

THE Servant of India

Editor : S. G. VAZE. — Office : Servants of India Society's Home, Poona (D. G.).

VOL. IX, No. 27. }

POONA—THURSDAY, AUGUST 19, 1926.

INDIAN SUBSN. Rs. 6.
FOREIGN 10s. 6d.

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	329
ARTICLES :—	
16d. or 18d ? By V. N. Gadbole, M.A.	341
Classics vs. Vernaculars. By Prof. M. R. Paranjpe, M.A.	342
Railway Finance Standing Committee. By Economy	343
Patriotism. By H. C. E. Zacharias Ph.D.	345
REVIEWS :—	
Disinterested Politics. By Prof. A. R. Wadia, M.A.	347
The Laws of Ancient Ireland. By J. D.	348
BOOKS RECEIVED	350
S. I. S. FIRE RELIEF FUND	351

TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

THE VICEROY'S address to the Legislature on the 17th is not so much striking in what it says, as it is in the manner of saying it. The manner is admirable and just what it ought to be—being that of a Parliamentarian speaking to Parliamentarians; and not that of a heaven-born Olympian pompously condescending to drop some pearls of wisdom, or of some shrewd diplomat, who with his tongue in his cheek humours or else unceremoniously overrides what to him seem the puerilities and foibles of a people who for him only exist as Imperial pawns. The matters touched upon on the other hand do not receive any treatment which could be considered outstanding. In all respects His Excellency seems to be expecting to hear more views on them, before committing himself to any definite policy. Thus the recommendations of the Taxation Enquiry Committee, which are the subject of consultations with the Provincial Governments, are now to be made the subject of an expression of views on the part of the hon'ble members assembled; whilst the Tariff Board's reports on the steel and textile industries will be considered next January. On the other hand the report of the Royal Commission on Indian Currency and Finance has necessitated the Government taking immediate action—as regards (1) the ratio of rupee to gold and (2) the means of establishing that ratio. In this case Lord Irwin was obviously confronted by Sir Basil Blackett's *fait accompli* and seems to have bowed to it. H. E. promises that Sir Basil will give a clear statement of his policy and we welcome H. E.'s view that it was his Government's "plain duty to bring the matter before the Legislature at the earliest

possible date." For the time being nothing more can be said about it.

OF other matters touched upon, we would single out Lord Irwin's gracious reference to "the valued support from the unoffical labours of Mr. Andrews" in connection with the South African question: a reference, as merited, as it must be gratifying to all public opinion in this country. The action taken to carry out the Lee Commission's report is referred to as ushering in "a reorganisation of the Services of a very striking character"—and it is certainly noteworthy that Government now seem to have decided to place all officials in transferred departments under the control of Ministers. Greatest general interest no doubt will be taken in the Viceroy's remarks about the Reforms and the Statutory Commission of 1929. Once more the British determination is expressed to help India "through working of popular institutions to assume greater responsibility for her own destiny", though "the fundamental duty of Parliament to judge of the progress made" is no less stressed. The most pleasing part of this section consists of Lord Irwin's exhortation notwithstanding the sharp criticism and disagreement of opinion regarding the existing scheme, "to admit the sincerity of those views differing from our own"—an attitude to which he pledges himself and his government. Rightly he sees his supreme task in the dispelling of the atmosphere of suspicion and distrust which make any problem intractable. Probably if any Viceroy can accomplish that task, Lord Irwin will. His first address to the Legislature certainly once more deepens one's respect and sympathy for the broad humanity, open-mindedness and self-restraint it reveals.

NO better send-off to or greater advertisement of the Responsivist Party's Campaign in Bengal could have been designed than was actually given by the "civil disobedience" feat of Pandit M. M. Malaviya—thanks to the Chief Presidency Magistrate's famous order. Swarajism in Bengal is therefore of course hard put to it to know what exactly to say—to back Panditji for his defiance of Government, or to cecry him for assailing the Swarajist shibboleth. *Forward* of the 11th, in fact is thinking aloud when it bewails the fact that "Pandit Malaviya's triumph for a principle was used to boom a party"—a venial sin of which *Forward* and the Swarajist party of course have never, never, never been guilty. Panditji admittedly came, saw and conquered Calcutta; and then left. But he was almost immediately followed by other leaders, this time of the Maharashtrian Responsi-

vist Party, who may have wished to return the compliment of the "Congress election propaganda in Maharashtra", for which the Congress Working Committee voted Rs. 1000 last month. From all accounts they seem to have been certainly a good deal more successful than the Swarajist hot gospellers who toured Maharashtra not so long ago, without as much as causing a ripple in the solid Reponsivist current flowing in this Province. Messrs. Jayakar and Kelkar in fact were a distinct success in Calcutta and the various Albert Hall meetings have already shown, that the great "walk out" stunt seems to be ending in making the bulk of the Swaraj Party's members—even in Bengal—to "walk out"—of their party. In the meantime there is a good deal of—verbal—accommodation: on the one hand Mr. Jayakar has told his Calcutta audience that he is out to "work the Reforms for what they are worth"; on the other he soothed them by saying that of course in Bengal acceptance of office must be made conditional upon a general amnesty of political prisoners. His commonsense resumé was, that, if they did not accept Cabinet posts, the Communalists would. Quite so: but under such conditions, what is the good of talking about "conditions"?

* * *

THE paucity of students at the Gujarat Vidya-peeth does not deter the Dhruva "National" Education. Committee which sat to inquire into its present condition from recommending its retention. We are glad that the Committee does not go by mere numbers, for the *raison d'être* of such an institution is that it strikes out a new path and the very novelty of it may keep back, though by rights it should attract, students. The Committee say, and rightly, that the continued existence of the University will be justified if the University is true to its ideal, however short it may fall by reason of practical difficulties, in giving effect to them. We are of course interested in seeing what the ideals are which the University has kept before itself; naturally of course freedom from Government control and the imparting of education from the national point of view figure prominently among these ideals, though the exact import of these terms is far from clear. These ideas are nothing new; they were the basic principles of the National Education movement of the years 1906 and 1907. But they have now given place to the one predominating idea at the back of the present National Education movement, viz. that of hand-spinning, which was entirely absent from the former movement. The best illustration of this recent change is the Samarth Vidyalaya at Talegaon, conducted by the late lamented Prof. Bijapurkar. This school came into existence in 1907 and was acclaimed as the best fruit of national education in Maharashtra, but latterly it had practically ceased to be recognised as a national school, merely because it refused to introduce what has now become the chief if not the only ingredient of national education. Nothing shows better the utter irrelevance of khaddar and spinning in regard to national education than the persistent refusal of Bijapurkar and his colleagues to admit this feature into his school. The committee report that the element of compulsion should be reduced in the matter of hand-spinning. This affords an eloquent comment on the Tolstoyan principles which Mahatma Gandhi is supposed to practise in conducting the University. Tolstoy left his children free to learn or not to learn even the subjects of universally acknowledged utility, while his disciple in India has been forcing down the throats

of pupils a subject of such obviously dubious value as hand-spinning, and the committee is now constrained to recommend that he should rely upon the moral influence of teachers, who, however, are asked to resign if they will not fall in with the peculiar doctrine of Mahatma Gandhi.

* * *

THE transfer of the Imperial capital from Calcutta to Delhi led to a welcome annulment of the partition of Bengal; Separation of the Railway Budget, similarly the postponement last year of the expenditure of 70 lakhs on the work of fitting rolling stock with automatic central buffer couplers pending a reinvestigation of the method of conversion made it possible to grant a welcome suspension of the Cotton Excise Duty. The relation of cause to effect is identical in either case. But the fact that postponement (not abandonment) of a necessary work involving expenditure of such heavy proportions as 70 lakhs should provide extra revenue to the General Budget raises a question of principle which the Legislative Assembly will do well to bear in mind, when as is possible the question of the continuance of the convention regarding separate railway finance comes to be considered with reference to the Railway Budget for 1927-28. One of the conditions attaching to the convention, although not specifically stated in the resolution passed by the Assembly, is that any cuts made by the Assembly in the Railway Budget will go straight into the railway reserve, so as to prevent the General Budget from benefiting by the cuts. This is an extremely one-sided arrangement and if the Railway Budget is to be above even the suspicion of manipulation either by the Assembly or by the Executive which manipulation would have the effect of benefiting the General Budget, the present one-sided arrangement must needs be balanced by a corresponding obligation on the Government to throw into the railway reserve any sums made available by such necessary postponement of expenditure. The principal point to secure is that the money saved by cuts or postponement is there in the railway coffers for immediate use whenever it is found necessary to restore the 'cuts' or to undertake the postponed work.

