

# The Servant of India

Editor: S. G. VAZE.

Office: SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY, POONA 4.

VOL. XXI, No. 42., }

POONA—THURSDAY, OCTOBER 27, 1938.

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

## CONTENTS

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK ... ..	529
ARTICLES:	
Foreign Policy for the Commonwealth. ... ..	533
Economic Planning. ... ..	534
Sind Politics. ... ..	535
Civil Liberties under the Nizam. ... ..	537
REVIEW:	
Constitutional Law: By S. V. K. ... ..	539
SHORT NOTICE ... ..	540
BOOKS RECEIVED. ... ..	540

## Topics of the Week.

### Dyarchy in Indian States.

FROM the cabled summary of the London Correspondent of the *Hindu* of Madras, it would appear that Sir R. K. Shanmukham Chetty, the Dewan of Cochin, in his address to the East India Association, defended the introduction of dyarchy in Cochin and its suitability in the Indian States generally on two grounds. The first was that it was the only possibility because full responsibility was not permissible for a variety of reasons. The cabled summary does not say if Sir Shanmukham had enumerated the variety of reasons why full responsible government was not possible in the Indian States. His views, however, are not unknown in India. Sir Shanmukham and Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar both hold that inasmuch as the Ruler of a State has obligations towards the Paramount Power which he alone can discharge, it is not possible for him to divest himself of those responsibilities and share them with his people. We have repeatedly pointed out that the responsibility of a Prince to the Paramount Power was not personal to the Prince but to the Government of his State, and that the Government of a State, whatever its character, would have to carry out the responsibilities or take the consequences. We can easily understand that the Princes in their individual interests and capacities will be more subservient to the wishes of the Paramount Power than their peoples and that, therefore, the Paramount Power would prefer the continuance of the autocratic rule of the Princes. Unwilling to extend responsible government in British India, the British Government is even more reluctant to permit such development in the Indian States. And we can believe that the Paramount

Power vetoed the proposals for constitutional reform which Sir Albion Banerjee was said to have drafted when he was Dewan of Cochin. Whatever that might be the Paramount Power, through the recent statement of Earl Winterton, has, outwardly at least, put itself right, if only in a negative way, when it said that it would not oppose constitutional reform in the States and that the permission of the Paramount Power was not necessary for such reform. After this very authoritative statement, it is a pity that there are Princes and Dewans who still contend that responsible government in the States was not possible because of paramourty.

SIR Shanmukham apparently played on the phrase "full responsible government" when he said it was impossible in the Indian States. It is true paramourty limits the power of the Governments of the Indian States; they are not fully independent, and cannot, in consequence, confer full responsible government on their subjects. But those who ask for responsible government in the States realise the limitation and ask only that such power as is now vested in the Princes, however large or small, should be shared with their subjects.

THE other reason why Sir Shanmukham preferred dyarchy in Indian States was that it would be more successful in the Indian States than it was in British India. The chief reason which militated against dyarchy in British India was, according to him, the British *personnel* of the Civil Service. The civil services in the Indian States, he claimed, were local people and not mere birds of passage; they were not aliens but natives. Whatever be the superior chances of success of dyarchy in the Indian State as compared with British India, it ought to be clear even to Sir Shanmukham that the reasons given by him will not render dyarchy acceptable to the peoples of the Indian States. The civil services in England are manned by natives and not by alien birds of passage. Nevertheless, the people of England would not be content to have dyarchy, *Swadeshi* personnel can be and is as autocratic and reactionary and unacceptable as *bideshi* personnel. The Indian States, which have very largely *swadeshi* personnel, are perhaps the worst governed in India, barring a few exceptions. But as was pointed out by Sir Albion Banerjee, in a good many States the Dewans and even some of the other higher officials have for a long time been outsiders. To-day several States have Britishers as Dewans and other high officials.

### Princes and Federation.

DURING the discussion following the address of Sir Shanmukham at the East Indian Association, Sir Hopetoun Stokes, who presided, is reported to have said that it was not possible for the Rulers of Indian States to form a *bloc* in the federal legislature either in support of the Paramount Power or in opposition to democracy. He felt that political consciousness in the Indian States was awakened and sooner or later even the most reactionary State could not stem the tide of democracy. Sir Henry Gidney, on the other hand, was reported to have said that he wished the Princes to nominate the States' representatives to the federal legislature in order to check the democratic potentialities of the Congress and in order to support the Paramount Power. Perhaps Sir Henry represented the British point of view more nearly than Sir Hopetoun.

\* \* \*

Mr. A. P. Pattani, the Dewan of Bhavanagar, is reported to have said that the reason why the Princes preferred to stay where they were rather than join the federation was the fear of the unknown; they did not know what would be their status under federation. In any event, federation or no federation, the status of the Princes is bound to change and is changing. Whether it is due to the time spirit, or international currents, or the agitations in British India, or the acquisition of a certain measure of provincial autonomy by British Indian provinces, or the incursions of British Indian publicists into the Indian States, or the discussion of federation, there has been great unrest in almost all the Indian States. Even if federation does not come about, the agitation in the Indian States will not die down until the Princes give up their autocracies and establish democracies in their States. British Indians and the Indian States' peoples stand together in this respect, and both will achieve democracy both in the States and in British India, irrespective of federation.

### Germany and Colonies.

WITH the cool confidence that comes of unchallenged power and victory without cost, Herr Hitler has, it would appear, left it to the British and other mandatory Powers to take the initiative in returning to him the ex-German Colonies. Sections of people, German and non-German, in the mandated territories who are opposed to the surrender and look upon it with alarm, are apprehensive as to what the final outcome will be. While the Government of Great Britain has so far not published its views, if any, certain members of the Governments in the British Dominions have not hesitated to give public expression to their opposition. For once unofficial British leaders in the British East African territories have sought the co-operation of the leaders of local Indians and the Africans in this matter. Indians in Tanganyika have joined the local opposition to the surrender of Tanganyika to Germany. Unsatisfactory as is the status of Indians under the British mandate, it is bound to be worse under the regime of Hitler.

MR. TOM JOHNSTON, a former Lord Privy Seal, has mooted the suggestion that all non-self-governing peoples of the world should be put under an international board. Whether such arrangement

will really ensure that the interests of the governed peoples, who *ex-hypothesi* will not be represented in the Board, will be paramount or if it will result only in their more unquestioned exploitation by the concerted action of the governing powers, is more than we can say. The present mandate system under the supervision of an international board, the Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations, has not been an unqualified success in upholding the interests of the governed. Such criticism as there is to-day, however ineffectual it may be, may disappear under the system of direct international control.

