provided for in the Civil List for this special purpose. Even those who criticised the Civil List as extravagant felt that this provision was too niggardly, and that twice that amount would not be excessive. But this "unappropriated" head is now proposed to be abolished, the excess expenditure thus having to be met from monies appropriated to other classes of expenditure.

Perhaps the most important feature, from the point of view of Indian conditions, of the Civil List of British Sovereigns is that it is subject to independent audit. Every law dealing with this matter has a provision which says that "the Civil List Audit Act, 1816, and all other enactments relating to the Civil List of his late Majesty, and not superseded or expressly repealed, shall continue to apply to the Civil List under this Act." The audit of the Civil List was not always what might have been desired, but the improvement that has recently taken place leaves nothing to be desired. Sir Charles Dilke, by no means an indulgent critic, said in 1910 on this subject: "This Clause is the audit clause, and it used in former days to be in a most unsatisfactory condition. It is now in a most satisfactory condition. For the last two years the post of Auditor of the Civil List happens to have been held by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury. That has given such general satisfaction that I hope it is likely to be a permanent arrange-

ment." We believe it is a permanent arrangement. The account of the Civil List is separately maintained and if in any year there is a balance left over after expenditure it is carried forward to the next year. Thus out of the 25 years of King George V's reign there was a saving for 15 years amounting to £60,000 in all and for the other 10 years there was a total deficit of £45,000, which was met from the accumulated savings.

We hope that the details given above are not boring; they are given only to show the amount of care that is bestowed upon fixing the Civil List and to indicate the principles on which it is drawn up. There was some strong criticism levelled at the Civil List proposed for the present King in the House of Commons, but the general opinion on it was that, though Royalty was not run on the cheap, the Royal establishment, as the *Manchester Guardian* said, "is fairly modest as the establishments of the rich go."

Reviews.

PROBLEMS OF EMPIRE.

THE DUTY OF EMPIRE. BY LEONARD BARNES.
(Gollancz.) 1935. 22cm. 318p. 10/6.

THIS is a well-written and informative book, which approaches the complicated question of imperialism from a realistic point of view. Its chief merit is that it is written not by an armchair philosopher, but by one who possesses a firsthand knowledge of the problems with which he is concerned, having been on the Colonial Office Staff from 1921 to 1925, and assistant editor of two of the leading South African dailies between 1927 and 1931. The author does much to correct the familiar ideas of Empire as "a trust of civilisation" and of the white men as carrying the burden of the coloured as a sacred responsibility. He does not gloss over problems of economic exploitation, political domination, racial tyranny, and the destruction of indigenous industries and culture,—all of which are necessary accompaniments of modern imperialism. He describes the Empire in fact as "a composite jumble, ramshackle in some parts, repressive in others, aimless in most, and beneficent in a few." (p. 21).

The book is divided into four parts. The first three parts deal with the ethical, political, and economic aspects of imperialism respectively. In the fourth and last part, the author suggests a way by which imperialism may be transformed into an instrument for the service of mankind. The book deals primarily with the British Empire and the problems which confront it in different parts of Africa, although the author is equally familiar with conditions in India and other parts of the Empire.

Mr. Barnes rightly places ethics in the forefront and subordinates politics and economics to it. He believes with General Smuts, for whose anti-Indian and anti-native policy he has no love, that "unless we make State policy private morality writ large, there is no hope for the civilisation in which we live." From the ethical point of view, the author finds that the white settlers of Africa, particularly in the south and east, have at every point betrayed the trust reposed in them. The policy which they have pursued through the years has made them "thriving earth-worms," practically devoid of all humanitarian feelings towards the people of the soil.

The author points out that in the mining districts "conditions analogous to slavery" prevail. Native

labourers are recruited for the most part by deception, and the compound system under which many of them live is detrimental to health, morals, and economic uplift. A compound he defines as a "cross between a barrack and a gaol." There is no comparison whatever between the wages earned by native workers and those earned by European workers. On an average, the European earns eight times as much for less arduous work. Heavy fines and hard labour are imposed for the slightest infringement of contracts, the terms of which many a native may not understand. Besides, the native is effectively shut out from all skilled and semi-skilled occupations, and is destined by law to remain for ever on the level of a floating proletariat. In the words of the writer: "It is the distinction of the mines to have rendered slavery unnecessary by retaining its substance while dispensing with its form".