* * *

THE Budget Session of the Travancore Legislative Council on the 6th inst. had before Tying up the Safety Valve. it an adjournment motion to discuss the situation created by the new Press Law, which came into force (as Regulation 5 of May 22nd, 1926) by a *ukase* of the Maharani Regent, without reference to any representative body in the State. The President having disallowed the motion on the grounds that "no question of legislation shall come in when the Council is in budget session," most elected members refused to move other motions (on budget items), as a protest against the President's ruling prohibiting the discussion of the Newspapers Regulation, and on the 10th only 5 out of 39 motions were thus moved; and elected members subsequently only voted to defeat Government, as they did, e. g. on a question of tolls. On the 13th, not a single motion standing before that, on which a cut was to be moved with a view to ventilate Regulation 5, was moved. When it came to the latter motion, the Council was overcrowded and public opinion in general seems to have been at fever heat: as well it might, seeing the deliberation with which the affront to the Legislative Council,

which had been ignored when the obnoxious Regulation was introduced, was further deepened by the Council now not even being allowed to discuss it. In the circumstances the President seems to have had the good sense of changing his mind and allowing discussion on the Newspapers Regulation to proceed. Proceed it did for the whole day and in the end the cut was defeated by 30 to 14 votes; the 30 consisting of 15 officials, 10 nominated and 5 electes members, the 14 on the other side being all elected members. The to our mind most extraordinary piece of the whole business was the speech of the Chief Secretary, Mr. K. George, who justified the Regulation, because according to him "the Travancore Penal Code was utterly insufficient with the usual dilatoriness characteristic of the law courts to stop the menace of articles which were highly indecent, extremely scurrilous and unspeakably scandalous." Mr. George expatiated on the obscenity of "such newspapers which no decent man would allow his wife or children to read." Now Mr. George surely knows that obscene writings are effectively put down outside of Travancore even without a Regulation 5 and if his speech proved anything at all, it only proved the necessity for overhauling the Travancore Penal Code. It certainly did not try to prove that people financing obscene publications are frightened away by forfeiture of high licence fees. Obscenity is a paying business and the profits amply cover all such incidental losses. No, we are afraid, offenders against 5 (a) and (b) of the Regulation ("to excite disaffection" &c.) were more likely aimed at than profiteers in indecencies. The tone of the local press may be capable of much elevation, but Regulation 5 certainly will not effect that. Is a man with money necessarily a man of a lofty morality? Besides, if the Regulation itself was so obviously desirable, no *ukase* for its introduction need have been resorted to, and no stifling of its discussion in Council been so sedulously attempted. The long and the short of it—so the impartial onlooker can but conclude—seems to be that Travancore Autocracy does not like criticism and therefore tries the old, old dodge of tying up the safety valve.

* * *

THE news that trickles out of Native States is always scrappy and the information vouchsafed to the Indian Public at large about the recent strikes in Indore Mills has been no exception to that rule. Apparently there has been a strike on a large scale, the retort of a threatened general lock-out and finally a patched-up peace. The point of greatest interest however is that which caused the whole disturbance: the workmen's resolve to get their 12 (!) hour day reduced to the 10 hour day of Bombay and their labour conditions in general raised to that of British India. This is a devastating comment on those Indian "patriots" who are always tender to Indian Princes and to their government, because they are Indians. Exploitation as such obviously does not worry this class of politician overmuch: what worries him, is that the British allegedly keep it all to themselves. Mr. P. G. Kanekar in the *Guardian* of last week has an excellent article on the necessity of a new division of parties—not on the old and rather outworn criterion of for or against the British, but for or against the common people. The British may have often sinned against the latter: but the Indore Mills strike show once more, that today it is not the British who are the greatest danger to the common people of India. More's the shame of it.

18d. OR 16d. ?

IN view of the coming debate in the Assembly on the bill for stabilising the Rupee at 1s. 6d. gold it is necessary to clarify the issue further. We shall therefore examine one by one all the arguments, in favour of that ratio, marshalled in the Report. It is said that at this rate prices in India have been substantially adjusted to the world-prices. This is true but the idea that world prices have settled down is wrong; it is just possible that there may be marked changes still and in that case to maintain the ratio would involve a great strain on the mechanism of exchange. It is forgotten again that internal rupee prices may not be completely adjusted to the world prices and yet nothing might happen. Secondly it is said that wages too are adjusted to this rate. With a lower rate prices would rise and after a few years a demand for higher wages would be irresistible. The answer would be that present wages are high enough and no rise can be demanded. Granting however that a rise does take place, it is better to have higher wages and realize higher price for your goods than to pay lower wages and have to compete with foreign goods at a reduced price.

With regard to contracts made at a lower ratio, it is said that they are fewer than contracts made recently after the old rate was known to be disturbed. The answer is that they are not fewer but immensely larger. The total debt payable by the agriculturists exceeds 800 crores and all this was contracted at the lower ratio. It is true that prices to-day even at 18d. are higher than they were when these debts were contracted but the paying off the debt would be easier with still higher prices.

The next argument assumes this form: With a 16d. rate all prices would rise by 12½ per cent. and this would be hard on the consumers as it would check import and lead to a real reduction of wages of the clerical class. This is an old issue between consumers and producers and must be decided according to the balance struck. It comes to this: the rich and the middle class would suffer and the poorer class would gain; every one must decide for himself what the ultimate balance is. Each class naturally looks at the question from its own point of view and the statesman must decide by standing aloof. We do not think however that the effect on trade by the adoption of the 16d. ratio would be convulsive, as the Report makes it out to be.

It is said further that the effect of the adoption of the lower rate would lead to an increase in Central as well as Provincial taxation since at higher prices expenditure in all departments would soar up and would thus check nation-building projects. Of course this is undeniable but the remedy would be to cut expenditure which probably no government in the world dreams of. No government likes to admit that it is extravagant. Supposing however that higher taxation is

necessary it is better to have more money with you and pay higher taxes than to secure a bare living and to pay lower taxes. The next consideration offered is that with an 18d. rate the melting point of the Rupees is much nearer than with a 16d. rate. This is perfectly true but if the danger comes at all a little postponement would not give much relief. Other remedies will have to be adopted in any case.

The last argument is that a rate is an accomplished fact for a year or so and to change it again would be to disturb everything. The answer would be that stabilisation after a period of "Leave alone" is bound to produce some alteration and the vital consideration is whether this alteration would lead to a temporary disturbance or a permanent disturbance. As a matter of fact nobody knows what is going to be the level of world prices for the next twenty years and it is difficult to decide the question whether a régime ushered in by a 16d. ratio would tend to be stable. In such a case we would pronounce against stabilisation and leave exchange to be decided from day to day by trade factors. Have we not all said that a fixed exchange is only a luxury and not a necessity? Why not adopt that philosophy?

We would now review the arguments in favour of the 16 d. ratio. This rate is natural according to those who favour its adoption because it was maintained for a long period. The answer is that no rate is natural except when it is kept at that point. It is urged that the 18d. rate was due to manipulation. This is true to a certain extent, but the justification given by Government is that manipulation was necessary to depress prices and present exchange from rising too high. We think Government should have let things alone. It is said that a rate of 16d. would require less gold; but this is true only if the number of rupees remains the same which cannot be since a lower rate would mean an inflation of currency; this argument therefore has no force. It is urged in favour of the 16d. rate that in case of an adverse exchange more gold would be required to be paid. We think this is a valid objection to the higher ratio. It is further said that a 16d. ratio will help us to compete with countries with a depreciated currency. The answer given by the Commission is that this would apply during the transition period only. But in our opinion untold harm would result to India during this transitional period and there would be no consolation in later adjustment. The next plea is that with a 16d. rate gold would be dearer and hence the hoarding of gold would be checked. We think this is very likely and does constitute a minor reason for adopting the lower exchange.

Another argument is that if world prices fall then Indian prices at 18d. would fall much more than with a lower ratio and excessive cheapness would be harmful to producers. This in our opinion is the most telling argument against the 18d. ratio; we are not prepared to believe that

European prices have attained a stable equilibrium, as the Report imagines to be the case. The substance of the whole argument in favour of a 16d. rate is that debtors, primary producers and employers of labour would gain. Considering that primary producers constitute 80 per cent. of the population and employers, though few, keep industries alive we do not think this argument can be dismissed as special pleading. We have presented the case for both the rates of exchange in outline and would leave the matter here and wait for any fresh arguments on both sides brought forward in the Assembly.