\* \* \*

MR. TOM JOHNSTON's proposal will give only negative satisfaction to Hitler. If Germany is to have no colonies, others will be deprived of them; she will have attained equality with others, but in a negative sense. It is very doubtful if the present mandatory and colonial powers will give up the mandates and colonies they have. Even if all of them did agree to surrender their mandates and colonies, it is still doubtful if Hitler will be content with such negative equality. He wants the abrogation in *toto* of the Versailles Treaty and the restoration of the *status quo ante*, as is evidenced by the pledge which is reported to have been administered to the German Army recently by Ritter van Epp, head of the Reich Colonial League. It said that the German Army would display the same energy as their forerunners to regain the colonial possessions they acquired so that "our national humiliation may be removed." It is thus very unlikely that Hitler will agree to Mr. Tom Johnston's proposal.

\* \* \*

HITLER's determination to get back the ex-German Colonies, irrespective of the wishes of the inhabitants thereof or the mandatory Powers, is certain. The only question is whether he can have them without war, as he had Austria and Czechoslovakia, or whether he will have to fight for them. If, according to Mr. Chamberlain, Hitler did not hesitate to plunge the whole world in war to secure Sudetenland, he is not likely to hesitate to do so on the colonial question. It is entirely for the mandatory powers to determine whether they will resort to war or submit to Hitler. Will England and France, which sacrificed Czechoslovakia for the sake of peace, embark on war to deny Hitler the colonies he wants? Or, will they sacrifice their own possessions and surrender the colonies in order to avoid the horrors of war? If they are willing to go to war on the colonial issue, it would have been far nobler, beneficial and effective if they had gone to war in defence of Czechoslovakia; better still in defence of Abyssinia and China.

### Woes of Emigrants.

THE Government of Madras deserve to be thanked for the steps they have taken, first, to investigate the inconveniences and exploitations that emigrants to Malaya suffer at the port of Negapatam, and, secondly, to devise measures to minimise and obviate them. The Special Officer appointed by the Government discovered that the "unassisted" emigrants, who in recent years outnumbered the "assisted" emigrants, were subjected to inconveniences during their stay in Negapatam preparatory to sailing. The ignorant and unsophisticated villagers had none to look after them in Negapatam, and no place to stay. With the result

that some none-too-honest people set up business in looking after these people and fleeced them right and left. The Government have rightly censured the Negapatam Municipality for its negligence and apathy towards these unfortunate emigrants. Then, it appears that the disinfection of clothes of emigrants, which involves the change of clothes, is done in the open without any privacy. Those who object to this exposure and prefer privacy secure exemption by tipping the authorities. But the most unconscionable exploitation concerned the grant of vaccination certificates. Even high officials of the Government not only connived at the exploitation of the poor but shared in the wretched spoils. Government have rightly cashiered the officials concerned, though in some cases they have mitigated the punishments as the culprits confessed to their sins and made amends. Government propose to stop the disinfection except when there is an epidemic and to regularise and simplify the process of getting vaccination certificates. Thousands of the very poor, who were too dumb to agitate, have suffered for many years from the human sharks at the ports. It is hoped that the Madras Government's steps to remedy the evils will be successful.

GOVERNMENT have not, however, published the detailed recommendations of the Special Officer to remove the existing defects. It will be of doubtful advantage to remedy the disinfection inconvenience by abolishing disinfection except when epidemics are on. A better alternative will be to insist on disinfection, but arrange for privacy. As regards accommodation and care, the "unassisted" emigrants must be treated just like the "assisted" ones. In this case, the responsibility will fall not on the Malaya authorities but on Indian authorities. In fact, we repeat what we have more than once urged that *Indian emigration must increasingly be under the control of India and not of foreign authorities*. Indian officials should be charged with the recruitment, insofar as it is permitted, of the emigrants, and their care at the ports, on the voyage and on landing. Thereafter, the Agents of the Government of India will take care of them in the countries of immigration. The expenditure on the Indian side should be shared between the Government of India, the provincial Government and the local municipalities and port authorities concerned.

#### Rajkot.

THE situation in the small State of Rajkot is extremely intriguing. For some time past there has been considerable unrest in the State, organised by the Praja Parishad, the Peoples' Party, against the maladministration of the State and in favour of responsible government. Leaders like Sirdar Patel and others had cajoled and threatened the Ruler into putting things right and agreeing to the grant of responsible government. Recently, the Ruler appointed Sir Patrick Cadell, a retired British member of the Indian Civil Service, as his Dewan in place of Mr. Viravalla. The agitation of the Praja Parishad, however continued unabated. It is not clear if Mr. Viravalla, the ex-Dewan, was a party to the appointment of Sir Patrick, but it would seem that the new Dewan declined to go all the way with the old in the matter of repression and maladministration. According to a statement issued by Sirdar V. Patel, the new Dewan had agreed to cancel the much-hated match monopoly of the State, but

under the influence of the ex-Dewan, the Ruler declined to assent to it. Ultimately, under the influence of Mr. Viravalla, the Ruler issued an order dismissing Sir Patrick Cadell from the Dewanship. Sir Patrick declined to obey the order of the Ruler and appealed to the Government of India. With the result that Mr. Viravalla, the ex-Dewan, has been ordered by the Government of India to quit the State within twenty-four hours! It is not clear at the moment of writing whether the Ruler has cancelled his order dismissing Sir Patrick, and whether the order to quit on Mr. Viravalla was served by the Ruler and Sir Patrick, or by the Ruler himself, or by the Government of India over the head of the Ruler. The situation is indeed intriguing from the constitutional point of view. All pretences to internal autonomy of Rajkot Ruler are proved to be hollow. In fact, it is sheer *punditry* to speak of the Indian States as political entities; they are just vassals of the British Government and obey orders. Paramountcy is indeed paramount.

APART from constitutional proprieties, the people of the State are greatly relieved that the notorious ex-Dewan and his Cabal have been removed, though the process is not exactly in consonance with civil liberties. Sir Patrick, who has successfully defied the Ruler, has offered to reconstitute the local representative assembly and is in touch with some of the leading citizens. It is said however that he has not invited the co-operation of the Paraja Parishad. That is unfortunate. It is hoped that he will be wise enough to seek the co-operation of the Parishad and its leaders and inaugurate a new regime in Rajkot, leading to responsible government as early as possible. Notwithstanding his past associations with a bureaucratic government, is it too much to hope that Sir Patrick, who is now practically the ruler of the State, will be inspired by the ideal of responsible government and seek the proud privilege of being the first to initiate full responsible government in an Indian State?

#### Travancore.

THE Maharaja of Travancore and his Dewan, Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar, deserve to be congratulated on their wise decision to suspend, in honour of the Maharaja's birthday, the notifications under the Criminal Law Amendment Regulation and to release all the prisoners sentenced under the Regulation. We hope that the unhappy past will soon be liquidated and more harmonious relations established between the Government and the people in Travancore.