Conditions in agriculture are not any better. In the last twenty years, as the author observes, a system of native policy has been built up in the Union of South Africa which is a calculated outrage upon every tradition of fair dealing. In the Transvaal and Natal, "no male native may be employed outside the farm on which he resides, unless he carries a document from the farmer permitting him to seek employment." Brutality is added to oppression. For instance, if a person "appears to be" under 18, he may be flogged in addition to any other penalties inflicted on him for violation of the contract. The author agrees with the late Lord Milner in believing that the racial inequalities to which the natives are subjected in the Union would never be tolerated in a Crown Colony. The Afrikaner policy of the Union Government is bringing serious discredit to the whole of the British Empire, and particularly to Britain, the chief partner.

The root of the trouble in South and East Africa the author traces to two conditions: (1) confiscation of enormous tracts of land by a handful of whites and throwing the cloak of law over it; (2) complete self-government for these immigrant settlers. So long as these conditions prevail, the author sees no hope for the future. In the West Indies and parts of West Africa, where these conditions do not prevail to the same extent, the author finds that the situation is less intolerable. In this connection, it is interesting to be told that the Parliamentary Committee of 1837, presided over by F. Buxton, laid down:

(1) So far as the lands of the aborigines are within any territories over which the dominion of the Crown extends, the acquisition of them by Her Majesty's subjects, upon any title of purchase, grant, or otherwise, from their present proprietors, should be declared illegal and void.

(2) The protection of natives is not a trust which could conveniently be confided to colonial legislatures.

Speaking of the British Empire as a whole, the author says that it is supposed to stand for

- (1) Peace among all its members.
- (2) A system of co-operative defence against outside aggression.
- (3) Freedom for all its members.
 - (a) Personal.
 - (b) Economic (i. e., decent and steadily rising standards of living).
 - (c) National.

In practice, the author finds that these boons apply to self-governing dominions only, and not to colonies and dependencies which constitute six-sevenths of the whole empire.

Many of the grievances arising out of British imperialism, Mr. Barnes believes, "are ultimately traceable to the free movement of private capital into and out of India and Africa." He considers that much free flow of capital has not brought any relief

to the masses. As far as India is concerned, it has only tightened the grip of the Anglo-Indian and Indian rich upon the poor, and the grip of Britain upon India.

The old Colonial system, as the author sees it, stands condemned from whatever angle one may look at it. Imperialism can be justified only "in so far as it genuinely and steadily tends to transform the Colonies into free societies of free men." This end, the author holds, cannot be achieved so long as the capitalistic order persists in Britain, for capitalism and imperialism are twin-brothers. The author is convinced that "some sort of socialist revolution in Britain is a pre-condition of any tolerable imperial system." Genuine self-government for India and other Colonial empires is impossible so long as the necessary economy of capitalist imperialism remains in England. The British character needs to be increasingly socialised and internationalised.

The author is aware of the fact that the solution which he suggests is not likely to meet with the approval of the Dominions, in some of which the worst traits of European character have become exaggerated. He, therefore, opines that the Dominions will largely have to be left out of account in any socialist planning of imperial re-organisation. The chief concern of British Socialism must be with the dependent empire.

As soon as Socialism—not the present Labour party—comes into power, it should grant self-government to Colonies and dependencies at the earliest possible moment, and work for the welfare of the masses both at home and abroad. The building up of a socialist State in Britain should go hand in hand with the pulling down of the old Colonial system.

Admirable as it is, the book offers no solution to the pressing economic, political, and racial problems of Africans in South and East Africa to-day. Is it possible to bring the administration of indigenous people directly under the control of a well-organised and justly constituted family of nations? The book further fails to show how imperialist Britain can be converted into a socialist and internationalist Britain. In spite of these failures, the book is so valuable that it should be in the hands of every administrator of imperial affairs as well as in the hands of every person who desires to have an intelligent understanding of the complex and complicated problems arising out of the relations between imperialist powers and subject races.

It is a happy augury for the future that a book of this kind, calling for a radical revision of the British attitude towards the Empire, has come from the pen of one who has served as member of the Colonial Office Staff.

E. ASIRVATHAM.

MEDIAEVAL SOCIALISM.

MEDIAEVAL SOCIALISM. By BEDE JARRETT.
(Burns Oates.) 1935. 20cm. 94p. 2/6.

THE title of the book is likely to provoke a feeling of protest in many minds. Is not Socialism, it will be asked, essentially the outcome of the industrialisation of society that characterises the modern as distinguished from the mediaeval period. If by socialism is meant the movement towards collectivisation of industry and the supremacy of the wage-earners both in the process and the functioning of this transformation, then indeed Socialism is a peculiarly 'modern' movement, following in the wake of large industry and class differentiation. But if by socialism is meant the organisation of individual and collective life in support of a common social purpose, then socialism is not only mediaeval but ancient. The earliest social

philosophers and religious prophets have always emphasised the social responsibilities of all persons, and their outlook on such institutions as property, industry, state, etc. has always been deeply imbued with a communal, if not always a communist, ideal.