V. N. GODBOLE,

CLASSICS VS. VERNACULARS.

HISTORY REPEATS ITSELF.

ON Thursday, 29th of July, Mr. R. V. Parulekar read at the Shikharvihar Mandal, a paper on 'The Early History of the Medium of Instruction in Bombay', wherein he quoted paragraphs from old records, some of which would be very helpful to a student of the present controversy between the Classicists and Vernacularists. In 1863, that is, some five years after the University of Bombay was established, the University decided to replace the study of the Vernaculars by the compulsory study of Classics in college classes, apparently for the good of the Vernaculars themselves. In his convocation address in 1863, says Sir Bartle Frere, the then Chancellor of the University: "Some discussion has arisen which must, I believe, bear useful fruit regarding the relative merits of the Classical languages of this country, as compared with the Vernaculars, as objects of university study. I will not anticipate the result of this discussion. No one estimates more highly than I do the importance of Vernacular education; no one has a higher estimate of the capabilities of some of our Indian Vernacular languages; no one has higher hopes as to the space they may one day fill in the literature of India. But I would remind you that the improvement of any Vernacular language, which has but a scanty modern literature of its own, must depend mainly on the cultivation of Classical languages. However great the natural capabilities of a language, it cannot become suited to the wants of a highly civilised people, except by the cultivation of those languages which already have a Classical literature of their own".

It is easy to see the strong parallelism between the arguments of Sir Bartle and those of the Classicists in the present University Senate. I have no wish to enter here into the discussion of the fallacies in these arguments; I have done it elsewhere. But one may agree with Mr. Parulekar in that "the Classical language in Indian schools is English, not Sanskrit or Persian; it (English) is doing for the Indian student and his Vernacular what Latin did for the English student and his Vernacular". Again it is now sixty-three years since these words were spoken

by Sir Bartle and the Vernaculars continue to be the Cinderella of the University. It was expected that "a very moderate knowledge of a Classical language would tend to improve the vernaculars, themselves left outside the pale of the University." That was like the fond parent who wished to see her child growing strong on a moderate allowance of arrow-root, forbidding the child all the while from exercising its limbs. If this view continues to influence the Senate, sixty-three more years will pass and we shall not have made any substantial advance.

It is instructive to see what steps were taken by the Colleges, when the Vernaculars were ousted from the University curricula, of course "in the interest of the Vernaculars themselves." "As a result of the exclusion of the Vernaculars from college studies, the funds, both public and private, which were hitherto earmarked for the encouragement of the Vernaculars in the Colleges were alienated from that purpose. The Director ordered that the Daxina Fellows who were hitherto required to contribute to the cultivation of the Vernaculars should be employed as tutors in teaching ordinary college subjects. The Gaikwar Scholarships which were expressly given for the promotion of the Vernacular studies were now given as scholarships for general proficiency. The Sundar Jiawaji Prize originally given by the donor for a Vernacular essay came to be awarded for a Sanskrit essay. The Kibe Prize which was also meant for a Vernacular essay was now given for an English essay. . . . We utterly fail to understand the propriety of this action of the College authorities, unless it be that the spirit of the University was spreading abroad and those who were responsible for higher education were unconsciously cultivating a spirit of hostility to the Vernaculars."

This reform—the displacement of the Vernaculars by the Classics—has done little good to the Classics, while it has done incalculable harm to the Vernaculars. Excellent Marathi books which deserved to pass through several editions are now obsolete and out of print. Numerous ancient manuscripts unearthed and published through magazines are again getting into obscurity. Having to depend for support on the lay public, rather than the university scholar, the writers of Marathi novel, Marathi drama and Marathi poetry are again and again tempted to descend to a lower ideal of authorship. In the face of all this discouragement the achievement of Marathi writers in the last sixty years is certainly commendable; but that should be a reason for encouragement, for the removal of the barriers and not for their continuation. On the other hand the study of the Classics is unpopular with the average college student in spite of the patronage of the University. Look at any annotated edition of a Sanskrit text prescribed for the F. Y. A. and Inter Arts. Besides supplying copious notes on all difficult words and phrases appearing in the text, the annotator gives—has to give—the translation of every

sentence in it. Without the help of these crutches the student finds his progress impossible, and our Classicists in the University expect these cripples to help the advance of Marathi with the knowledge of their Sanskrit. They are blind, ignorant or obstinate.

Before concluding, I think I cannot do better than sum up the controversy, Sanskrit vs. Marathi, in the words of the writer of 'The Teaching of English in England':*

"In citing the opinion, which we accept and put forward with entire conviction, we are aware that we are opposing ourselves to those for whom the idea of a liberal education is inseparable from a knowledge of the Classics, and we desire to clear the ground of possible misunderstandings. In the course of our inquiry we have not found either among ourselves or the witnesses whom we have heard, any trace of hostility to the Classics. We recognize that for some minds the study of man's life and thought in a setting so far removed from modern conditions as was the ancient world may have special advantages. We recognise, also, that since many of our great writers have been influenced directly or indirectly by Classical studies, the reader who approaches them with the same equipment will, in some ways, find it easier to understand them immediately and without loss of time. Further we do not despair of the Classics or regard them as having no future in this country. We see in them sources, which can never be forgotten, of our own language, our own art, our own experience and we hold that no student of English will have completed his exploration or gained all its advantages until he has ascended the stream of literature and discovered these perennial sources himself. Nevertheless, we are convinced, both by necessity and by reason, that we must look elsewhere for our present purpose. The time is past for holding, as the Renaissance teachers held, that the Classics alone can furnish a liberal education. We do not believe that those who have not studied the Classics or any foreign literature must necessarily fail to win from their native English a full measure of culture and humane training. To hold such an opinion seems to us to involve an obstinate belittling of our national inheritance."

M. R. PARANJPE.

RAILWAY STANDING FINANCE COMMITTEE.

ON the last occasion when the Railway Standing Finance Committee of the Legislative Assembly met at Calcutta in June last the attendance was so scandalously poor that out of a total of 12 there were only 4 members present on the first day and 5 on the day following. The business transacted at the meeting included such important questions as the

* The Report of the Departmental Committee of the Board of Education (London), published by H. M. Stationery Office. Price 1s. 6d.

provision of rolling stock during the quinquennium ending March 31, 1932, and the policy regarding the provision of quarters for railway staff and was therefore entitled to every effort on the part of Government to secure a larger attendance. Mr. Jamnadas Mehta, than whom no member takes a keener and more intelligent interest or exercises greater influence on the popular side in the decisions taken, was conspicuous by his absence; although it is some satisfaction to observe that Mr. Rama Iyengar was able to be present if only on the second, i. e., the last, day. He is a well-informed, studious and watchful critic of the railway administration and his presence at the meetings of the Committee is an asset of no mean value. In order to understand the composition and the functions of this Committee, one has to go back to the constitution of the General Standing Finance Committee. Sir Malcolm Hailey is one of those Civil Servants who are temperamentally inclined to loyalty to the policy of the Government which employs him. He is affable, sincere, liberal-minded and sympathetic, however else he may have on occasions appeared to be when acting as a spokesman of the Government. One of his first acts on the introduction of the Reforms in 1921 was to create a Committee of the Legislative Assembly, called the Standing Finance Committee, to advise the Finance Department of the Central Government of which he then held the portfolio. Nothing in the Reforms Act or in the rules made under it rendered it obligatory on Government to institute such a committee. It was an absolutely voluntary act of the Government. The idea behind the Committee was, in the words of Sir Malcolm, "to utilise for our own advantage the brain of those members of the Assembly who have had knowledge of finance and administration" and "to use their experience on our own behalf." The functions originally assigned to the Committee were to scrutinize and advise on all proposals for votable expenditure before they were sanctioned or were included in the main annual budget or in the supplementary budget; and the Committee consisted of 10 elected members of the Assembly and one nominated by the Governor General, the latter member being its Chairman. After the lapse of a little over a year, it was decided by Government, again on its own initiative, to enlarge its functions. It was also decided to add 4 more elected members, in view of the difficulty of assembling even 3 or 4 members and of the unfairness of placing before so small a body and asking its views on cases of great financial importance. The enlarged functions of the Committee were (a) to scrutinize all proposals for new votable expenditure and such non-votable items of expenditure as Government may submit to it; (b) to sanction allotments out of lump sum grants; (c) to suggest retrenchments and economy in expenditure; and (d) generally to assist the Finance Department by advising on such matters as may be referred to it by that Department.