In order to re-establish confidence, however, it is essential that the recent acts of violence, leading to repeated police shooting and to no inconsiderable loss of life should be thoroughly investigated by an impartial commission consisting of officials and non-officials under the chairmanship of an eminent judge. It would have been wiser if the Travancore Government had repealed the Criminal Law Amendment Regulation and had announced their policy regarding the demand for responsible government in the State. They might at least have appointed a committee to consider the problem. As it is, the Travancore State Congress will be obliged to continue its agitation for responsible government with unabated, perhaps increased, zeal.

### The Gun is Mightier than God.

WITH the fall of Canton and of Hankow it seems fairly clear that China will not be able to resist Japan much longer. The reverses are bound to have disastrous effect on the morale of China. The fall of Canton will cut off the only effective channel for the supply of ammunition. Hereafter, China will resemble Abyssinia. Her proud but thinning armies will fight desperately, but more heroically than effectively, while they retreat to the western fastnesses, and leave the coastal belt to the Japanese. China will mingle her pathetic cry with those of Abyssinia and Czechoslovakia at her desertion by her friends who solemnly guaranteed her inviolable integrity and independence against aggression. With the defeat of China the bitter cup of the sacrifice of international peace and honour at the altar of ruthless force and unconscionable greed is full to the brim. India burns with impotent sympathy for China. Verily, verily, the gun is mightier than God.

\* \* \*

### Organisation.

THE defeat of China at the hand of Japan has a lesson for India. It is amazing that China, with all her superiority over Japan in men and resources, has been again and again defeated by all and sundry, the latest being Japan. Japanese organization proved superior to Chinese numbers. During the last century and over, India has been under foreign rule and was not free to organise herself; Japan has been an independent country and was free to and did organise herself. China had an intermediate position; she was not as free as Japan nor as subject as India; her independence was greatly limited by foreign powers. The small size and comparative homogeneity of Japan facilitated her organization; the large size and the comparative heterogeneity of China and India militated against their rapid and effective organization. During recent years the Chinese nationalists had freer opportunities for organizing the Chinese nation, an opportunity which Indian nationalists have not yet had. The progress made in China was commendable, but the lag was great. Before China could come on a level with Japan in organization, she has been attacked and defeated.

If India should achieve freedom and escape the fate of China, it is essential that she should, within the limits of the present constitution and in spite of it, make supreme efforts to organize her people even as Japan has successfully done.

\* \* \*

### U. T. C.

DR. G. S. MAHAJANI moved a resolution in the Bombay Legislative Council requesting the Bombay Government to afford facilities for the introduction of compulsory military training for at least two years in the Bombay University Training Corps for every student who aspired for a University degree. Dr. Mahajani himself admitted that the question directly concerned the University and the Government of India and not the Provincial Government. He, however, sought the goodwill and good offices of the Bombay Government to further the project. Dr. R. P. Paranjpye had taken the more correct line when in 1924 he moved a resolution in the Bombay University Senate recommending that military education should be made compulsory for University students. The resolution was however lost by a single vote. In 1925 the Indian Territorial Com-

mittee, presided over by Lieut. Gen. Sir John Shea, acknowledged the important place of the University Training Corps as the foundation of an Indian national army, and recommended that every facility should be given to the formation and development of such Corps in Universities and Colleges, but that it should be left to the Universities to make membership in such Corps compulsory on their students. In 1928 the first conference of Indian Universities pleaded for the expansion of the U. T. C. organization in India. In 1933 a resolution was moved in the Council of State to the same effect. In 1934 the Bombay University pressed for expansion of its U. T. C. But very little came out of these representations to the Government of India by the Universities or in the Central Legislature. The Government of India either pleaded want of funds or discounted the value of the U. T. C. organization or discovered lack of enthusiasm on the part of the students and the University authorities. While the Shea Committee recommended that "the University Training Corps be viewed as the foundation of the national army and that no artificial limit be set to its expansion of these Corps, every encouragement being given for the formation and development on sound lines of fresh contingents in all Universities and Colleges where they do not already exist", the Commander-in-Chief in 1934 said: "As a recruiting ground for officers, the University Training Corps has almost entirely failed to serve their purpose and they are, of course, of no direct military value of any kind; even from the educative point of view, the results achieved have been disappointing." He pointed out that few of the units had succeeded in reaching their full sanctioned strength and that there was "no spontaneous desire for this form of service" in many parts of India. He ended, however, by saying that if the Government of India received enthusiastic applications for the expansion of the U. T. C., they would consider them sympathetically. Dr. Mahajani has accepted the Commander-in-Chief's invitation to "get busy" from this end.

\* \* \*

DR. MAHAJANI was on strong ground when he preferred that demand for Bombay. The Army authorities had spoken very favourably of the Bombay University Training Corps. Bombay has fulfilled all the conditions laid down by the Commander-in-Chief. It is up to the latter now to give the promised response. There is, of course, the question of finance. If the Government of India have the will, the comparatively small amount needed to give effect to the reform in Bombay will not be difficult to find. If the worst comes to the worst and the Government of India plead want of funds, the Provincial Government may well consider if they should not find the finance and ask the Government of India only for the services of its expert staff, etc. If the Government of India refuses both, the Provincial Government will have to explore the possibilities of giving as much and as good a military training as it is open to them to organise even by stretching the Government of India Act to the farthest. The Government of Bombay have readily accepted the resolution moved by Dr. Mahajani. They have done so at the very time when Mahatma Gandhi was offering non-violence as the supreme remedy for national and international ills. The Bombay Government have been more realist.

\* \* \*

## Articles.

### COMMON FOREIGN POLICY FOR THE COMMONWEALTH.

#### I.

MR. ARTHUR MOORE, the editor of the *Statesman*, Calcutta, has unearthed the suggestion, made some years ago by the Round Table Group, that there should be constituted a central imperial government for the British Commonwealth of Nations to be in charge of foreign, and in consequence, defence, policy of the Commonwealth. The unity of the foreign policy of the Commonwealth was hitherto maintained by the Government of Great Britain deciding it and the Dominions submitting to it. The Statute of Westminster gave constitutional expression to the growing independence of the British Dominions not only in internal affairs but in external affairs as well. With the increasing realization of this independence, it was inevitable that the Dominions should increasingly realize that the interests of each Dominion were not identical in all respects with those of other Dominions, and that divergence of interests would inevitably reflect in divergent foreign policies. Hitherto the divergences in interests have not been many or vital, and a common policy for the Commonwealth was maintained by the process of consultation with the Dominions. In practice, England decided and the Dominions acquiesced.

But this situation may not last long. Already Ireland has held out the threat that under certain conditions she may not be friendly to England. The demand of Herr Hitler for the surrender of the ex-German Colonies is likely to create an unbridgeable divergence of views. The Dominions have already declared their opposition to the surrender of their mandates. England, faced with the alternative of war and other complications which will affect her more than the Dominions, may be willing to compromise, and agree to surrender the colonies under her own mandate, while not insisting on the Dominions doing likewise. But South Africa is as much opposed to the return of Tanganyika as of South West Africa. England and the Dominions may fall out on the question of Tanganyika.

