

The Servant of India

EDITOR : P. KODANDA RAO—OFFICE : SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY'S HOME, POONA 4.

VOL. XIII No. 34. } POONA—THURSDAY, AUGUST 21, 1930. { INDIAN SUBSN. Rs. 6.
FOREIGN 15s.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
TOPICS OF THE WEEK.	397
ARTICLES :—	
Halting Progress.	399
Aspects of Modern Federalism. By S. P. Sarma. ...	400
Trade Union Unity. By R. R. Bakhale. ...	402
Indian Affairs in England. By D. V. A. ...	404
REVIEWS :—	
Points of View. By K. Chandy. ...	406
Industrial Trends. By Ernest Kirk. ...	406
Bombay Corporation. By S. R. V. ...	407
South America. By K. M. P. ...	408
BOOKS RECEIVED.	398

Topics of the Week.

Picketing Colleges.

IN a timely article in the *Fergusson College Magazine* Principal G. S. Mahajani has brought together some striking passages from the utterances of the late Mr. G. K. Gokhale, Dr. R. P. Paranjpye and Mr. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri on the subject of students and politics. All the three personages were as much in touch with students as with politics : for years they taught the young in schools and colleges and won their affection and trust, and for years they strove in the political field and rendered signal service to the Motherland. Their opinions, particularly when they coincide, are, therefore, entitled to the utmost respect. All of them deprecated the active participation of students in current politics. Said Mr. Gokhale :

The active participation of students in political agitation really tends to lower the dignity and the responsible character of public life and impair its true effectiveness.

This is as true today as it was when he uttered it in 1910. The recent conduct of students in picketing colleges has lowered the dignity of public life as few other things could. Congress leaders themselves have in unreserved terms condemned coercive picketing, including obstructing passages by laying across on the pavement, drawing up cordons, shouting and jeering and making noises worthy of another place, and preventing the holding of classes. In the name of democracy and liberty a handful of students have attempted, and in some cases successfully, to dragoon a peace-loving majority and imposed a dictatorship without justification or authority. The Fergusson College itself, which embodies Mr. Gokhale's life work and enshrines his ideals,—a College which is controlled and conducted by nationalistic and patriotic Indians and is staffed by teachers who have placed the education and welfare of the rising generation above the personal ambitions and prospects of themselves and their families,—even the Fergusson College was not

exempt from such undignified attentions from some of its own students, incited thereto by outsiders. We refuse to believe that the students of the College in their calm moments do not regret having created these futile scenes and embarrassed their devoted teachers, who are their best friends and wellwishers. The times, however, are exceptional and even veterans have been swept off their feet by the tornado. It would be surprising if under the circumstances the enthusiasm and idealism of the young did not find vent on occasions in fruitless excitement. The authorities of the Fergusson College, however, rose to the occasion. Principal Mahajani handled the delicate situation, potential of mischief, with tact, consideration and understanding of the students' storm-tossed mind. With a happy and commendable combination of tact and delicate courtesy to the lady picketers, who, on the second day, drew up a cordon to bar the passage to the College, he invoked the aid of his wife to break through the cordon.

But it is bootless to blame the students. The blame for these regrettable scenes rests on those who exploit the youth of the land for their own political purposes, and who have created the atmosphere of defiance of law and discipline. As Mr. Sastri said in an address to students on the last Gokhale Day in Poona :

They do not serve the best interests of India who seek to enlist in the near battle of political life your untired enthusiasm, your unregulated zeal, your patriotism which in your own good time certainly is bound to bear an abundant fruit, but which, alas ! called into play before its time, while immature and undeveloped, is sure to recoil with infinite detriment on your life, on the fortunes of your families and, let me add, on the fortunes of the common Mother, whom you would fain serve.

* * *

Gandhi Cap and National Flag.

THOUGH the Government of India and the Secretary of State professed official ignorance at the time, it was a fact that orders prohibiting the wearing of Gandhi caps were issued by the District Magistrate of Guntur. The hoisting of national flags on private houses was similarly forbidden in Rajahmundry. When both these orders went up to the Madras High Court in revision, Mr. Justice Pandalay set both of them aside so that the use of Gandhi caps and the display of the national flag on one's own private dwelling are no longer a crime. This was possible because some of the persons affected chose to contest the orders. We hope this will be done in the case of all unjust orders issued in any part of the country. Else if one were meekly to submit to them, it would be placing a premium on autocracy. Justice Pandalay in his judgment does not agree with the Magistrate in thinking that the use of Gandhi caps necessarily means sympathy with the civil disobedience movement. It is quite