The origin of the Railway Standing Finance Committee, however, presents a strong contrast to that of the Standing Finance Committee hitherto described. When the proposals of the Government concerning the separation of the railway from the general finances were placed before the Assembly in March 1924, the original intention was that the estimates of railway expenditure should be submitted to the Central Advisory Council attached to the Railway Department, prior to their submission to the Central Legislature. This Council came into existence early in 1922 in pursuance of a recommendation of the Indian Railway (or Acworth) Committee and consisted of (not elected but) selected members drawn from both the Legislative Assembly and the Council of State. It was soon discovered by the representatives of the people in the Assembly that since the right of voting supplies belonged by Statute exclusively to the Assembly, the transfer of the scrutiny of the railway estimates from the Standing Finance Committee composed entirely of members of the Assembly to such a mixed committee of selected members as the Central Advisory Council would not do and Government accordingly proposed the constitution of a special Standing Finance Committee for Railways consisting of 12 members, 10 elected members of the Assembly and 2 nominated official members of the same body, one of whom was to be the Chairman of the Committee. The proposal as finally passed by the Assembly and accepted by the Government constituted a Standing Finance Committee for Railways of 11 elected members and only one nominated official member, the latter being the Chairman of the Committee. The votable expenditure under the Railway Budget is more than half as much again as that under the Central Budget and one would have thought that the Railway Department would need a larger Standing Finance Committee. But so far from the Committee having a larger number of members it has a membership actually smaller by three than that of the General Standing Finance Committee. The smallness of the Committee is one of the factors militating against the attendance of a decent number at its meetings and it is therefore necessary that its strength should be increased. Another factor conducive to poor attendance apparently is that the procedure adopted for convening the meetings is faulty in so far as the dates for such meetings are fixed not with reference to the convenience of the majority of the members but only with reference to that of the Government member of the Committee. Lack of proper appreciation of the requirements of others is a besetting weakness of the Railway Department and a study of psychology forms no part of the intellectual equipment of our railway administrators in India. In fact, the atmosphere of machine-like and shiftless ways of thinking is so all-pervading that even the few Indian Civil Servants who in other spheres show a certain amount of freedom of thought easily fall under the influence of this way of thinking of the

technicians who appear to imagine that machines and men both act in accordance with one and the same set of laws.

The Associated Press message of 19th July last, which is presumably an authorized version of the proceedings of the Railway Standing Finance Committee which met at Calcutta on the 14th and 15th of June, mentions the laying down of a quinquennial programme of railways for rolling stock but not a word is said about the details of this programme. Instead of giving any information about the five-year programme, all we are told is that for the year 1927-28 the total demand for rolling stock is Rs. 1,71,80,000 in respect of additions and Rs. 2,88,25,000 in respect of renewals and replacements and that the additional stock is required in connection with the opening of new lines and to meet the normal development of traffic. The latter is a seductive statement. The overcrowding of third class passengers due to deficiency of coaches is an age-long complaint. This deficiency still stands, although the Railway Department have never yet once disclosed what this deficiency amounts to. To speak therefore of providing for normal development of traffic while this deficiency lasts is to speak what appears to be the language of absurdity. In any case, it is never stated how much of the additional rolling stock is against the existing deficiency of coaches. The public is supposed to be easily satisfied by the mere general statement that in the additional rolling stock special provision is made to increase the number of lower class carriages in order to avoid overcrowding. This reminds one of the story of a man who won in a competition as to the best way for public speakers and writers to avoid coming into trouble with the Government. The simple suggestion which won the prize for the competitor was: "Say what you like against the Government, but at the end of it be careful to add 'God save the King.'" And so it is with our railway administrators. Again, if one asks to know how much of the additional rolling stock goes towards meeting the normal development of traffic and how much towards the equipment of new lines the answer given is somewhat as follows:—

"The programmes for additional rolling stock are based on the needs of each railway system considered as a whole, including new lines added during the year. This has been found the most economical arrangement. It is not possible therefore to give any reliable approximate division between existing and new lines."

When the gauge of a new line is different to that of the existing connecting line, it becomes imperative to ascertain the requirements of the two lines separately and to make separate provision for rolling stock for each of the lines. When, however, the gauge of the two lines is identical, the rolling stock of the one can be used on the other and it becomes possible to meet the requirements of the two together with an amount of rolling stock smaller than would be

necessary if separate rolling stock were provided for each. But how the adoption of this economical arrangement makes it impossible to give any reliable approximate division between the existing and new lines is more than a layman can understand. Both lines share in the economy resulting from the pooling and it would be interesting and instructive for the layman to know why a division between the two in proportion to the requirements of each of the two lines ascertained separately would not constitute an approximation reliable enough for all practical purposes. When new lines are being laid down in unprecedented numbers as paying propositions, it is important to have some means of ensuring that the new lines are not being subsidized indirectly through the provision of rolling stock by the existing lines and that things generally are not moving in the direction of perpetuating and extending the existing deficiency. The watchful Mr. Rama Iyengar's demand at the meeting of the Committee for the production in future of specific justification for each programme of additional rolling stock is therefore extremely welcome. From paragraphs 37 & 61 of the Railway Administration Report for 1923-24 we had gathered the impression that the Railway Board had already laid down in that year definite standards for determining the requirements of rolling stock, but Mr. Parsons' reply to Mr. Rama Iyengar shows that this is not the case. Meanwhile we fail to see how in the absence of specific justification the Railway Board in the first instance and the Committee in the second could at all scrutinize and approve of "all rolling stock programmes of each railway administration for 1927-28."

ECONOMY.

PATRIOTISM.

A SUPRA-NATIONAL authority, then, as I showed last week, may well be needed for the healthy functioning of each individual State; the legitimacy of its intervention may be admitted to be theoretically unassailable: yet few citizens and fewer States will be able to contemplate such curtailment of their country's sovereignty with equanimity and without grave misgivings. The latter arise naturally out of the suspicion that the intervention, ostensibly for the benefit of Humanity, might only too easily be intended for the benefit of the intervenor himself. As we have seen already, such suspicions have been only too well founded in the past: but in the past, it must be remembered, the intervenor was either a single State or a league of a few States—never yet a Federation of the whole World. Even Mandates of the present *League of Nations* of course are issued to a single State which is thereby empowered to superintend the destinies of another country with at least one eye on its own advantage. This is hardly the kind of supra-national intervention which would commend itself to the present Mandatories, if, say, there was a suggestion of giving a 'mandate' over China to Japan or one to Germany over Portugal or to Haiti over the Negroes of the U. S. A. There is of course no doubt that the populations distracted by ceaseless civil commotions in China and Portugal or the Negroes in their abject Jim-Crowism would great-

ly benefit by the assertion of some extrinsic authority which could substitute order for chaos or justice for mob-law. But clearly, that authority would, like Caesar's wife, have to be above all possibility of suspicion: and it could only be that, if it was the authority wielded, not by one, nor even by a few high and mighty ones, but by the whole world. *Securus iudicat orbis terrarum*: the whole world's judgment—and it alone—can safely be depended upon.

That the idea itself is practically sound, is evidenced by the incalculable good which even so partial a world-authority as the present League of Nations has already been able to effect internationally, its great and many defects and handicaps notwithstanding. One great safeguard against abuse of such power consists of course in the watchfulness, not to say jealousy, of some States and in the fact that in each case there always must be even more States who can afford to take a strictly impartial line of justice. But the best of all safeguards perhaps consists in the natural reluctance of each single State and of its citizens, to allow "foreigners" to curtail *ab extra* their own power of self-determination. This "patriotism" no doubt has its great dangers too, when not balanced by a cosmopolitan consideration of the needs of Humanity as a whole: but at least equal danger would lurk in a Cosmopolitanism which had evaporated all loyalties to lesser societies than to that of a world levelled down to a grey uniformity and philistine monotony, swayed by mass emotions which would sweep the whole of humanity and which would carry all before them, since there would be no more walls of human partition to break their tidal force.