While the divergence of interests are becoming increasingly manifest, the method of consultation with the far-flung units of the Commonwealth is bound to be increasingly ineffective and unsatisfactory. For instance, when Mr. Chamberlain signed the Munich Agreement and the subsequent Anglo-German Pact, he could not possibly have consulted the Dominions. It is true that he was not able to consult his own Cabinet, but as the head of the British Cabinet which he himself empannelled and who were all elected by the same electorates, he could claim to speak on behalf of his Cabinet and England without con-

sulting them. He may not claim the same right as regards the Dominions with separate Cabinets responsible to different electorates. If, therefore, the British Commonwealth is to continue to have one common foreign policy, something more than consultation, mostly formal, between the different units becomes essential. Hence the proposal that the Commonwealth should have an imperial Government in charge of foreign and defence policies.

#### II.

It is doubtful, however, if such a project will have wide and effective appeal. Neither the Imperial Conference nor the un-official British Commonwealth Relations Conference has so far approved of the idea even provisionally. According to Mr. H. L. Harris, Australia at any rate does seem to favour the constitution of a single executive for the British Commonwealth. In a monograph, *Australia's National Interests and National Policies*, specially prepared on behalf of the Australian Institute of International Affairs for the last session of the British Commonwealth Relations Conference held in Sydney, Mr. Harris said:

Australia's contribution towards the solution of this problem may seem very disappointing. The national instinct is strongly in favour of letting things alone so long as they work satisfactorily. Mr. Hughes in 1921, Mr. Bruce in 1926 and Mr. Scullin in 1930, all emphasised that Australia did not want to participate in any imperial constitution-making." (p. 130.)

This policy of letting things alone as long as they did not hamper her freedom is illustrated by the failure of Australia to implement the Statute of Westminster:

Two attempts have been made to pass the necessary Bill for the adoption of the Statute of Westminster and it is not through yet. It will no doubt be adopted sooner or later 'not as a means of climbing some new pinnacle among the nations of the world, or for expressing any militant nationalism in opposition to Great Britain, but merely as a useful means of clearing away obsolete machinery.' (p. 130)

As a better alternative to a common executive for the British Commonwealth, the Australian Commonwealth preferred, according to Mr. Harris, the method of the League of Nations and regional pacts subsidiary to the League Covenant:

The ideals which it had hoped would be realized through the League of Nations made a powerful appeal. The concept of permanent peace ensured by principles of conciliation, arbitration and collective action seemed to resolve all difficulties of intra-imperial and international co-operation and to 'constitute a focal point for a common Empire policy.'... When the League was palpably losing ground as a world organisation the Commonwealth made specific proposals for the reform of its constitution.

The proposal for regional pacts subsidiary to the Covenant was an attempt to strengthen the principle of collective security by limiting commitments to defined areas. The proposal stands as Mr. Casey phrased it: 'We hope and believe that it is possible to reform the League on the basis of regional responsibility, which will give it some chance of being revived as an active force in the world in the years ahead.' Mr. Lyon's suggestion

for a pact of non-aggression for the Pacific countries was another indication of the thought that is being given to the problem of maintaining the basic principles for which the League was believed to stand. (pp. 130-31)

### III.

Mr. Moore includes India in his concept of a Commonwealth Government. If the present Government of England is to have its way, Mr. Moore is anticipating a great deal and by a long stretch. At the moment, the people of India and for that matter the Government of India, have no foreign policy. Theirs is to obey and not to decide. It is only when India attains full Dominion Status that she will have a foreign policy.

If and when she does attain that status, it is very doubtful if India will prefer a Commonwealth Government to the League and regional pacts. Australia, which has very close racial, national and religious affinities with England, and besides,

has no history of wrong and grievance to nurse and brood over or to revenge, or to forget and forgive, and which still insists on importing its Governors and Governors-General from England, and is in fact, closest to England in every respect, has not however felt any enthusiasm for a common government for the Commonwealth. It is very unlikely that India, differing from Australia in all these respects and more, should prefer a policy which did not appeal to Australia. The race relations within the British Commonwealth have not been such and are not likely to be such as to enthrone India in favour of the British Commonwealth. Even the ideals of the League are, from the race point of view, unsatisfactory. But as compared with the League, the British Commonwealth is very much worse. As between the two, India would prefer the League to the Commonwealth, unless the latter changes its character.

## ECONOMIC PLANNING.

A GREAT deal of enthusiasm has been evoked during the last few days in the press and in the public by the decisions taken by the meeting of the Congress Industries Ministers at Delhi and the subsequent announcements. Even officially there has been talk of Planning Committees and a Planning Commission. We have already noted our approval of the idea of the Provincial Ministers of Industries meeting together to discuss questions of general policy and we are glad that at the Delhi Conference such a degree of concerted action could be agreed upon. We are, however, not clear about the implications of a number of propositions made by the President of the Congress and other prominent speakers at the Conference and we feel that the expectations raised by the use of the phrase "Planning Commission" are highly unlikely to be fulfilled. Under the present circumstances, a Committee or even a Commission cannot do much more than arrange for the conduct of an economic survey and perhaps enquire into the possibility of starting a few important industries. It may also consider the policy to be followed in respect of the comparatively minor question of technical training. Any vigorous action by the State involves, in the first instance, the control of the Federal Centre and more fiscal freedom than is possessed by the Indian Government under the new Constitution. It is evident, however, that the Congress Executive is making its plans deliberately disregarding these precedent obstacles. In this we feel it is acting rightly. For, in this way alone could the possibilities of achievement and the obstructions in its way be made clear.

There are, however, a number of other factors to which also it is necessary to pay close attention. Consider, for instance, the possibility stressed in the Conference of regional distribution of industries. We fear that serious consequences may result

if the policy underlying any regional distribution is not carefully thought out. An unfortunate tradition of looking upon India as a highly centralised unitary state has been the result of a century and half of British rule. Regard for regional interests is supposed even by Indian publicists to be a sign of parochialism and an abstract transcendental attitude has been built up around the concept of the Indian nationality. In the economic sphere the result has been the glorification in the abstract of the "Indian entrepreneur." The regional origins and affiliations of the Indian entrepreneur have not been looked into except when the anomalies become too glaring as in the case of the cry against the Marwari in Calcutta. In the same way, for the grant of protection etc. India has been considered one whole market without enquiry into the unfairness involved in the idea for regions distant from the centres of productive activity. This same attitude may lead to a distribution of industries which takes into account the technical considerations alone. So that while some regions are industrialised the people of other regions remain as before hewers of wood and drawers of water. The development of an all-sided life for each of the more important regions is an aim which ought never to be lost sight of. It is an aim which, it should be noted, has always considerably influenced the activities of the Planning Commission in Russia.