conceivable that a man may wear the Gandhi cap and at the same time be a deadly enemy of the civil disobedience movement. If the use of the Gandhi cap was likely to have resulted in a breach of the public peace, its use may justifiably be prohibited under sec. 144. Cr. P.C., as was done at Guntur. "But" says Mr. Justice Pandalay, "before such an order is passed it should be shown by evidence, which a reasonable mind may accept as satisfactory, that it was necessary to pass such an order in the interests of the public peace. In my opinion that has not been done in this case. Where that is so, an order like the present is more likely by its necessarily irritating effect to adversely affect the public peace than if it had not been passed." The prohibition of flags was based on the ground that "they gave room for certain rowdies and men of bad character to think that they can safely molest or attack the places where the flags were flying under a wrong belief that no notice would be taken by those responsible for law and order, and that in the interests of peace and tranquillity it was necessary to remove the flags." The connection appears to us, as it has to Mr. Justice Pandalay far-fetched, if not fantastic. And the fact that no Police officer went into the witness box also confirms this view. The evidence before the Magistrate not being enough to prove "the existence of any emergency of apprehended danger" the order was set aside as being "unauthorised." There is no doubt that those who took the trouble to challenge them have done a public service, for if the orders had been allowed to stand they would doubtless have constituted an undue interference with the liberty of individuals. It is hoped that all those who were convicted under the illegal orders of the Magistrates will be released above and rendered due reparation.

* * *

The Walk Out in Bengal.

WE regret the circumstances which resulted in the resignation of the Hindu Minister and the walk-out of some fifty Hindu members of the Bengal Legislative Council over the Primary Education Bill. It appears that the Minister of Education, who happens to be Muslim, introduced a Bill to provide for mass primary education, which should ultimately become compulsory. The scheme was intended to be financed by a special cess on land to be contributed partly by the landlords and partly by the tenants. The landlords were to pay their share of the cess and to collect from their tenants the latter's share and pay it to the Government. The spending of the money thus collected was to be controlled by the Government. In principle, it amounts to primary education being financed, not from the general revenues of the State, but by a special cess on land, other properties and incomes being exempt from it, and the cess being collected, not by the State or local statutory bodies, but the landlords both from themselves and from their tenants, and the amounts being spent by Government through local bodies. It so happens that the great bulk of the landlords are Hindus and the tenants Muslims. The collection of the tenants' share by the landlords, who are already none too popular with the tenants, will make them more unpopular still. The Muslim Education Minister toured East Bengal to seek popular support for his Bill. East Bengal has a majority of Muslims, who seemed to have been led to read into the Bill a communal triumph for Muslims: getting the Hindus to pay for the benefit of the Muslims. But the immediate cause of the unfortunate incident was the refusal of the Muslim Minister to allow the Bill to be referred to a select committee. The Minister argued that in view of the impending dissolution of the Council, the Bill

would lapse if it was not pushed through in this session, and that a measure of such great social value, already delayed too long, would be further postponed and share the fate of two other previous bills which were wrecked in the select committee stage. The opponents argued that a Bill of such great importance, involving taxation to the tune of over a crore of rupees and so controversial as it has proved, should not be rushed through the open Council but should, in the first instance, be referred to select committee, and that it would be unfair of the Muslim Minister with the help of the support of the Muslims, the Government officials and some non-official Europeans, to force the Bill down the throats of the Hindus. There seems to be a feeling that the action of the Muslim Minister was more in the nature of an electioneering stunt to secure him a personal victory at the polls.

The principle and the procedure of the Bill are both open to grave objection. Primary education should be financed from the general revenues to which all classes contribute according to their ability and not by means of a cess on land alone. It is equally objectionable to make the landlords responsible for the collection of the cess from their tenants. It was impolitic to attempt to rush the Bill through the Council without referring it to a select committee. It was equally impolitic to ignore the views of the opposition of the Hindu members and adopt the methods of the steam roller particularly on the question of the spread of primary education on which there can be no difference in principle.

* * *

Imperial Concern.

DISCUSSING the problem of the Army in India, the Simon Commission observe :-

The external defence of India is a matter in which other parts of the Empire are also closely and directly interested. Imperial foreign policy, Empire communications, Empire trade, the general position of Britain in the East, may be vitally affected. And if operations on an extended scale in that region become necessary, involving the risk of conflict with a major power, it is the Imperial Government, with its fuller knowledge of the international situation and its direct concern with all questions of Imperial strategy, which would naturally take the leading part.

It was for this reason that they recommended that the British Army should be retained in India but under Imperial control, India paying a substantial part of the cost. It will be noticed that, according to the Commission, the Dominions besides Britain are interested in the external defence of India. But they are not invited to share the cost of it. When again it is said that the Imperial Government would take the leading part in a conflict with a major Power, it follows from the recommendations of the last Imperial Conference and the conventions since acknowledged, that the Dominions also will have a say in the matter, though again without sharing the cost of the campaign. Will it be denied then that in the external defence of the Dominions India is equally concerned? Is not the interest reciprocal? We wonder if the Dominions and Britain will agree to India stationing parts of her army in their territories, but of course, not subject to their control, and share the cost with India. The suggestion has only to be made to be indignantly and promptly repudiated. No Dominion will tolerate the stationing within its territory of the army of another Dominion over which it has no control, but towards the cost of which it will have to contribute. The defence of every Dominion

is certainly the concern of every other Dominion, but concerted action can only be secured by co-operation and co-ordination and not by quartering the troops of one Dominion in the territory of another.