That this danger is not a mere figment of phantasy, the present history of the United States of America proves only too well. Perhaps in no other country is difference of opinion from the perfervid patriotism of the 100-percenter so little tolerated and so relentlessly persecuted. The reason of course is that the American mentality worships the norm, the average—mediocrity in fact, not to put too fine a point on it. America lives, and what is worse, aims at living, in a *Main Street* of self-satisfied philistinism, which frankly has no use for "tall poppies". A man stands out in popular esteem, because he is so typical, because he conforms so perfectly to the standardized ideal. Technology and mass production demand the standard, the interchangeable part, the Fordized factory, the branded foods: and technology rules America. Perhaps also is this mentality the legacy of the Puritans of New England, who, no longer able to check the subjectivity of their own consciences by the objectivity of an institution, the Church, had been forced to counteract their a-social tendency towards anarchy by making a fetish of "convention". Thus hundred-percentism has become a creed, Normalcy the ruling passion, the Melting Pot an axiom. No minority has a right to exist as such, but must be melted down, and run into the rigid and uniform moulds of the prevailing American standard; no individual may have tastes of his own or opinions of his own, which differ from those laid down by convention. The matter has gone so far that a man is no longer physically able to clothe or feed himself, as fancy tells him, because only standardized food, and standardized clothes are available. Everything has been put into a "can"; everything has been put on the Procrustean bed of the machine. To escape from this deadly dullness of standardized life, the American has rushed into a world of sensationalism

and make-believe "secret societies": only to find even that regulated and standardized by the publicity and regalia-makers. Unable to produce quality, the standardized American can only strive after quantity: and quantity, not quality, is of course exactly what the machine can turn out. America is not the land of "unlimited possibilities", it has merely become the land of unlimited monotony.

Such a state of affairs would be calamitous enough, if it were merely the state of eleven crores of human beings: it becomes a world problem through the fact that the American ideal of "Normalcy" *à l'Americaine* is becoming an article of export. As wave after wave of foreign immigrants was being assimilated and standardized, the Hundred-percenter naturally came to think of himself as a superior being and of his standard as the *non plus ultra*. But if his standard is the thing, is it not selfish to keep it to himself? No, let the whole world be given a chance of imitating this last word in civilization, let the standard of "God's own country" become the standard of the whole world. And if those other benighted people don't want to? Clearly, then, they must be compelled to their good: and admittedly the resources of a highly efficient and industrialized State of eleven crores like America is capable of exerting a good deal of compulsion. That is the danger, the greatest danger of all: not merely that American acquisitiveness will want to subordinate the whole world to Wall Street, but that American fanaticism will want to mould the whole world after the manner of Main Street. What if America were able to persuade, cajole and coerce other countries to accept their "normalcy"? What if that normalcy were to capture a "Federation of the World", which would yield the potential power of being able to steam-roll flat any outstanding feature, not stereotyped in the American pattern? The picture I have drawn is not a fanciful one, but based on generally acknowledged facts; and to those who would have fuller and unimpeachable description, I can but recommend another book by an author already mentioned by me—M. J. Bonn in his "Amerika and sein Problem"—who I am sure cannot fail to bring home to his reader the reality and gravity of the "problem".

I mention this book particularly also, because its author not only describes "The States", but also its antithesis on the American continent, the Canadian Province of Quebec. "Quebec", as he says, "stands for the multiformity of life, as America does for the uniformity of it" (p. 59). "In the modern American world, where the purposiveness of living often seems but to prove the purposelessness of life, Quebec is a living piece of European tradition and its people one that can give purpose and colour to life, because the purpose of life lies behind life. Out of the flat uniformity of America Quebec rises up, in conscious contrast, like a medieval castle of the Holy Grail".† Quebec is today what it is, because the British at the time thought a little *isle de France* in an Anglo-Saxon Sea safe enough to be granted for all times the right of the French language and of the Catholic religion. As a result we have in the Quebec *inhabitant* the true type of yeoman farmer bound to his homestead, to his village community, not by economic necessity, but by his own choice and predilection. The *inhabitant* of Quebec is rooted in his soil, because he loves it, not because somebody forces him to remain there; the farmer of the

* Meyer and Jessen, München, 1925, 8 x 5, pp. 176.

† *ibid.* p. 47.

United States would any day rather move to the city, any American city, than stay on the land, to which he is tied, not by bonds of affection, but by mortgage banks and food trusts. Who would deny patriotism to the American? Yet his patriotism is the result of a political concept, not that of the home-sense of the French Canadian; continental, not regional; an abstraction, a creed, a Nationalism—not a homely fact, a daily experience, a parochialism. The contrast brings well out the defect of Americanism—and its only remedy. The levelling down of all regional distinctions, the uprooting of a people and their condemnation to a permanent "frontier" life, always moving on and about, always living in tents and shacks, even when labelled "flats": all this has naturally produced a people, which changes professions and homes as others would a garment. And this Americanism is brother germane to Cosmopolitanism, both being based on a deliberate process of *déracinement* and atomizing egalitarianism and both aiming at a nation and a world, which is not the integration of natural differences, but a convention of mutual agreements. Such a conception of the World is the same as Rousseau's of the State: in the latter case the individual citizens by an arbitrary *contrat social* agree to form a State; in the former the individual States arbitrarily "covenant" to form a League of Nations, just as the New England States freely covenanted to form the United States of America. The Catholic conception, as we have seen, bases itself on the natural givenness of the State; similarly in that philosophy is every State part of Humanity, whether it wishes to be such or not. But therefore also does Catholicism not need to reduce all component parts to drab uniformity: humanity is one, because it is a polyphony made up of many chords, not because it is the monotony of a monotone.

St. Thomas defines piety as "the duty and homage due to parents and country" (S.T., 2a 2ae, 101,3), "who have given us birth and nourishment, and to whom consequently man is debtor." (*ibid.* 101,1.) The country of his origin gives man that specific *cachet*, which distinguishes him from strangers: one naturally loves one's country therefore, because it is part of oneself, of one's own individuality. The moment, however, one aims at universal uniformity, that regional *cachet* disappears and with it the motive for loving one's homeland. America shows the extreme of that process, on the huge scale of its eleven crores. But the process has been going on too in Europe, where since the French Revolution regional costumes and dialects have died out and given place to a uniform style of dress and habits, at least in what is called "polite society"; and here in India we too have felt that levelling influence of "de-nationalization". But India has a culture of its own, just because it is a unity which has been able to integrate great differences—regional, linguistic, physical, spiritual. Europe in the same way and for the same reason has had its culture of Christendom; and moreover within Europe again, each country is not merely a heap of atomized parts, but highly differentiated, as Castile, Andalusia and Catalonia in Spain; as Languedoc and Languedoul in France; as north and south of the Humber in England; and still more, as the greatly fragmentized separate principalities and city republics which used to make up the often very shadowy unity of Italy and Germany. It is easy to see the evil of excessive provincialism and separatism: but have Tuscany and Siena, have Baden and Weimar no compensatory elements to

show? How small were Athens, Corinth, Sparta—yet has their greatness ever been rivalled? It would be absurd of course to go to the other extreme: parochialism and xenophobia are just as false, as unrestrained centralization. But what needs emphasizing today is that regional differences must on no account be levelled down, but rather be integrated into the solidarity of a greater whole. The Quebec *inhabitant* is prone to become narrow, unless he can feel himself a useful and needed part of a greater entity; so is every State in the last instance prone to be narrow, unless it functions as the essential member of a Federation of the World, for which its nature destines it.

Patriotism therefore is not merely compatible with Supra-nationalism: it is a necessary ingredient of it, if the latter is not to become a Frankenstein, a super-Leviathan. *Per contra*, Supra-nationalism is just as essential, if Patriotism is not to degenerate into that untrstrained selfishness, so familiar to-day and so much more dangerous, because so much more powerful than the private egoism of a single individual. We must love our homeland, as we love our mother: by placing them above those of other people in our affections, not by forcing, or even expecting, others to rank them as we do. The French saying that every man has two countries, France and his own, is typical of that diseased idea that one's own country is objectively so superior to all others as to contain all that humanity needs. Out of this group-megalomania springs that most dangerous, because most fanatical of all imperialisms, which is so much in love with its own national characteristics and achievements, as to feel the missionary duty of imposing its own individuality on others. Of that tendency was the France of the 1789 Revolution and is the Russia of the 1918 Revolution; into that tendency America is visibly drifting for the future. Thus has false Patriotism a tendency to issue in a false Cosmopolitanism: a tendency that can only be checked by the realization that States, as individuals, are different and meant to be different and can only contribute their quota to humanity through these differences of theirs, which however must also never be allowed to develop one-sidedly and egotistically to the detriment of the whole.