Apart from such considerations of policy, there are even more fundamental difficulties in the way of a Planning Committee or Commission. A country may drift into regulating and planning various economic activities by natural stages; interference in one sphere leading perforce to interference in others. Or it may deliberately adopt a highly controlled and planned economy for attaining surely and speedily certain aims. Great Britain

As an excellent example of the former type; Russia and Germany of the latter. English policy has been the result of comparatively slow progress in the directions of planning for over a couple of decades. The instruments and organisation for control have been shaped as circumstances arose, and as they were proved, their adaptation and use extended further. The degree of interference has also grown slowly and the problems of the ultimate objectives and values behind planning have never yet been raised in an acute form. In the case of Russia and Germany the process has been widely different. A hasty improvisation of means, leading to their frequent breakdown, and a definition of aims of policy as regards capital and labour have been necessary. In the case of India we have to start from much a lower state of organisation than in Germany and we cannot possibly imitate the example of England.

In India State interference in certain forms of activity, especially rural activity, has been no doubt prominent in the past. But our industrialists have always been left entirely to their own devices. Grant of protection has been a one-sided affair. It has helped to prop up the position of industries but it has not been taken to imply any corresponding responsibilities on their part. We are not likely to follow the English model in this regard. Our planning, when it comes, will be of the totalitarian type. This makes necessary, however, the definition of the philosophy behind the planning effort. It is noteworthy that in the innumerable recent discussions regarding planning this crucial point has never been mentioned. This may be either through oversight or through the realisation that it raises problems which are well-nigh insoluble. It is undoubted that to-day Indian financial and industrial capitalism wields a very important influence in the political sphere. The Government of India has always been very sympathetic to the capitalistic point of view except when it came into conflict with British interests. Last year's events have also proved how high our capitalists rank in the eyes of the Congress High Command. Ordinarily, therefore, one expects that the Indian plan, if such one were formed, would follow the German model. It would be a plan where labour is severely regulated and the employer raised to the position of benevolent despot, in which the *entrepreneur* holds the key position and the State is dominated in economic matters by a small group of financiers and industrialists. If an Indian plan is put forth in the near future it can only follow these lines. But a clear perception of these matters would be highly inconvenient at the moment. For, after all is said and done, the political power of the Congress rests to a very considerable extent on elements that consider themselves Leftists. Most of these would fly into open revolt if they realised such implications of a plan.

It is, therefore, that we hold that it is highly premature to talk of a plan just now. We have neither the political nor the economic power; we have not even the rudiments of the necessary organization nor the tradition of administrative integrity which is the *sine qua non* for the proper working of a plan. Above all, we have no definition of the objective of the plan, or of the social and economic structure that we desire to raise as its result. Under the present circumstances, the plan could only be one in which the capitalist dominates and dictates; but the moment is inopportune to discuss these fundamental issues. It is only when the elements of the Right by following consistently a policy of divide and rule thoroughly demoralise the radical elements that the true position of the Indian capitalist will be revealed. The process of dividing and weakening the Left has already begun and will, as recent events prove, be successful. By the time the Right obtains a modicum of power at the centre, this process should have gone far enough. It will only be then that the details of a Fascist economic plan could be unfolded and a planning commission set to work. In the meanwhile it is yet premature to talk in terms of a plan.

#### SIND POLITICS.

MR. M. A. JINNAH has failed in his immediate objective in Sind, which was to organise a Muslim League Government in that Province. In the Legislative Assembly of sixty members there are thirty-five Muslims, who therefore, constitute a communal majority. These Muslims, however, are divided into four political, rather personal, parties of various strength. The present Premier came to office and retains it with the co-operation of some Muslims and of some non-Muslims and among the latter the Congressmen. Mr. Jinnah is not satisfied that the Sind Premier is a Muslim, and that the majority of the Cabinet are Muslims whose partiality towards the Muslims is not in question. Mr. Jinnah did not suggest that Muslim interest in Sind had suffered under the present Ministry, nor did he suggest any measures which he would see adopted to promote Muslim interests. He did not even suggest that the Ministry he wished to set up should contain only Muslims either; he was willing to admit a few non-Muslims, even as the present Ministry has done. In effect, the Ministry he contemplated would not differ from the present one either in its communal composition or pro-Muslim policy.

Nonetheless Mr. Jinnah insisted on a change in Ministry. His sole purpose was that the Sind Ministry should avowedly and solely be a Muslim League Ministry, sustained only by Muslim votes in the Assembly and not dependent on the support of non-Muslims at all. Mr. Jinnah's ambition was that in Sind at least there should be unadulterated Muslim rule and not a national rule

in which Muslims and non-Muslims would cooperate. He is obsessed with the idea that the Indian National Congress is a Hindu organization and that it is in power in several Indian provinces. As a counterblast he wishes to have some provinces under Muslim rule. He is chagrined that even in provinces with Muslim majorities like Bengal and the Punjab, the Governments, though predominantly Muslim, are still coalition Governments, resting to some extent on the support of non-Muslims. The bitterest pill for Mr. Jinnah is the North Western Frontier Province, which is over ninety-five per cent. Muslim, but has a Congress Government. Assam was slipping away from the Muslim League leadership. Though any Government in Assam in the present state of politics has perforce to be a coalition, nevertheless the last Government was headed by a Muslim Leaguer, while the present Government is headed by a Congressman. Stung to the quick by this severe blow to the prestige and power of the Muslim League, Mr. Jinnah made a supreme effort to establish a purely Muslim League Government in Sind. He called to his assistance the Muslim and Muslim-League Premiers of Bengal and Punjab and did his level best and, be it admitted, his worst to establish a Muslim League Government in Sind. He had to confess defeat.

For the success of his purpose, it was necessary for the thirty-five Muslim members of the Sind Assembly to form not only one political party but also a Muslim League Party. The only common factor among the thirty-five members is that they are all Muslims in religion. It is inconceivable that because they have a common religion they have also their politics and economics in common. A communal minority might hold together as a political party by negative fear and lack of responsibility for government, but a communal majority which has to govern cannot ordinarily be a single, political party, even if personalities are eliminated. Mr. Jinnah, who insists on calling the Congress a Hindu organization, might have noticed that in no legislature where Hindus form a majority, have they formed a solid party, voting together. The Congress as a political party might do so, but not the Hindus as a communal majority.

Moreover, notwithstanding Mr. Jinnah's view to the contrary, the Congress is a national organization and is open to all communities and has representatives of all Indian communities. The Congress Cabinets can and have found place for all communities, including the Muslim, but a Muslim League Cabinet cannot, by its very nature, include non-Muslims. Muslims and non-Muslims can all belong to the Congress, but only Muslims can join the Muslim League. Muslims in non-Muslim provinces can more readily reconcile themselves to Congress Cabinets than non-Muslims in Muslim provinces to Muslim League Cabinets. It is not, therefore, surprising that Mr. Jinnah's dream of setting up of unmitigated

Muslim League Governments in any of even the Muslim majority provinces has so far failed, and deservingly so.