Responsibility towards the Indian States is another excuse for maintaining an Imperial army in India. Great Britain directly governs certain Native territories in South Africa, over which the South African Government has no control. But Great Britain has no Imperial Army in South Africa in order to enable her to discharge her obligations to the Native territories.

Dr. Ansari and the Working Committee.

THE action of Dr. M. A. Ansari in accepting a place on the Working Committee of the Congress is significant in two ways, as was that of Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya some weeks ago. Neither of them favoured the Congress programme of mass civil disobedience and both did their best to oppose it. Only a few weeks ago Dr. Ansari re-affirmed his original views. And now he felt compelled to join the Congress Working Committee, not because he has changed his opinions but because he "cannot view with equanimity the policy of repression continued by the Government in face of unequivocal public condemnation." Government are driving friends and neutrals into the arms of their opponents.

At the same time the presence in the Congress Cabinet of persons like Pandit Malaviya and Dr. Ansari will have a chastening effect on the intransigent elements in that body. Their influence is bound to be cast on the side of truce, peace-pourparlous and the slowing down of aggressive demonstrations. There is much need for such restraining influence in the Congress Executive, as in Government circles.

Indian Stores Department.

THE Indian Stores Purchase Department was constituted in 1922 for the purpose of making Government purchases in bulk, thereby economising the cost, and of stimulating production in India. The latest Report of the Department indicates that the services of the Department have been increasingly utilised by the purchasing departments of the Governments in India. As yet recourse to the Department is optional, and on the repeated advice of the Public Accounts Committee, the Government of India have ordered certain departments under their control to make their purchases through the Stores Purchase Department. In spite of the diversion of purchases of the Post and Telegraph Department to the Stores Purchase Department to the extent of Rs. 38,68,000, the total value of stores purchased by the Department during the year rose only by Rs. 40,000. It is time that the Government of India and the Governments of the Provinces decided to make all their purchases only through the Department.

The second, and perhaps the more important, object of the Department is the stimulation of production in India. The Government of India have issued Revised Rules for the purpose, by prescribing an order of preference. Articles manufactured in India out of raw materials produced in India get the first preference; articles manufactured in India out of imported raw materials come next; imported articles held in stock in India come third and last come articles manufactured abroad and specially imported. It remains to be seen to what extent these rules will be honestly and zealously observed by the purchasing departments.

Articles.

HALTING PROGRESS.

CONSIDERING the reputation which Sir Abdur Rahim won for himself as a rank communalist by his earlier incursions into politics, his latest speech as President of the Bengal Muslim Conference is a welcome turn for the better. He gave expression to some unexceptionable and noble sentiments, surcharged with true nationalism.

Let me at the outset make the Mussalman position quite clear. India is as much the home and the only home of us, the Indian Mussalmans, as of our Hindu and other fellow countrymen. India's political advancement and prosperity is as much, therefore, our concern and as near to our hearts as to those of her other citizens. It is our duty and privilege equally with the rest of India's population to serve India.

When I lay before you the picture of what India may well expect to be under a free constitution, you will see at once that a radical change in the present system of government, while benefiting India as a whole, will benefit the Mussalmans of India the most. You will, I am certain, agree with me that the constitution of the country should be so designed as to help the political and economic advancement of all of India's citizens, the Mussalmans no less than the Hindus, the Sikhs, the Parsis and the Indian Christians and remove once for all those causes of communal selfishness, distrust and jealousies, which are such a disquieting feature of the present situation, by calling forth whole-hearted service of the representatives of all communities in the great national task.

Need I tell those who argue that a self governing India has no meaning for us without 'safeguards' for our rights and interests, that in a self-governing India under a free constitution in which the people at large will control the government, the Mussalmans, far from being in danger of losing any rights, will be gaining along with others valuable rights which none possess now. I advise you strongly, therefore, to throw all your weight in favour of a government broad-based on the will of a free people. . . . I want you all the time to keep steadily before your mind's eye the great national destiny of our country not as a distant goal but something which will be achieved in the near future and then to think and act with other communities as citizens of a proud, happy and prosperous India. I trust you will reject with scorn the advice of those who see nothing but bogeys and dangers lurking in every corner and never believe for one moment that 70 millions of Indian Mussalmans will go under, under a free constitution. On the other hand I assure you that among the great leaders and rulers of future India not a few will be Mussalmans enjoying the confidence and homage of all and not a few Hindu leaders will think of your interests as of their own community.

After making this admirable appeal to the Muslims, and severely criticising the Simon Report for its reactionary proposals, he harks back again to the Resolutions of the All-Parties Muslim Conference held in Delhi in January, 1929. While the Lucknow Pact was an agreement reached by both the communities, the Delhi resolutions were a purely unilateral demand to which nobody except the Muslims, and not all of them, are committed. Sir Abdur Rahim wisely recognises that there is nothing final about the Delhi Muslim scheme, and warns the Muslims: "you will be making the

gravest mistake if you adhere to the letter of any particular scheme." The whole question should be discussed afresh at the Round Table Conference.