Patriotism therefore is an essential ingredient of Catholic Politics, because it counteracts the egalitarianism of Cosmopolitanism: but Scholastic Philosophy, denying as it does the "natural" intention of normal conflict between States and States, as it denies that between class and class and individual and individual, balances Patriotism itself by the Catholic idea of Human Solidarity.

H. C. E. ZACHARIAS.

REVIEWS.

DISINTERESTED POLITICS.

FREE-THOUGHT IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES.

By J. A. HOBSON, (London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd.) 1926. 8½ × 6. pp. 284 10s.

IN these days of extreme specialisation it is not usual for people to take a broad synthetic view of things, and so it is all the more refreshing to come across a book like the one under review, which boldly criticises the self-sufficient attitude of our professional economists and politicians. It undertakes a trenchant study of the unacknowledged, but none the less real, forces which tend to warp

the judgment of scientists. There is an unfortunate tendency on the part of economists to emphasise especially unduly the economic aspect of human life with at times a patronising reference, and more often a contemptuous one, to the ethical aspect of human endeavour. It is a distinct merit of Mr. Hobson's book that he seeks to rise above the abstractions of economists and ethicists alike, and in doing so he is frankly conscious of the great work that has been done in recent years by psychologists, who have not been content to take the workings of reason at their face value, but have dived deep below into human nature to detect the real motive springs of human activity, with its merely superficial veneer of rationality.

It is a common boast of physical sciences that they aim at, and achieve, exactness only because of their scrupulous regard for facts and their severe disregard of individual likes and dislikes and of any utilitarian spirit in general. The history of science shows indeed that this is an ideal which has not always been religiously respected. Personal jealousies, conservative habits of thought and at times a confusing fear of offending the powers that be, have affected the even course of scientific achievement. But on the whole it has succeeded in achieving a disinterestedness, which has been the goal and the despair of social sciences with their bewildering play of live human prejudices and interests. Mr. Hobson's problem is just to see whether the severe disinterestedness of the physical sciences cannot be compassed by the social sciences like Economics, Politics and Ethics. By "free thought" he just means this absence of interest-ness, freedom from individual, national or racial *idola*, a free play of reason unswayed by conscious fear or unconscious bias. This is his goal, but he is painfully conscious that this free thought has not been actually achieved in the world of social sciences. Scientific progress in the social sciences has been hindered by the "timid conservatism of their professors [and their genuine class sympathies and reverences." He passes the dominant schools of economic and political thought in review with the definite object of exposing the unacknowledged bias governing them. But he has the undying faith of a rationalist—a faith without which there can be no advancement in human knowledge—that reason can overcome this bias, once it is ruthlessly exposed.

In the realm of economics the ghost of the "economic man" of the days of Ricardo and Mill still haunts the thought of the Neo-Classical economists with a subtle recognition of the old vested rights, which by the very length of their age have come to have a more or less undisputed sway over all questions relating to sex and property. They bring a keen intellect to bear on economic problems, an astute mathematical analysis, whose abstract rigour hypnotises men into a blind veneration for their judgments, but as Mr. Hobson points out economic welfare is only "a mixed or composite concept, in which average current desires are qualified by social ideals". No doubt Carlyle's merciless defiance of the "dismal science" and Ruskin's aesthetic onslaughts on mere economic life have not failed to evoke an aesthetic and ethical response from such advanced economists like Prof. Marshall and Prof. Pigou, but the fact remains that their thought has been coloured and moulded by their own aristocratic environment and the introduction of mathematical abstractions has but tended to perpetuate the abstractness of the exploded myth of the "economic man," and served to deflect public attention from the hideous drabness of proletarian existence. Thus has been

rendered possible the birth of a Proletarian Economics actuated by its own class prejudices, all the more embittered by centuries-old memories of oppression and injustice. From the standpoint of "free thought" neither of them is satisfactory. A genuine Economics requires a transcendence of the Neo-Classical emphasis on the interest of the producers, as well a transcendence of the Proletarian emphasis on the interests of the consumers. Hence the identity of the producer and consumer as an economic organism should be the centre of all economic studies with a due appreciation of the part played by society in its bearing upon economic welfare and the general life of the community. Such in brief is Mr. Hobson's review of the economic sphere.

If economics with all its show of mathematics does not display free thought to any satisfactory degree, no wonder if politics with its more blatant shibboleths and coarser prejudices fares still worse. Not the least interesting portion of the book is the discussion of Power Politics. Nationalism does not blind the author to its palpable defects. "Lip-service to public opinion, by those conscious of the power to manufacture it, and to electoral machinery, by those conscious of the power to manipulate it, is an instructive barometer of popular self-government". He is not tender either to the high-sounding claims of Imperialism as a civilising agency: "So came about that amalgam of trade, religion and philanthropy, adventure, pride of territorial size and dominion, that goes into the composition of Imperialism". Yet he does not altogether deny the possibility that the collective assertion of an instinct of leadership may be accredited with a social or human value. He recognises the futility of the Mandatory System unless it is deliberately guided by the interests of the people ruled, and not of the Mandatory powers concerned, as is actually the case. Nowhere perhaps is the rationalising tendency so predominant as in the case of politics. In peace and in war alike we are familiar with the phenomena of ugly deeds being sought to be glossed over with high-sounding epithets. It is regrettable that partisan tendencies have invaded the precincts of sober scholarship under the name of eugenics. No more disconcerting book has seen the light of day in recent years than Dr. McDougall's "Ethics and some Modern World Problems." He revels in the glorification of the white race, and with consummate modesty assigns the role of hewers of wood and drawers of water to the coloured races! He conveniently forgets the contribution of the coloured races to the civilisation of humanity long before the Anglo-Saxons had emerged from their barbarous haunts. But cold truth may have to hide its face in the presence of racial egotism. To the credit of Mr. Hobson be it said that he is the last man to be a party to such crudely interested theories and he runs down the barbarity of "racial self-esteem dressed as Anthropology or Race Eugenics," and speaks of it as "the most injurious, as it is the most ridiculous, example of the havoc which the will to power can make when a social science prostitutes itself to its paymasters." Power politics is only a device on the part of the strong to exploit the weak, and hence the political problem for Mr. Hobson emerges in the form: "In what form of government can the intelligent will of peoples be best evoked for the attainment of political power?"

The proper answer to this question can be given only by a free ethics, i. e. an ethics that is not prostituted to a purely national or racial end.

It is only on such a basis that international justice can rest and flourish. When all is said and done our economic and political life presents such a chaos of conflicting motives, because they seek a spurious independence of ethics. Nothing tells ultimately so forcibly as character, and character that is not grounded in morality is the most devastating enemy of humanity. But if morality is to fulfil this high mission it must be free in the highest sense of the term. It must not be the handmaiden of national or racial arrogance; it must be content with nothing less than the uplift of the whole humanity. And to this great end economics and politics and ethics have to work hand in hand. In the past all of them have been twisted to serve narrow ends. Can we hope that in the future they will have sufficient grit to stand on their own legs and refuse to be manipulated by the selfish interests of its students? Pessimists will of course smile and say that social sciences can never in the very nature of things be free from individual and national *idola* but Mr. Hobson has faith—a faith that is born of sincerity—that reason will tell ultimately and guarantee free thought in the social sciences, because “seeing facts and thinking straight are more attractive to the mind than seeing falsehood and thinking crooked.” It is because of this faith that the book ends in a hopeful note: “If marching quick appears to be dangerous, safety does not lie in marching slow, but in knowing where you are going and in keeping a good look-out. This is the task of disinterested thinking.”

The perusal of the book raises a reflection how and to what extent the message of the book will hold in the case of India. India has generally been in the tight and suffocating grip of orthodoxy. It has made our morality conventional; it has killed the living breath of religion and left only a mass of outward forms and symbols, whose very meaning has been lost by the masses; our very ignorance has made us sensitive to criticism and the looseness of our faith has made us morbidly shy of any exposure of our cherished beliefs. That is why our political life suffers from a sense of hollowness: it presents the appearance of a man who makes frantic attempts to walk with only one leg, trying to keep the other fixed in the ground. It has affected our ability to think clearly, for our thought is clogged by the mildew of ages, and we have lost the desire to think freely.

A. R. WADIA.

LAWS OF ANCIENT IRELAND.

LIBERTY, ORDER AND LAW UNDER NATIVE IRISH RULE. By SOPHIE BRYANT. (Harding & More, Ltd.) 1926. 9 × 6. pp. 398. 25s.