It is for this reason that whenever strong revolutionary forces, such as the trade union movement in the nineteenth and the socialist movement in the twentieth century, assert their position as plausible creeds, a certain type of counter-revolutionary thought is readily induced. In this process religious socialism, or speaking for the West, Christian socialism, raises its voice in favour of far-reaching social reform. The Bible is known to contain several texts which may well serve as a socialist, and even a communist, breviary. It must be admitted that the deep religiosity and social solidarity that are inculcated by these essentially counter-revolutionary movements are greatly instrumental in building up a reformist and an evolutionary bloc of liberal socialism, much in the way as in most Catholic countries on the continent.

Father Bede Jarrett's exposition of socialistic currents in mediaeval Christian thought is both scholarly and eloquent. It will prove valuable to all those who are trying to understand the many aspects of the great social problem of the present day, namely, the growing discontent among the non-property classes in a democracy.

Apart from the outlook of social responsibility and communal solidarity induced by a devout faith, Christianity has little to offer either in the understanding or the solution of the problem of class struggle. It is the process of economic concentration in a world of mechanical industry that sets the stage for the emergence of the modern social problem. Neither of these points has been considered in the mediaeval systems of thought. Against this background the extreme claims of individualism in a liberal democracy appear as demands for social anarchy, where the economically strong are allowed the protection of the law to exploit the economically weak. The problem of socialism is thus an essentially political problem in the sense that the legal systems require to be reorganised so as to make socially unjustifiable acts in the economic sphere impossible. A purely religious, and in fact even a purely economic, outlook on the social issue is not likely to be either historically correct or practically helpful.

It is very refreshing to find that Father Jarrett recognises this limited, but by no means unimportant, significance of the study of socialistic trends in mediaeval thought. A perusal of the book is bound to be helpful in forming a correct social outlook. The doctrines of sin and of the temporal supremacy of Caesar have no relevance to the current controversy about socialism; but the philosophy of social duties which characterised mediaeval Christian thought, and which has been so ably discussed in the book, will be very useful to students of contemporary social problems.

D. G. KARVE.

SHIDZUE ISHIMOTO.

FACING TWO WAYS: THE STORY OF MY LIFE. By BARONESS SHIDZUE ISHIMOTO.
(Cassell.) 1935. 24cm. 297p. 12/6.

THIS is the autobiography of Baroness Shidzue Ishimoto, one of the leading women in Modern Japan. Shidzue was born into a Samurai family of Tokyo, and though Japan had cast away feudalism thirty years before her birth, her childhood and youth were spent in a family which observed the rigid etiquette, intricate formality and the austere discipline of the old civilisation. After an education in the Peereses'

School, she was given in marriage to Baron Keikichi Ishimoto, an aristocrat who had travelled widely. Baron Ishimoto, though born in the purple, was a humble student of Christian humanism and exchanged a life of ease and pleasure for one of hard toil. He got an appointment as Engineer on a small salary in the Miike Coal Mining Field in Western Japan. He took his wife with him to the mining district and encouraged her to be an active, liberal and understanding companion instead of remaining a meek, feudal wife. He undertook a trip to the United States and took his wife along with him so that her knowledge of men and things might deepen and her desire for service become keener on coming in contact with the humanitarian organisations of the West. He even wanted to visit Russia—so attracted towards the Socialist Republic he was—but was prevented from so doing by Japanese higher authorities. The encouragement given by her husband to cultivate the qualities of service, heroism and self-reliance as well as her own ideas to work for the emancipation of womankind in Japan from the restrictions and discipline of family and society made Baroness Ishimoto a fearless worker for improving the lot of women in Japan. She came to possess a burning conviction that if modern Japan is to survive, her women ought to be treated on the same footing as men and that there should not be one standard of morality for men and another for women. She felt that woman's emancipation would best be achieved by scientific birth-control, and she became an ardent admirer and willing disciple of Margaret Sanger. She carried on propaganda for birth-control in Japan and by so doing, she antagonised women of the Samurai class. The cause of women to which she had dedicated herself gained slightly by the earthquake tragedy of 1923 in which women rendered excellent services. But though progress in her work was slow on account of the conservatism of the Samurai class, she was buoyed up by the feeling that her husband approved of her noble endeavour. But unfortunately her husband who had hitherto been a Radical now became a Conservative owing to the influence of his friends and did not like his wife identifying herself with the Feminist movement. Naturally husband and wife drifted apart, and rather than obey an unreasonable husband, Shidzue separated from the Baron and with her two sons worked for the cause of women in Japan. After her separation from the Baron, Shidzue went on a lecturing tour to the United States and with the remuneration that she got, she started a birth-control clinic in Japan giving scientific information on birth-control to her sisters.