Mr. Jinnah accuses the British Governors of having let down the Muslims. In preferring this charge, Mr. Jinnah identifies the Muslim League with the Muslims, and ignores the Muslims outside the League and in the Congress. The Governors were asked to see that, consistently with joint responsibility, all major communities were represented in the Cabinets. They have done so. It is only the Congress that can fulfil that condition because a person can belong to any religious community and yet be a member of the Congress. Mr. Jinnah insists that the Muslim members of the provincial Cabinets should be members of the Muslim League, and that the provinces should be run by the Congress as well as the Muslim League as co-partners. The ideals of the two are poles asunder, and joint responsibility in a cabinet consisting of representatives of the two bodies will be impossible. To blame the British for not giving exaggerated importance to the Muslim League and Mr. Jinnah is base ingratitude. If anything, the British have done nothing but exaggerate the importance of the Muslim League, much to their own and Muslim benefit and to the detriment of the national interests of India. But there is a limit beyond which even they may not go. If the British Governors had insisted on the inclusion of Muslim League's nominees in Cabinets in provinces in which the Congress obtained majority representation in the legislatures, they would not only have violated the principle of joint responsibility specially enjoined on them, but they would have had to suspend the operation of the Government of India Act altogether. They could not force Muslim League nominees on the Congress majorities, particularly when the Congress itself included Muslims in its Cabinets. Mr. Jinnah might recognise that in this respect the British Governors were helpless.

It is a different thing for Mr. Jinnah to appeal to the Congress itself to find a place for his followers. The Congress will naturally and rightly answer that, as a national organization it looks after the interests of all peoples in India, that, in fact, it has included members of all communities in its Cabinets, and that if Mr. Jinnah is not satisfied with the way Muslim interests are being looked after by the Congress, he is welcome to join the Congress, and that at all events, a political party on a communal basis was unnecessary.

Mr. Jinnah is not improving his reputation for sanity or the prospects of communal harmony by his advocacy of the concepts of two nations in India, the Muslim and the non-Muslim; and of Muslim provinces and federation of Muslim provinces as distinct from non-Muslim provinces; and of federation of Muslim provinces in India joining Muslim States outside of India. It is good that



there are Muslims in Sind itself who deplored and repudiated such ideas.

### CIVIL LIBERTIES UNDER THE NIZAM

THE Indian States' Peoples' Conference has recently published a small but highly informative brochure on the administration of the Nizam's Dominions. The brochure is very instructive and revealing in more respects than one, but the part of it that deals with the condition of civil liberties in the Premier Indian State is unique for the almost incredible nature of the facts that it enumerates. Thinking of the condition of civil liberties in Hyderabad in the light of these facts coming from a responsible organization, our first impulse was to dispose of the subject with the simple statement that civil liberties are unknown to all the fifteen million subjects of His Exalted Highness, the Nizam. But on second thoughts and in view of the circumstance that conditions in this respect are more or less common to most of the Indian States, (which cover nearly two-fifth part of India and which have in all a population of 80 millions, more than one-fifth of the total population of India;) we decided to take a review of the actual situation in Hyderabad.

#### FREEDOM OF SPEECH

As far back as 1921, a *Firman* of the Nizam declared that a political meeting or "any meeting calculated to bring about political results should not be held without the permission of the Executive Council. (The E. C. shall obtain my sanction before granting such permission.)" Besides this, the agenda as well as the proposed proceedings of the meeting had also to be submitted previously for the sanction of the Executive Council. Later on in 1929, an executive order was issued to the effect that "every person desirous of holding a meeting shall in writing intimate his intention . . . at least ten days prior to the date of the meeting," to the proper authorities. Even in cases of non-political meetings the authorities had "the power to send for the rules in force of such meeting, copies of speeches and list of persons convening the meeting." This was with regard to non-political meetings such as those ordinarily held for offering congratulations or condolences, celebrating anniversaries of persons and institutions and others of the kind. Political meetings or "meetings likely to bring about political results" must not be held without the special permission of His Exalted Highness. At the time of giving such permission Government might demand security from the conveners of political meetings.

The immediate result of this Order was that the State authorities began to interpret almost every proposed meeting as political or "likely to result in political consequences." They apparently wanted to err on the safer side, because the defini-

tion of political meetings was not made clear by the Order. In 1929, a letter was addressed to the Commissioner of Police, Hyderabad, requesting him to define what was meant by 'political'. The Commissioner forwarded it up to Government and asked the correspondent to wait. No reply was received for *two years*. In 1932 the reply that the Police Commissioner sent, briefly said: "The Government have not favoured with any explanation. It will be better, however, if the matter be stopped at this". As the author of the brochure under review observes: "No Daniel in the Premier State could define the word "political" in two long years."

A long time after this, in April 1933, a *communiqué* issued by the Information Bureau stated:

H. E. H. The Nizam's Government are not prepared to make any change in their policy about political meetings. In the category of political meetings I included all those meetings which are likely to lead to any communal disturbances, or which are likely to lead to create disaffection against the Government or in which *opposition* is shown to the administration of H. E. H. the Nizam's Dominions or British India, the more especially so when they are organized or when there is the possibility that the Government or their Officers may be blasphemed.

Most of the proposed meetings were crushed in embryo under this Order. Permission to hold a meeting to celebrate the anniversary of a library at Medak was refused twice, "once for non-payment of Court-fee stamp of eight annas and for postage stamp for reply." The function had to be postponed. When in 1935, the Hyderabad public wanted to hold a condolence meeting to mourn the death of the late Mr. G. K. Devadhar, ex-President of the Servants of India Society, the organisers of the meeting were informed: "the meeting under question cannot be allowed".

The holding of any conferences in Hyderabad is practically impossible owing to the extremely procrastinating nature of the whole procedure of obtaining official sanction. The necessary permission is not secured, often for years together. The permission, if given, is given only under the conditions that Government's policy and orders in "educational, political and other matters" must not be "discussed or criticised," that lists of speakers and subjects of discussions must be submitted beforehand, and that resolutions to be passed by the conference must be submitted to the authorities a week before the conference. If the Subjects Committee amends the resolutions, the amended resolutions have again to be submitted to the authorities and can be passed only after fresh sanction is obtained. The authorities "may curtail or stop the speech of the President". Outsiders are not allowed to take part in the conferences and securities are demanded from the organizers and forfeited by Government at their discretion.

After Sir Akabar Hydari became the Prime Minister of Hyderabad, rules regarding public meetings were slightly revised. Meetings were dichotomically divided into (a) meetings that are purely of a social, educational, literary or charitable nature and (b) meetings that are not of the nature mentioned in (a). For meetings coming under (a) permission need not be awaited unless the convener receives information to the contrary, but for meetings coming under the negative head (b), permission is absolutely necessary. Punishment for the breach of these rules extends to one month's imprisonment with or without fine which may extend to Rs. 200.