SIR JOHN DAVIES, an eminent lawyer, sent to Ireland by King James I, reported to his Royal Master as follows:—“There is no nation of people under the sun that doth love equal and indifferent justice better than the Irish, or will rest better satisfied with the execution thereof, although it be against themselves, so as they may have the protection and benefit of the law when upon just cause they do desire it.” A perusal of Dr. Sophie Bryant's book will help the incredulous to realize that there was in Ireland a system of law and equity, which in its origin and its administration was calculated to produce in the people the very characteristics to which Sir John Davies invited the attention of the King. If the subsequent history of the country apparently belies the opinion of Sir John Davies it has to be remembered

that much in that subsequent history which was law was very far removed from justice and lacked the consent of the people.

Amongst the priceless treasures of Trinity College and museums in Ireland are some of the ancient Irish manuscripts, records of the early civilization of the country, first translated in the last century. Of these manuscripts not the least interesting from the point of view of the student of human institutions, and particularly of Aryan institutions, are those that contain the ancient Laws of Ireland.

These laws, though of great national interest to Ireland, make a much wider appeal and the student of legal development will find them worthy of acquaintance, while to those interested in Aryan institutions they are a very valuable revelation of the habits and customs of an Aryan people secluded from the influence of other civilizations.

Dr. Sophie Bryant summarises and analyses the main branches of the laws which originally consisted of judgments handed down as delivered by upright judges of the past, and with these judgments came traditions of dire diseases which had afflicted unjust judges. When St. Patrick came to convert Ireland to Christianity he found in King Laoghaire a sceptic, who, according to the *Senchus Mor* itself, the *Mss.* with which Dr. Bryant deals, desired to put the apostle to the test of his own teaching. He accomplished his desire with results which apparently pleased the King, for immediately afterwards Patrick and the King arranged that a council of three bishops, three kings and three poets should revise the laws, confirming what did not clash with the word of God and the conscience of believers. The result of the labours of the “big nine” is the *Senchus Mor* (Great Antiquities) of which “no human brehon of the *Gaedhil* is able to abrogate anything”. All this is told in the introduction to the *Senchus Mor*. There follows a list of the degradations to which dignitaries who act unworthily are subjected and they are numerous enough to ensure upright behaviour.

Dr. Sophie Bryant gives many translated extracts from the *Senchus Mor*, and, although the primary object of the book is probably to suggest further study to those who may be able to obtain facilities for such, the work is comprehensive enough to be valuable even to those who may not be able to pursue the subject further. The various divisions of the laws are dealt with in the different chapters. There is the law of fosterage with the payments prescribed in proportion to the honour price of the parent, the responsibilities and liabilities of the foster parent, the refund in case of default, the punishments for the offences of the foster child, etc. Fosterage was the system of education in ancient Ireland, a system deliberately adopted again by the Protestant Orphan Society of Ireland in 1869 and recommended later for the protection and education of the illegitimate child at the cost of the father “in proportion to his honour price”, i.e. in accordance with his station.

The law of lord and tenant is a branch of the law of social connections as much as fosterage and family law are. Subsequently an alien system of land laws produced tragic effects, to undo which has necessitated continuous legislation in the last 70 years. No adequate idea of the change that produced so much tragedy can be obtained without studying the ancient land system. Dr. Sophie Bryant's chapter on this subject does reveal the great importance of the change that took place.

Again with numerous translated extracts there are chapters on the Law of Social Connections; those of the chief with his tenants; of the church and her tenants; of the members of one family; of foster relations; of tutor and pupil; of husband and wife, co-partners with equal rights in property, 1500 years before the Married Women's Property Acts; of marriage; and of separation. There is a chapter on the law of contracts dealing with the validity of contracts between parties of differing status; capacity to contracts; warranty; implied contracts, etc. Although the subject is not dealt with exhaustively, but rather somewhat vaguely, in the original, there can be no doubt of the essential sanctity of contracts in ancient Ireland and elaborate provisions to enforce them.

Sections of the laws deal with the organisation of the church and the disposal of church property, succession to an abbacy, tithes, first fruits &c.; for the early Irish church was not a Latin organisation but one adapted to the ancient Irish civil society, a fact which contributed largely to the church's great success in Ireland.

Probably for many, and especially in India, the law of the organisation of the family and tribe will prove most attractive. This part is difficult reading but it will repay the student's labour. It is useless to attempt to give even a brief survey here. The chapters must be read and re-read and the calculations which they indicate must be worked out and followed carefully by the student himself. They will reveal a system of the greatest interest and suggest fruitful comparisons with tribal and family organisations elsewhere.

There are two chapters on the Law of Torts, in one the tort being treated as criminal, in the other as civil. These will well repay study and comparison with more recent laws. They are followed by a chapter on distraint, a most elaborate process, with details, such as the symbolic "fasting on a person," reminiscent of the East. The law of entering into possession is dealt with in a subsequent chapter.

The Law of Sick Maintenance is dealt with in a chapter which discloses the early foundation of public hospitals in Ireland. It made provision against "quacks," but, on the other hand, it held the doctor responsible for failure to cure!

There is a chapter on the Rights of Women as Owners of Property which suggests very advanced views for the period and a final chapter on the incidence of fines under the law of torts. The principle is to make the criminal or wrong-doer himself pay, but failing this, those entitled to his property in case of his death, and generally his family or tribe. In the last resort the King had to pay the compensation, as he is responsible for the behaviour of his subjects.

This book will not be easy reading. Even with a knowledge of the Irish language the reader will have to refer frequently to the glossary. But in spite of the necessity of frequently consulting the glossary it is a book which will attract and repay study.

J. D.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

LABOUR AND NATIONALISM IN IRELAND. By J. DUNSMORE CLARKSON. (Columbia University, New York.) 1925. 9 x 6. pp. 502. 18s.

FAMILY ALLOWANCES IN PRACTICE. By HUGH H. R. VIBART. (P. S. King & Son, Ltd, London.) 1926. 9 x 5½. pp. 237. 10s. 6d.

A SHORT HISTORY OF POLITICAL ECONOMY IN ENGLAND. By L. L. PRICE. (Methuen & Co., Ltd. London.) 1924. 7¼ x 5. pp. 201. 5s.

THE POLITICAL ASPECT OF CO-OPERATION. By ALFRED BARNES. (The Co-operative Union, Ltd., Manchester.) 1926. 8¼ x 5¼. pp. 84. 1s.

GOVERNMENT OF THE WEST INDIES. By HUME WRONG. (Clarendon Press, Oxford.) 9 x 5½. pp. 190. 10s. 6d.

A DICTIONARY OF MODERN ENGLISH USAGE. By H. W. FOWLER. (The Clarendon Press, Oxford.) 1926. 7¼ x 5. pp. 742. 7s. 6d.

THE FACTORY SYSTEM. By R. W. COOKE-TAYLOR. (Methuen & Co., Ltd., London.) 7¼ x 5. pp. 189. 3s. 6d.

THE DUBLIN CIVIC SURVEY REPORT. (The Civic Institute of Ireland.) 1925. 12¼ x 10. pp. 150. 21s.

INTERNATIONAL YEAR BOOK OF AGRICULTURAL LEGISLATION. (The International Institute of Agriculture, Rome.) 1925. 9¼ x 6¼. pp. 1191. 12s. 6d.

HAND-BOOK TO BRITISH MALAYA. By CAPTAIN R. L. GERMAN. (Malay States Information Agency, London.) 1926. 8¼ x 6¼. pp. 183. 2s. 6d.

REPORT OF THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN CURRENCY AND FINANCE. (Government of India Central Publication Branch, Calcutta.) 1926. 9¼ x 6. pp. 144. Rs. 2.

REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE ON THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON. (H. M. Stationery Office, London.) 1926. 9¼ x 6. pp. 76. 1s. 3d.

SIR, TEACH ME BRAHMAN (Adhihi Bhagavo Brahma.) By Rev. J. F. PESSEIN. (Catholic Mission Press, Pondicherry.) 1926. 7¼ x 4¼. pp. 75. As. 6.

The Servants of India Society's Fire Relief Fund.