Such then is the story of Baroness Shidzue Ishimoto's life. The Baroness is not a thoroughly Westernised lady. She has a great admiration for the art and philosophy of old Japan and at the same time she wants to destroy some of the antiquated conceptions of the Japanese regarding woman and her place in family and society. All through the book we find her facing two ways—hence the suggestive title of the book.

This is the story of a courageous and self-willed lady who endeavoured to lead her sisters in Japan to emancipation and self-reliance beneath jealous eyes, amid the babel of rancorous tongues and at a certain stage against the wishes of her husband. But the interest of the book does not rest on the story of the Baroness's life alone. In an extremely pleasant style, the Baroness gives a fine pen picture of the social and religious life of Japan. Particularly interesting are her pen pictures of the Samurai customs and manners, life of the Japanese miners, Geisha ladies and tea-shops, Zen-sect or the religion of Solitude and Nichirenism or the religion of social righteousness.

We have no hesitation in saying that this is

an extremely interesting and instructive book on Modern Japan.

M. V. SUBRAHMANYAM.

PROBLEM OF TOWN-PLANNING.

OUTLINE OF TOWN AND CITY PLANNING.

By THOMAS ADAMS. (Russell Sage Foundation.)
1935. 24cm. 368p. \$ 3-00.

THIS excellent and up-to-date book has been written by the author, particularly for two types of readers viz., (1) that comprising laymen interested in civic improvement, who desire some knowledge of the basic principles in civic growth and the objects, scope and practical applications of city planning; and (2) that comprising students of city planning who intend to pursue it as a profession. To the second class of readers, however, it provides only an introduction to the detailed study of the subject.

The book presents the whole story of the art and practice of city planning, starting with examples from the hoary past like the cities of Mohanjo Daro, Nineveh Babylon, the Chinese, Greek, Roman and Mayan cities, then adducing examples from the glorious cities of the Renaissance and then narrating a fuller description of the town-planning activities of the modern period, and ending with a chapter giving guidance and the probable developments of the future. The most instructive part of the book is the portion dealing with the effects of the religious, artistic and sociological tendencies of each age on the city planning of that period. The book also gives very new and refreshing ideas regarding not merely the town and city planning, but also the "Regional" and "State Planning," so that, the planning is not confined merely to a particular town or city as we in India are accustomed to suppose, but, also to a region consisting of several towns and districts which are contiguous. This means comprehensive planning of the area not merely for the present but for the future. Such contributions to public knowledge are very welcome particularly at this time, when the necessity for economy and orderliness makes it so important to plan ahead and to avoid the baneful results of haphazard development.

The author being an American, the book contains examples and details of planning mostly of American cities, which a non-American may consider rather dry and somewhat overdone. The matter in the book would have been still more interesting, if the general principles had been first adumbrated and explained at length and then typical examples of existing cities had been adduced, explaining the merits and demerits of each with reference to the principles enunciated. The plans given in the book are on a very small scale, making them in some cases unreadable.

The book, on the whole, is a thought-provoking and interesting contribution. And it could not have been otherwise, considering its author, who has an experience of over thirty years, both as a teacher and a practitioner in the United States.

K. D. JOSHI.

JUSTICE UNDER MUSLIM RULE.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE DURING THE MUSLIM RULE IN INDIA.

By WASHED HUSAIN. (University of Calcutta.)
1935. 22cm. 185p.

THIS is a modest but systematic essay on the subject of Justice under Muslim Rule in India. It is a welcome addition to the study of Mediæval India which has been attracting increasing attention of late.

Modern India is faced with several intriguing problems, not the least formidable of which is that of Hindu-Muslim relations. The hope of harmonious relations must necessarily lie in correct mutual understanding between the two vast communities, each of which has made vital contributions to the rich history of our country. Mr. Washed Husain has, therefore, done well in drawing special attention to the administration of justice under Muslim Rule in India.