On the question of the relations between the two communities Sir Abdur Rahim makes some very important comments. He frankly realises, having perhaps the atmosphere of London in view, that "the Indian Mussalmans' case, so long as it a part of the nation's case, is strong, but in so far as it is based on purely separatist predilections it would require a great deal of justification." He however offers no justification. Instead, he proceeds to lay down the demand. He concedes that so far as the government of the country is concerned, the best political talents among both communities will have ample scope in a free constitution and asks for no guaranteed seats in the Cabinets by statute. But as regards the electorates, he seems to be unable to make up his mind quite. He sees the incompatibility of the Muslim claims for separate electorates and reservation of seats according to population even where Muslims are in a majority, with democracy and responsible government, but hesitates to drop the claims. "All I wish to say now is that Mussalman opinion is so set upon it (separate electorate) that it would be inexpedient at present to reject the principle wholesale." He estimates that in Bengal under the extended franchise which the Simon Commission proposed, the Muslim voters will form 70 to 80 percent of the voters "in a fairly considerable proportion of common electorates." That ought to satisfy all reasonable demands, but he fears that under a mixed electorate communal emphasis will be laid on questions which tend to divide the two communities and for that reason prefers separate electorates. The chief merit claimed for the mixed electorate is just the opposite result that it mitigates the purely communal emphasis.

It is a matter of some significance that Sir Abdur Rahim does not reject the common electorate, though he does not whole-heartedly accept it. He suggests two compromises, rather, two combinations of both. He would have some members of the legislature returned on the communal roll and others on the common roll. In Bengal he would reserve 40 per cent of the seats for Muslims on a separate roll and 40 per cent for Hindus on a separate roll and throw open the rest of 20 per cent to be competed by both communities on a common roll. The second alternative is that the separate rolls should be retained but the electors should be free to vote for a candidate not of their own community. We fear that neither of the alternatives is free from the defects and evils that the nationalists see in separate electorates and the communalists see in common electorates: either will combine the evils of both. Moreover, under the first alternative, the constituencies, already too large and unwieldy, will become larger still, particularly the constituencies under the common electorates.

As regards the Central Legislature Sir Abdur Rahim insists on separate electorates for Muslims and the reservation of 33 per cent of the seats, though

he does not hesitate to lecture the Bengal landlords when they claimed the retention of separate seats for them in the Bengal legislature. "If they would only look ahead into the future", he says to them, "they would see clearly that their best interest lies in exerting themselves to the utmost to secure the confidence of the people and being returned as their representatives, and not in isolating themselves." This exhortation may well be addressed to the Muslims also. In another place he acknowledges that the interests of 90 per cent of Bengal Muslims are identical with those of 60 per cent of all Bengalees and that under the new constitution there will be so much of common interests to promote that communal differences will have little scope. And yet he persists in supporting separate electorates.

With regards the constitution of the Central Government Sir Abdur Rahim repeats the demand of the Delhi Conference for a federation of completely autonomous states, with the residuary powers vesting in the states and not in the Central Government. Though Sir Abdur Rahim does not avow it, the sinister motive behind that particular demand is clearly indicated in the speech which Moulana Shaukat Ali delivered as President of the Khilafat Conference which met simultaneously with the Bengal Muslim Conference in Calcutta. "We must have our majority, whether big or small, in the Punjab, Bengal, North-West Frontier Province, Sind and Baluchistan." In suggesting that only 40 per cent of the seats should be reserved for Muslims in Bengal on a separate register and that 20 per cent should be thrown open to both communities on a common roll, Sir Abdur Rahim has by implication repudiated the motive of the Moulana.

On the whole, while Sir Abdur Rahim starts with admirable national sentiments, he ends, rather disappointingly, as a communalist. He argues for nationalism but finds for communalism.

The resolutions of the Conference are excellent in some respects. India will no longer be content to be a "dependency" or "possession," in the interests of India and England, India should be accorded Dominion status "in no way inferior to that of Canada and Australia." The responsibility for the good government of India, the Conference insisted, should no longer vest in the British Parliament but in the Indian Legislature. In taking this stand the Muslims in Bengal have come into line with the most advanced nationalistic political thought in India. But they relapsed into their communal groove when they insisted on a federation of completely autonomous provinces with the residuary powers vested in them, on the retention of communal electorates, and the grant of a permanent communal majority to Muslims based on population in Bengal.

ASPECTS OF MODERN FEDERALISM.

A feature of modern political development that no student of contemporary affairs can miss is the rapid spread of Federalism as a form of government. This was foreseen by political thinkers de-

ades ago, for we find Henry Sidgwick saying: "When we turn our gaze from the past to the future, an extension of Federalism seems to me the most probable of the political prophesies relative to the form of government." W. W. Willoughby says: "Just as in the middle ages, the tendency was towards feudalism and in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries towards absolutism, so at the present time, the movement seems towards federalism." Among the latest examples of this phenomenon are the German Republic and the Soviet Republic. And to-day there is the question of India becoming yet another federal state. Among the conditions favouring such a consummation, two are said to be essential. First, between the communities that seek federation there must be bonds of union which draw them together but which are not so strong as to lead to a merger. In Dicey's expressive language, a federalism is a natural constitution for a body of states which desire union but not unity. Secondly, the communities should not be markedly unequal to one another as that would ultimately lead to absorption of the weaker by the stronger. A mere corollary of this is the third condition, viz., that no one state should be overwhelmingly powerful, for, in that case, it will dominate the others and thus run counter to the very principles of federalism. Such, for example, was the case of the German Empire in which the position of Prussia was too strong.