(9th to 15th August)

I. GENERAL.

Newab Sir Md. Muzammilullah Khan	Rs.	1,000
Shrimant Balasaheb Pant Sachiv, Bhor	"	500
H. H. The Maharaja Saheb of Nabha,		
Mussoorie	"	400
Kunwar Lakshmiraj Singh, Aligarh...	"	250
Nawab Abu Bakr Khan, Aligarh	"	250
Rai Saheb Kunwar Jagdish, M.L.C.	"	150
Munshi Amba Prasad, M.L.C., Agra	"	200
Shrimant Babasaheb, Chief of Miraj Jr.	"	200
Maulvi Abid Khan Sahib, Aligarh	"	200
Haji Musa Khan Sahib, Aligarh	"	200
The Raja of Kanika	"	200
Kunwar Maheshwar Bakhsh Singh	"	200
Dr. Dwarka Nath Mitter, Calcutta	"	200
The Siwalik Club, Dehra Dun	"	150
Kunwar Raja Kumar Singh, Aligarh	"	150
Sahas Brijballab Saran and Jagdish Saran,		
Mussoorie	"	101
Kanwar Madhc Singh, Etah	"	101
Principal Lakshman Prasad & Staff,	"	101
Rao Saheb V. L. Thube, Poona	"	101
A Sympathiser, Simla	"	100
The Hon. Rai Rajeshwar Bali, Minister of Education, (First Instalment)	"	100
Hafiz Hidayet Husain, M.L.C., Cawnpore (2nd Instalment)	"	100
Pt. Govind Ballal Pant, M.L.C., Nainital	"	100
Kunwar Dhakan Lal, M.L.C., Bareilly	"	100
Babu Saradapada Mukerjee	"	100
Rai Sahib Lala Kishori Lal, Aligarh	"	100
Maulvi Md Umar Khan, Aligarh	"	100
R. B. Pt. Badri Datt Joshi, Nainital	"	51
Babu Manni Lal, Aligarh	"	51
Mr. D. D. Thacker, Jharra	"	51
A Lahore Friend,	"	51
Kunwar Hiralalji, Indore	"	50
Mr. G. W. Bewoor, I.C.S., Nagpur	"	50

Mr. Hashmatrai Lalsing ...	20
Mr. Bulchand Alomal ...	20
Mr. Hemandas Chandiram ...	20
Khan Bahadur Nabibuksh Md. Hussain ...	20
Mr. Abdul Khadar Md. Hussain ...	20
Mr. Ramchand Alimchand Parumal ...	20
Mr. Gurumukasing and Brother ...	20
Mr. Kishenchand Amarsing ...	15
Bhai Hakumal Choithram ...	10
Mr. P. De Souza ...	10
Mr. J. K. Thadnai ...	10
Dr. Tharmal Lokumal ...	10
Mr. Dharmdas Ghanshamdas ...	10
Mr. Navalrai Isardas ...	10
Mr. Harkishandas Gulabrai ...	10
Mr. N. S. Khuhro, M.L.C., Larkana ...	10
Mr. Narayandas Dharamdas ...	10
Mr. Liliram Jetbmal ...	5
Mr. Vastiram Djalnal ...	5
Dr. Khemchand Shevakram ...	1
Total ... Rs.	1,849

III. COLLECTIONS IN SIMLA.

Mr. B. Ram Rau, I.C.S. ...	100
Mr. Balak Ram, Bar-at-Law ...	100
Mr. G. L. Corbett, I.C.S. ...	50
Mr. A. Macleod, I.C.S. ...	30
The Hon. Mr. A. H. Ley, C.S.I., C.I.E. ...	30
Mr. H. A. Sams ...	30
Mr. J. S. Pitkeathly, Chief Controller ...	25
Mr. J. H. Field ...	25
Mr. J. Kaul, Deputy Secretary ...	25
Mr. G. A. Lawate ...	25
Mr. P. R. Rao, M.L.A. ...	25
Mr. H. G. Haig, C.I.E. ...	25
Mr. A. L. Parsons, Financial Commissioner ...	25
Mr. W. T. M. Wright, I.C.S. ...	25
Mr. S. C. Gupta, M.A. ...	25
Lt. Col. Sir Robert Dunlop, C.I.E., D.S.O. ...	25
Anonymous ...	25
Mr. J. F. Coatman ...	20
Mr. S. C. Gupta, Bar-at-Law ...	20
Dr. S. N. Sen, M.Sc., Ph.D. ...	20
Captain C. M. Ganapathy, I.M.S. ...	20
Lt. Col. J. K. S. Fleming, O.B.E., I.M.S. ...	20
Mr. J. A. Richey ...	20
Mr. C. Rajyapalan, M.B.E. ...	20
Mr. V. S. Sundaram ...	20
Mr. A. G. Clow ...	15
Mr. B. S. Kisch, C.I.E., I.C.S. ...	10
Mr. R. W. Iargett, I.C.S. ...	10
Mr. M. G. Subrahmanyam ...	10
Mr. C. V. S. Rao ...	10
Mr. R. A. Halfhide ...	10
Mr. Situl Singh, M.A. ...	10
Mr. J. F. C. Jukes, C.I.E., I.C.S. ...	10
Dr. S. K. Banerjee ...	10
Rai Bahadur S. N. Banerjee ...	10
Mr. H. Sparke ...	10
Mr. L. Harischandra, Advocate ...	10
Mr. J. M. D. Wrench ...	10
Mr. R. G. Marriot, I.F.S. ...	10
Mr. D. Sadashivan ...	10
Pandit Chintamani Pant, Executive Engineer ...	10
Mr. R. S. Dipchand ...	5
Dr. B. N. Banerjee M. Sc. Ph. D. ...	5
Mr. M. V. Unakar ...	5
Mr. Tarachand ...	5
Mr. P. Davies ...	5
Rai Saheb S. K. Banerjee ...	5

Mr. C. V. D'Eca ...	4
Messrs. N. C. Banerjee & S. C. Ghosh ...	3
Mr. Mukherjee, M.A., B.L. ...	2
Total ... Rs.	979

IV. COLLECTIONS IN MYSORE.

Dr. Sir Brajendranath Seal ...	Rs. 200
Dewan Bahadur C. Srikanteswara Aiyar ...	100
Mr. K. B. Madhawa ...	25
Mr. A. V. Ramanathan ...	25
Mr. Y. Ramaswami ...	25
Prof. M. Hiriyanna ...	20
Mr. V. Subrahmanya Aiyar ...	20
Mr. B. Minivenkatappa ...	20
Mr. B. Krishna Rao ...	20
Mr. Y. Srinivasa Rao ...	20
A Friend ...	20
Prof. A. R. Wadia ...	10
Mr. N. V. Bapat ...	10
Mr. G. Ramanuja Aiyangar ...	10
Mr. N. Sarabhoja ...	10
Mr. K. V. Karve ...	10
Mr. N. Rama Rao ...	10
Mr. V. V. Karve ...	10
Mr. K. S. Acharya ...	10
Mr. M. Ramayya ...	10
Mr. R. V. Krishnaswami Aiyar ...	10
Mr. B. Narasinga Rao ...	10
Mr. S. Venkatakrishnaiya ...	10
Mr. H. Nanjundaraj Urs ...	10
Mr. B. Subba Rao ...	10
Mr. N. Madhava Rao ...	10
A Sympathiser ...	10
Mr. H. R. Krishna Moorti ...	5
Srimati K. D. Rukminiamma ...	5
A Sympathiser ...	5
Mr. R. Thippayya ...	5
Mr. A. Krishna Rao ...	5
Mr. T. G. Rama Aiyar ...	5
Mr. K. G. Narasimhayya ...	5
Mr. K. Venkataramayya ...	5
Mr. V. Govindarajan ...	5
Mr. K. N. Ramaswamayya ...	5
Mr. M. Sivaram ...	5
Mr. N. Subba Rao ...	5
Mr. G. Narasimhayya ...	5
Mr. D. V. Narasimha Rao ...	5
Mr. S. N. Rajgopala Aiyar ...	5
Mr. M. A. Srinivasachari ...	5
Dr. D. S. Puttanna ...	5
Mr. B. Bhima Rao ...	5
Mr. M. A. Singrachar ...	5
Mr. B. Ramanna ...	5
Sowcar Banumayya ...	5
Sowcar Thamnayya ...	5
Srimati Abhayambal ...	3
Mr. A. Chennakesavaiya ...	3
Mr. K. Dhanakoti Setty ...	3
Mr. H. S. Nanjundayya ...	2
Mr. S. Krishnaswami ...	2
A Friend ...	2
Mr. H. C. Dasappa ...	2
Mr. R. Ganpathi Aiyar ...	1
Mr. B. V. Krishna Aiyangar ...	1
Total ... Rs.	784
Grand Total for the Week ...	Rs. 11,346-14