The definition of a public meeting as "any meeting in which the public or a part of the public can participate" is very vague and liable to abuse. Moreover, any meeting "notwithstanding that it is held in a private place and admission to it is by tickets or otherwise, can be deemed to be a public meeting." Under these Rules, "even statutory meetings of Companies and Associations, Municipal meetings and general and sub-committee meetings of all kinds of Associations can be brought under the definition of public meetings if the police choose to do so." Mr. Bhulabhai Desai, who was recently a victim of these Rules, describes them to be of "sinister appearance" and such as "negative the fundamental rights." He also says about a rule: "It is so worded that the Executive may use it or refrain from using it according to their own view of what they intend to suppress or allow."

#### FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

There is no regular legislation regarding the Press in Hyderabad. The Home Secretary has, under executive orders, framed certain rules "to govern the establishment of the press or starting a newspaper or a magazine." If any person desires to start a press or a paper or a magazine, he has to apply to the Home Secretary who thereupon starts an enquiry as to the *behaviour*, the financial conditions and other points regarding the applicant. If the Home Secretary is satisfied on all these points, which does not happen very often, he grants permission for the starting of the press or the paper. The editor of a prospective paper, before the permission is granted, is required to enter into an agreement that no anonymous tracts would be printed in his paper and that his paper would not publish any news which would be "likely to affect adversely public opinion concerning the Government or any officer of the Government." Besides this the editor is often "subjected to oral or written warning from the Secretariat for discussing social and religious matters which may appear objectionable." "There being no legislation to show the editors the limits of their criticism except the whim and caprice of the Home Secretary or any other officer entrusted with the task, they

always stand the risk of being taken to task for anything they write in their columns."

These rules and regulations regarding the Press have become so effective that nearly seven million Telugu people in the Nizam's Dominions have only one bi-weekly, nearly four million Marathi people have only one weekly and more than one and a half million Kanarese people have no periodical at all in their language. However, in Urdu, which is the mother-tongue of His Exalted Highness, there are about 40 dailies, weeklies and magazines which are directly helped by the Nizam as well as various Government departments. Independence of their outlook, therefore, can only be imagined.

Apart from these choking restrictions on the Press in the Hyderabad State, the Government of the Nizam have deemed it fit to prohibit entry into their State of many newspapers and periodicals from British India. Before 1932, thirty-five periodicals published in English, Marathi, Urdu, Bengali and Telugu were prohibited in Hyderabad. The *Kesari* of Poona has been under a ban for nearly a generation; the *Servant of India*, the *Bombay Chronicle* and the *Hindu* were also temporarily prohibited. During the last few days Government have banned twenty-three papers coming from the Punjab, the C. P. and Bombay.

#### FREEDOM OF ASSOCIATION

Most astounding restrictions are imposed upon the people of Hyderabad as far as their right of association goes. These restrictions are now being extended even to institutions which are avowedly devoted to the cause of education. New rules have been made for "the establishment and guidance" of private schools. These can be opened only with the permission of the authorities. If they are opened without it, they will be immediately closed down by the Collector or the Commissioner of Police. The founders or managers of schools which were in existence before these restrictive rules came into force, were required within three months to submit to the authorities detailed information regarding the object of starting the schools, the curriculum followed in them, description of the buildings in use, the number of teachers employed with their qualifications, etc. In cases in which these details supplied were found unsatisfactory, the schools were actually closed down. The number of educational institutions in the year 1926 was 3142 with 76,654 pupils in them. After the new rules came into operation in the year 1928 the number of such institutions came down to 1305 with 31,740 pupils in all. It might perhaps be relevant here to note that only 4 per cent. of the people of Hyderabad are literate.

More stringent restrictions are placed on institutions devoted to physical education. In 1935, new rules regarding Akhadas were brought into force. According to them, before any Akhada is started, permission of the authorities has to be secured. An

Akhada is defined as "any place where the public or any particular group or community generally gathers together for physical exercise." But fortunately, "it shall not include a place where members of a family especially do physical exercise". Under the rules, strictly speaking, even a private tennis court, the moment it is used by persons not belonging to the family of the owner, becomes an Akhada and liable to be closed down if it was not started with the proper permission of the authorities. Moreover, if a particular Akhada changes its place, manager or even servants the changes have to be notified to the authorities within a week. Any breach of any of these rules makes the defaulter liable to a fine of Rs. 500 or in the event of the non-payment of fine, to simple imprisonment for three months.

If, in spite of these restrictions and obligations, some people have the courage to apply for permission to start a school or an Akhada the permission is far from readily given. In many cases it is withheld for years together and in some cases altogether refused.

In 1910 and again in 1931, the Government of His Exalted Highness issued orders whereby District Officers of the revenue, judicial and police departments were enjoined "to keep the dominions safe from the poisonous effect of political agitation in British India." It was suggested that a close watch be kept on all clubs, libraries, Akhadas, private schools, religious gatherings, etc. About the class of lawyers it was said by Government:

The conduct of the pleaders should be generally watched, for, firstly they are educated; secondly owing to the profession, the public looks upon them with respect and honour and in connection with the work in the courts, different classes of subjects perforce have to deal with them. It is found that they entertain more or less modern ideas and it is likely that those who come in contact with them will be influenced by their views and carry the poison to their own environment.

#### PUBLIC SAFETY REGULATION.

The climax of this woeful tale will be reached only when we study the so-called Public Safety Regulation issued by the Nizam's Government on 6th September 1938. The Regulation is intended:

for safeguarding the public peace and tranquillity by checking the entrance of undesirables into the State and for enabling suitable action to be taken against those associations or bodies which interfere with the administration of the State.

The Regulation enables State authorities to keep a strict watch on "undesirable" outsiders, to arrest them without warrant if they are already in the State and deport them summarily. If they return, they can be sentenced to one year's rigorous imprisonment or fine or both. Special powers are given to the Police to search houses and buildings for such outsiders. State subjects are enjoined, under penalty of six months' rigorous imprisonment and a fine of Rs. 1000, not to employ the services of any undesirable outsiders without the permission of specified

authorities. Hotels and restaurants are specially warned against harbouring any such people; they are required to keep a register of all their lodgers under penalty of three months' imprisonment for default. Private citizens, of course, will be suitably punished if they harbour any such people.

Under the Regulation any association can be declared unlawful by Government if they have reason to suppose that it interferes with the administration of Government or that its activities are likely to endanger the public peace and tranquillity and so on and so forth. The premises of such associations can be confiscated by Government and its members sent to jail for six months. If a person assists in the work of such organizations he will get three years' imprisonment.

The Regulation declares illegal, among other things, all anti-recruitment activities, boycott of Government servants, holding of mock funerals, spreading of scares, circulating of false reports among the Police and the Military. If the guilty person is found to be a minor under 16 years of age, his parents or guardians will be liable for the penalty.