The existence of a number of states who have agreed to the creation of another state superordinated to them has given rise to long discussions among political philosophers as to the residence of sovereignty in a federal state. One school of thought holds that the very name "Federal State" is a misnomer. Sovereignty being the supreme will of the State, is indivisible and inalienable; the constituent states are therefore either sovereign bodies or non-sovereign bodies. In a federal state where they have given up certain powers to a central organ, they, by the same process, give up their sovereignty. There is only one state under such circumstances, the Federal State. Where, however, as in a confederation, a central body has been created, the relationship between the states is strictly of the nature of an alliance, sovereignty fully remaining in themselves. In such a case, therefore, no federal state exists but only a number of constituent sovereign states. W. W. Willoughby is a good representative of this view. The opposite standpoint in favour of divided sovereignty is well expressed by Woodrow Wilson. He says: "in the federal state, self-determination with respect to their law as a whole has been lost by the member states. They cannot extend, they cannot even determine their own powers conclusively without appeal to the federal authorities . . . But they are still states because their powers are original and inherent, not derivative; because their political rights are not also legal duties, and they can apply to their commands the full imperative sanctions of law. But their sphere is limited by the presiding and sovereign powers of a state superordinated to them, the extent of whose authority is determined under constitutional forms and guarantees by itself." ("An Old

Master and Other Essays" by Woodrow Wilson, p.93).

A federal constitution is always made. It is the result of a conscious and deliberate act of political construction. It cannot grow up by itself like, for instance, the British constitution. This naturally implies that it is a written one and almost of necessity a rigid one as well. When a constitution is consciously devised, provision is generally made for fundamental changes being brought about in a special manner with varying degrees of difficulty. Hence some constitutions are more rigid than others. A distinction having been created between ordinary laws and fundamental ones, an agency is also created to see that it is maintained in actual working. In other words, a judicial body is created to safeguard the constitution and to interpret the instrument. But more important than all is the special attention paid in every federal constitution to the distribution of powers between the states and the central authority. So vital indeed is this question that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council presided over by Lord Haldane doubted in 1913 whether the term 'federal' could be applied to a state in which the residuary powers are with the centre. It said: "The natural and literal interpretation of the word (federal) confines its application to cases in which these states, while agreeing on a measure of delegation, yet in the main, preserve their original constitution." Today the United States and Australia have residuary powers vested in the states while in the case of Canada they are with the Centre.

The existence of two competing authorities, the local and the central, in a federal state gives rise not only to questions of divided sovereignty and of distribution of powers but also to duplication of legislative and administrative organs. Speaking of legislation alone, there will always be State laws and Federal laws. In a unitary state like Britain, the citizen obeys only one law; but in the U. S. A. he obeys two laws, rather two sets of laws, viz., the Federal constitutional laws and the Federal ordinary laws on the one hand and on the other, the State constitutional laws and the State ordinary laws. It is a point of very great importance how far the Federal government has control over State legislation. In the U. S. A., Australia, Canada and Switzerland, all of which possess written constitutions, the powers of the Federal Legislatures are strictly defined; but within the limits assigned they vary considerably. The U. S. A. constitution necessitates a republican form of government in every state, but does not vest the power to disallow or annul ordinary state legislation in the Federal government. In Switzerland, fundamental laws affecting the cantonal constitutions have to obtain the assent of the central authority which will not give it if the proposed changes are repugnant to the federal constitution. In Canada, the right to disallow acts of the provincial legislatures is vested in the Dominion Government.

In executive matters, Switzerland exhibits the greatest centrifugal tendency. Save in regard to a few matters like foreign affairs, military, etc. the

federal government has no staff of its own but has to get its orders carried out by the cantonal authorities. In this respect, she presents a contrast to the U. S. A. which is provided with a complete set of federal officials working side by side with state officials. The same duplication exists in the case of the judiciary. The U. S. A. represents the most perfect federal type with state courts and federal ones existing throughout the country side by side with no connection between the two. But Canada has only one set of courts, those responsible to the Dominion Parliament. In Australia, the High Court is the supreme federal court, the state courts having federal jurisdiction and their decisions being subject to appeal before the High Court of Australia. The cantonal courts of Switzerland generally administer justice but appeal in certain cases lies to the National Tribunal. On this question of duality of organs, J. A. R. Marriot says: "While however there are degrees of federal intensity even in constitutions of unexceptionable federal orthodoxy, we must nevertheless conclude that a reduplication of organs, legislative, administrative and judicial, is one of the indispensable marks of true federalism". ("Mechanism of the Modern State", Vol. II, page 417).