The writer is an advocate of the High Court of Calcutta and is well-versed in the history as well as the technique of the subject he deals with. Although his main thesis is confined to justice under Mughal administration, he has advisedly treated his subject in a very comprehensive manner. The reason, as he points out, is obvious: "The Mughal system of the administration of justice was of slow growth; the judicial machinery was set up gradually and from time to time modified and improved upon what had existed in the pre-Mughal period." Likewise he has pursued the subject down to the beginnings of British administration in India. Thus Chapter VIII describes the judicial system as it existed in 1765 when our present rulers acquired the Diwani. The closing sections of this chapter are of particular value and interest as they give a comparative view of Islamic and British courts of justice on the one hand, and on the other, point out the influences of Moghal rule upon its successors. In the words of Sir Jadunath Sarkar, "The administrative system of the Moghal Empire has more than an academic interest for us. This type of administration, with its arrangements, procedure, machinery and even titles was borrowed by the Hindu States outside the territories directly subject to Mughal rule... Nor is it altogether dead in our own times. Traces of it still survive, and an observant student of history can detect the Moghal structure under the Modern British-Indian administrative edifice." Mr. Husain has taken pains to point out some traces of these foundations.

However, one cannot help feeling that although the author's treatment has been both judicious, scholarly and interesting, the view on the whole has been too complimentary to cover the whole truth. He has written with the deliberate intention of vindicating Muslim Rule against its unsympathetic and adverse critics. But this could have been done without the use of such hyperboles as those found on pages 53 and 54 (e. g. "Capital punishments were almost totally unknown under Aurangzeb;" "he did not persecute the adherents of different persuasions in matters of religion;" etc.). In his conclusion he formally admits, "It cannot be denied that the judicial system of the Mediæval Age had its merits and demerits," but throughout the treatise he has emphasised the brighter almost studiously ignoring the darker side. "The Better Side of the Administration of Justice during the Muslim Rule in India" would, in my opinion, have been a more accurate title for this eminently interesting volume.

S. R. SHARMA.

SHORT NOTICES.

EASTERN LIGHTS. By MAHENDRANATH SIRCAR.
(Arya Publishing House, Calcutta.) 1935. 21cm.
305p. Rs. 4.

THIS is a popular, yet authoritative, book on 'Indian Philosophy and Modern Hinduism' and comprises

the author's lectures on that subject addressed mainly to his European listeners in Italy, France and Germany, to which countries he was specially invited. Dr. Sarkar has already made a name for himself in the world of philosophical learning by his scholarly and profound, if somewhat technical, works on Vedanta and allied subjects; and it is certainly refreshing to note that in the work under notice he has come down to the level of more popular exposition.

The book is naturally mainly expository in character and does not enter into controversial issues. It falls into three natural divisions. In the first (Lectures I-IV) Dr. Sarkar has brought out the nature and significance of the principal teachings of the Upanishads, the Gita, the Bhagavata, and the Tantras. The second (Lectures V-VIII) devotes itself to conceptual analysis and expounds the metaphysical, aesthetic, moral and spiritual ideas underlying Indian Philosophy as a whole. The third and the last group of lectures (IX-XII) addresses itself to more recent times and concentrates itself on the religio-philosophical teachings of some of the typical modern spiritual seers of India, Raja Ram Mohun Roy, Swami Dayananda Saraswati, Swami Ramkrishna Paramahansa and Sjt. Aurobindo Ghosh. In each of these parts of the book Dr. Sarkar evinces a thorough mastery of the subject, but at the same time has steadily kept in view the wood and never has lost himself among the trees. One would only have desired the author to include in the last part some reference to one or two representative spirits from the Deccan and the Tamil-Naidu Saints.

The printing and the general get-up of the book are good.

D. D. VADEKAR

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION IN THE MADRAS PRESIDENCY. By VEPA V. NARASIMHAM.
(The Store Press, Berhampur.) 1935. 20cm. 53p.

THIS brochure advocates the scheme which is known as the Champion Scheme for the reconstruction of the elementary education in the province. The opposition to the scheme has been great and this brochure might go a great way to clear up the many misconceptions about it. There is a great wastage in elementary education as evidenced by the fact that the number of pupils entering the first standard give up their schooling before they reach the higher classes. Compulsion wherever tried has only served to swell the number of pupils of the first standard which dwindles almost to nothing in the higher classes, and has been a waste of efforts and funds. Compulsion to retain those who enter the first standard in the school till they finish their fourth or fifth classes avoids this kind of wastage. Attempts to avoid this wastage in other provinces have been richly rewarded. The single teacher schools have been generally unsuccessful and have resulted in a great wastage of funds. The author advocates the system of double teacher feeder schools and the central schools. The author elaborates the significant role of the rural teacher, and he wants to differentiate between the rural elementary education and the secondary education. The book is not intended for sale but that does not absolve the printer of his responsibility for correct printing. The author is unsparing in his criticism of his opponents whether they be public men or workers in the field of education.

N. S. S.