This is the kind of rule that is prevalent in the Premier State of India. Such are the Indian States with which the new autonomous British Indian Provinces are asked to federate!

## Review.

### CONSTITUTIONAL LAW.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAWS OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE. By W. IVOR JENNINGS AND C. M. YOUNG. (Oxford University Press.) 1938, 22cm. 364 p. 18/-

THE bewildering variety of constitutional forms obtaining in the British Empire creates difficulties in the way of the student of British Constitutional Law. The difficulties are enhanced by the peculiar role Convention plays in British constitutional arrangements. Add to that the complications introduced by the operation of the Statute of Westminster, 1931, and the young student's despair is complete. Not that there are no good books to guide the student. But the bulk of authoritative volumes, like those of Dr. Keith's for instance, does not encourage the uninitiated. Again, the rapidity with which the constitutional practice of different parts of the Empire changes often outruns the production of revised editions of old books, leaving the novice to look askance at the puzzling mass of legal journalistic literature. Dr. Jennings and Miss Young's book is intended to give undergraduate students the most up-to-date material within the compass of a normal text-book. Their work is planned on the lines of Keir and Lawson's wellknown *Cases in constitutional Law*.

The book under review is divided into seven chapters while an appendix at the end gives important extracts from constitutional documents relating to Canada, Australia and South Africa. Of the seven chapters the first three are of a general nature, dealing with the Jurisdiction of

the Crown, the Constitutions of the Empire and Dominion Status respectively. The three following are concerned with special problems presented respectively by the constitutions of Canada, Australia and South Africa. The last chapter is devoted to a summary of the Federal Constitution of India which must rank as a model of compressed legal precision.

Each chapter opens with a short essay on the principles involved. It is followed by judicial decisions on leading cases illustrating those principles. The cases chosen include such recent ones as that of *Att-Gen. for Canada vs. Att-Gen. for Ontario and others (1937)* which, declared the so-called Canadian New Deal legislation *ultra vires* of the Parliament of Canada.

The expository essays written by Dr. Jennings are admirable for their brevity and lucidity. Dr. Jennings is indeed a master of the art of judicious selection. He is seen at his best when he discusses the implications of Dominion Status. In the course of that discussion he makes some interesting remarks on the place of conventions in the British Constitution. Commenting on paragraph 3 of the Preamble to the Statute of Westminster—referring to the constitutional convention that Parliament shall not legislate for a Dominion except with the consent of that Dominion—Dr. Jennings exposes once more the fallacy of Dicey's theory as to the binding character of conventions. Dicey held that constitutional conventions were obeyed because a breach of convention led ultimately to a breach of Law. The preamble to the Statute on the other hand emphasises the fact that legislation which is perfectly legal may yet be a breach of the convention. Section 4 of the Statute, therefore, does limit the authority of Parliament in legislating for the Dominions, strengthened as it is by the convention stated in the Preamble.

There is, however, one serious gap in this otherwise excellent book. Except for a brief reference to it in the chapter on Dominion Status, the Constitution of Eire does not find a place in these pages. With its republican character, the Irish Constitution is a highly interesting development within the British Empire held together by the unity of the Crown. Fortunately, the authors are conscious of this gap and it is certain to be filled in when the time comes for a second edition. There is no doubt that students as well as teachers of Constitutional Law will welcome this book—the former because it is essential and easy to digest it, the latter because it is safe to recommend it.

S. V. K.

### SHORT NOTICE.

#### MALNUTRITION: THE MEDICAL OCTOPUS.

By JOHN PRESTON SUTHERLAND. (Meador Publishing Co. Boston.) 1937. 21cm. 361p. \$3.00.

DR. SUTHERLAND has formulated in this book some facts and statements which are more important than the routine material we generally read in books on Dietics and Nutrition. This book is the fruit of several years of study and experience. Every page in this book has something new and

thought provoking. The benefits of human milk and the draw-backs of sub-human milk have been considered in detail and the author has condemned the excessive use of sub-human milk not only by children but also by adults. The author condemns the use of sugar and the products prepared from sugar on every page of his book. He has shown how the teeth of babies and the whole digestive system of the adults suffer from over indulgence in preparations of sugar such as polished mill-sugar, chocolates, jams, jellies, etc. There are three very important agents to the use of which many diseases can be attributed. "These three things are granulated sugar, white flour and meat or flesh of animals." Nature has never intended these foods to be used by man. Granulated sugar contains 100% sugar whereas in nature we find articles which contain less than 15%. The white flour is demineralised and therefore useless for consumption. Nature has given us the whole wheat and the minerals and vitamins are stored up in that small particle called 'wheat'. It is completely removed by polishing. The same is the case with rice. Taking all these points into consideration, the author has advised his readers to go back to nature and abide by the laws which she has so prudently laid down for man.

In this connection the following extract will explain the author's line of thinking. "The cow gets its calcium and various salts from its monotonous, simple, unvaried vegetable food and from no other source. Why should not the human being, child or adult, be able to acquire its food essentials, calcium and other minerals from natural sources, especially since the human being has such an astonishing variety of natural foods to use?"

The author has endeavoured to show how the problem of nutrition is fundamental and has given ample and valuable suggestions to improve health by readjustment of diet.

A. R. RAIRKAR.

### BOOKS RECEIVED.

- INDIANS OVERSEAS. By T. S. RAJAGOPAL. (Author, Lawyer, Santhepet, Mysore.) 1938. 21cm. 83p. Re. 1.
- GLANCES AT ISLAM. By VALJI GOVINDJI DESAI. (Navajivan Press, Ahmedabad.) 1938. 18cm. 40p. Three Annas.
- URBAN WORKING CLASS COST OF LIVING INDEX NUMBERS (1936) IN THE PUNJAB. By RAM LAL. (The Board of Economic Inquiry, Punjab, Lahore.) 1938. 24cm. 12p. Annas 8.
- COST OF MILK PRODUCTION (1931-32 to 1934-35) AT LYALLPUR, PUNJAB. By KARTAR SINGH AND LAL CHAND SIKKA. (The Board of Economic Inquiry, Punjab, Lahore.) 1938. 24cm. 77p. Annas 8.
- SALES OF LAND IN SOUTH-WEST PUNJAB, 1931-32 to 1933-34. By CYRIL P. K. FAZAL. (The Board of Economic Inquiry, Punjab, Lahore.) 1938. 24cm. 51p. Annas 6.
- LEATHER INDUSTRY: ITS TRANSPORT PROBLEM. By R. D. TIWARI. (Author, University School of Economics and Sociology, Fort, Bombay.) 1938. 24cm. 52p.
- PROLEGOMENA TO A HISTORY OF THE WORLD. By H. C. E. ZACHARIAS. (Author, Fu Jen University, Peiping.) 1937. 22cm. 69p. \$ 1.00.