Another point often raised in connection with a federal state is whether it should necessarily have a bicameral legislature. It is not possible to answer this question on a *priori* grounds alone. A federation is a union of states as well as of citizens. The legislature has to represent the integrity of the former and at the same time, the union of the latter for specific purposes. How to reconcile these apparently conflicting objects is the main problem for the constitutional jurist. In actual fact, no federal state to-day has a uni-cameral legislature. The principle of giving adequate representation to the constituent states as differentiated from the citizens composing them has been so closely observed in the U. S. A., Australia and Switzerland that in the Senates of those countries, all states have equal representation irrespective of differences in wealth, extent or population, among them. Whether as a result of centripetal tendencies in all federal states to-day, uni-cameral legislatures will not come into being in them also, it is not possible to foresee at present.

It is doubted by some if the cabinet form of government will work smoothly in a federation. There does not seem to be any reason why it should not. Both Canada and Australia have adopted it in their constitutions and have so far worked it smoothly. But in the U. S. A. the executive is Presidential, not Parliamentary, and in Switzerland, it is of such a mixed nature as not to be classed in either category. The only true federal state now trying the Cabinet executive is Australia and political writers feel it too soon to say whether she is successful or not. Still another feature in the recent history of federalism may be noted in conclusion. Not only has federation spread widely of late, but in all the states that adopted it, centripetal tendencies have conspicuously manifested themselves. In Switzerland, the cantons are so democratic in feeling that many of them adhere to direct democracy in preference to representa-

tive democracy. And yet they are unmistakably losing their traditional autonomy in favour of the central government. The same phenomenon is observable in the U. S. A., Australia and Germany. Where the tendency will stop it is not easy to say but it will not probably go so far as to destroy the type itself.

S. P. SARMA.

TRADE UNION UNITY.

"IS Trade Union Unity a possibility in India"?— is a question that is agitating the minds of many trade unionists. A reply to it depends largely upon the proper appreciation of the factors that contributed to the disunity, upon the lessons we have drawn from the trade union situation that has existed since November last and upon the spirit we desire to import hereafter into the working of the trade unions and the building up of the trade union movement.

That economic upliftment and material and moral advancement of the working classes is the objective of the trade union movement, is a proposition that stands unchallenged. Looked at from this point of view, it will be admitted that the last year's split in the movement had no basis of disagreement and was, to say the least, premature. It was forced on the Congress by those who wanted to build the superstructure without laying the foundations of a strong and powerful organisation. High wages, reduced working hours, good housing, provision for leave, unemployment and social insurance, compensation for accidents, social amenities, etc., are matters on which the All-India Trade Union Congress never had any difference of opinion. In economic matters it always showed a united front to the employers and Government. What it failed to achieve was due, not certainly to the hesitancy on the part of the Congress to put forth boldly the workers' demands in full, but to the weakness in the organised strength of the trade unions. If only we had steadily kept in view the fundamental objective of the movement and concentrated our energies on increasing and widening the organised strength of the unions, we would have been saved the painful spectacle of disruption and reaction that has set in and we would have been much stronger to-day than we ever were.

Instead, the Congress at Nagpur sought to widen, and succeeded in widening, *the very basis* of the trade union movement by putting into the background the economic character of the movement and by making the unions a vehicle of mass action. This was done not in a straightforward and direct manner by changing the constitution of the Congress, but by affiliating it with bodies which had accepted the wider basis of trade unionism. While the old basis of the Congress was designed to "lead to the creation of social conditions which allow of the establishment of equality in social and political domains between workers and employers", the new basis "proclaimed—and herein lies its merit—a number of ideas which likened it to revolutionary socialism. The ideas of direct action, pressure brought to bear on capital and

the State by the masses, and overthrow of capitalism by social revolution, ... constitute the practical side of their general principles." The new basis "is, above all, Communist in its essence, tactics, methods of combat, and its aim. ... Our movement has always been essentially a class movement." These quotations from the resolutions and statutes of the first International Congress of Trade Unions, Moscow, to which the Pan-Pacific Trade Union Secretariat to which our Congress was sought to be affiliated and the League Against Imperialism to which our Congress stands affiliated, own direct or indirect allegiance, abundantly show that our orientation at Nagpur approximated to the Communist philosophy of trade unionism under capitalist regime. A perusal of the *Pan-Pacific Monthly*, the official organ of the Pan-Pacific Trade Union Secretariat, and of the writings in the *Anti-Imperialist* of the League Against Imperialism will further bear ample testimony to what has been stated above. I concede that the subtle and ingenuous way in which the orientation was effected, might have made it extremely difficult for a majority of delegates to understand fully the implications of the change. But ignorance is hardly an excuse when an organised movement like ours was sought to be thrown into a death-trap.

Another factor that was responsible for the split was the excessive zeal shown by some leaders in subordinating industrial questions to political problems or giving political colouring to industrial matters. The boycott of the Whitley Commission practically amounted to the declaration of no faith in industrial negotiations and securing better conditions for labour through legislation—a proposition which even those who advocated it then are observing the to-day in breach. Even in the proletarian State of Russia, legislation is considered to be one of the essential means to secure betterment of workers' conditions; but we in India wanted to spurn the avenue designed to recommend such legislation because we live in a capitalist state! Repudiation of the Nehru Report and the Viceroy's declaration of November 1, was another exhibition of the profession of our faith in a political doctrine which no trade union leader professing it had ever attempted to explain to the rank and file and obtain their views. The trade union movement is a sacred trust so long as it is largely run by non-working class men; and they would be betraying the very cause they are anxious to serve, if they endeavoured to foist their own individual political opinions on the working class.

There are thus three sections in our movement which must be reconciled if trade union unity is to be achieved: one, the Communist or pro-Communist group which wants to widen the basis of trade unionism so as to make it a nucleus of mass action and which wants it "to fight side by side with the other organisations of the working classes to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat"; two, the political group which, more often than not, subordinates the economic interests of the workers to the political problems of the day and thereby reduces

the economic character of the movement; and three, the trade union group which places above everything else the economic character of the movement, insists upon protecting the economic interests of the workers and taking active part in political questions in so far as they relate to labour and do not adversely affect, but promote, the economic interests of the workers. It feels that the economic and political character of the movement should be so blended as to assure the rank and file that their primary interests are safeguarded, promoted and not sacrificed.

Can these groups be reconciled and brought under one All-India organisation in the interest of the Indian working class? Before attempting to answer this question, I must emphasise that unity between the second and the third, i. e., the political and trade union groups must and should be secured. And it should, at any rate, not be difficult to achieve it if only the importance of industrial and political interests of the workers is relatively understood and the economic and political character of the movement judiciously blended with appropriate emphasis on both. The political group should realise that too much insistence on political matters would, besides losing the real character of the movement, wane the enthusiasm of the workers in the movement and make them lose faith in the organised strength and its results. The trade union group should insist, as it has always done, upon giving due place to political affairs in relation to their importance to industrial affairs. With a clear understanding on this issue, it is not improbable for the two groups to work together harmoniously and at the same time give scope for both to work on their lines from within the same organisation. Perhaps a more definite and precise constitution for an all-India body may go a great way to secure this object.

Having achieved this unity between two groups of the same or similar ideals, principles and methods of work, the larger question of bringing about a working agreement with the Communist group, in the present weak state of our organisation, merits sympathetic consideration. I use the expression 'working agreement' advisedly, because a fundamental difference between the Communist and non-Communist philosophy of the trade union movement makes complete unity an impossibility. For three reasons, however, I feel that a workable basis may not be altogether ruled out. In the first place, the organisation being the very foundation of the trade union movement, is a common ground between the two sections. In the second place, the Communist section has not yet brought into the forefront its full-fledged programme and may not do so for many more years if it has taken any lesson from what has happened during the last few years. Lastly, there is no difference today between the two sections in so far as industrial grievances are concerned; and therefore, any agreement on them between the two will have a tremendous effect on the employers and Government. If, therefore, the whole problem is looked at in its right perspective and in the interest of the cause we all have at heart, I am inclin-

ed to take the view that an agreement is as much probable as it is desirable.

To achieve this, it is highly essential that the two wings should be organised on a national basis with trade unions affiliated to each according to their principles and methods and they should be co-ordinated at the top in a central body such as the All-India Trade Union Congress. I am opposed to two sets of trade unionists holding Communist and non-Communist views working in the same organisation because it means, as we know by experience, all wrangle and no work. Let each section develop its own organisation and the workers be allowed to judge the respective programmes of work and select the section they like. This method will ensure more constructive work, intensive propaganda and less wastage of energy in useless and unhealthy rivalry. The Congress will consider only such matters on which there will be agreement and common programme can be chalked out. Other matters of controversy may be dealt with by each section in its national organisation according to its principles and methods. The Congress will remain unaffiliated to any Indian or foreign organisation of labour; while the national organisations of the two sections may have such affiliations if they choose to do so. The Congress will thus have a status of an All-Parties Conference of Indian Labour with different national bodies affiliated to it, which will carry out an agreed programme of work leaving controversial matters to the affiliated bodies.

Having invested the Congress with a status of an All-Parties Labour Organisation whose function is to promote and carry out agreed items of work in the labour programme which are really more than those on which agreement is not possible, it follows that the two sections should have national organisations of their own with affiliated individual trade unions. Each section must pool its strength together if points of agreement and disagreement are to be carefully drawn up and assigned to the respective organisations for being carried out. The Communists and pro-communists have their Workers' and Peasants' Parties through which they secured influence and a majority in the All-India Trade Union Congress. The non-Communist section comprising the political and trade union groups must have a corresponding organisation to work similarly inside the Congress. Without such an organisation with a clear-cut constitution, it will not be possible for that section to work efficiently inside the Congress. And the Indian Trades Union Federation which was organised at Nagpur admirably meets this need. It is a body which accepts all non-Communist unions and is a fully democratic organisation with an advanced constitution. In matters of agreement it will, I believe, be willing to work inside the Congress; and in other respects it will carry out its own programme. It need not, therefore, be considered as a rival organisation to the Congress. Cooperation in common and agreed matters and independence in the rest will be its line of conduct. The Unions will have to select their proper place and

affiliate themselves to the sections with which they agree. A neutral attitude on the part of any of them will only postpone the day of unity which we are longing for. And postponement means infinite harm to the whole movement and an invitation for an attack from the employers and Government on the workers' already too low standards. May I fervently hope that the Unions and their responsible officials will avoid this catastrophe and bestir themselves to end the existing deplorable situation of helplessness and reaction? I pray that they will be moved to take the right decisions.

R. R. BAKHALE.

INDIAN AFFAIRS IN ENGLAND.

THANKS to the booming which the Simon Report received in the British Press, Sir John Simon is there now regarded as an unquestionable authority on India; and the man in the street has come to think that the proposed Round Table Conference without this "unrivalled source of expert knowledge," to borrow the *Times* phraseology, will not be of much practical use. No wonder that strenuous efforts were made for his inclusion in the British Delegation, whether as representing the Simon Commission or the Liberal Party. What these attempts culminated in, nobody who is at all familiar with the course of events need be told. The price for his formal exclusion was of course the representation in the Delegation of the Opposition Parties. That Lord Irwin must not have relished this over much is clear from the following remark by the *Spectator*:—He (Lord Irwin) has also, we expect, emphasized in communication with the Government here, the inexpediency of a Three-Party British Delegation to the Round Table Conference." We say Sir John Simon's "formal exclusion" because the Opposition Parties' delegates are sure to turn to this fountain source not merely for information but also for inspiration and guidance. We are not left to infer this, for the *Times* assures the British public that though Sir John Simon's "bodily presence at the Conference" may be an impossibility, he with all his colleagues—"to say nothing of a number of life long experts from India—will be available for consultation throughout its proceedings." This of course, as Sir Austen Chamberlain declared in the House of Commons at the time, would be "wholly unsatisfactory." He was so keen upon Sir John Simon's presence that he even thought of challenging the Labour Government on it and might have created an awkward situation for them but for the fact that, as the *Times* Parliamentary correspondent tells us, some Conservative M. P. s. had already started enjoying their holiday and the Liberals would have done nothing which would have defeated the Government. The factor which, according to the *Manchester Guardian*, decided the issue in the way it has been, was the realisation that "if insistence were made on Sir John Simon being made a member of the Conference it might lead to the Indian Nationalists refusing to take part." The *Daily Telegraph* seems to have reconciled itself to Sir John Simon's exclusion though for a different reason :

"But if the Report is to be the main matter before the Conference it would seem to contravene a plain and well-recognised principle if the authors of the Report are represented among those sitting to form a judgment upon it."

The cry about the Report being "the staple material of the Conference" has not yet died down; and Mr. Sastri, whose presence in England all these months is providential, plainly told the Friends' Service Council what would happen if too much insistence was placed on the Report being made the basis of the Conference. He said:—

People told them that when the Round Table Conference met they must first of all things consider the Simon Report. Only when it had been considered and found to be impossible might it be set aside. "If that is so, I promise you," he added, "that no one will come here. The Indian people are intelligent. They have read the report and arrived at their own conclusions. No, they must come free to put forth their own ideas. Honestly, to get their utmost co-operation and cheerful contribution to the Round Table Conference it would be wise to ignore the Simon Report altogether. Give us freedom to bring our ideas to the Conference."

He pointed out that while Mahatma Gandhi had now placed himself at the head of an independence movement the movement did not originate for independence, and that even now Gandhi when questioned talked only of the substance of independence for India. "He knows," said Mr. Sastri, "that independence is not realisable, and that even if it were, it could not be maintained. So he talks about the substance of independence, and his chief colleague has said that he himself would be content with Dominion Status with safeguards, a term we have used for some months in compendiously stating our demands."

The Sapru-Jayakar mission, or the Bahadur-Jayakar peace mission, as it is wrongly described in some papers, also occupied the attention of the British Press in mail week. In an article headed "Preparing for the Round Table Conference" the *Manchester Guardian* in referring to it points out that Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and Mr. Jayakar "started on their mission with no very great hopes." This shows that pessimism about the ultimate success of the mission is not confined to India alone.

As events show, it correctly traced the course of the negotiations when it expected the Congress party to lay down conditions of their co-operation. These, if report speaks true, are contained in the letter which is reported to have been despatched to the Viceroy by the peace missionaries and which is going to be the subject of personal talk between them later on. At the moment it is somewhat hazardous to say whether "it is being rather optimistic to imagine that so intransigent an organisation as the Congress party may be converted after all, to a policy of co-operation." Even with the Congress inside the Conference, the difficulties in the way of its success are, as suggested by the paper, "considerable." They are of course well known in India and the fear of the conference not arriving at any sort of unanimous conclusion cannot be said to be imaginary.

Referring to a recent question in the Commons by a Conservative member asking in horror "if it were not a sign of weakness for the Government of India to allow Mr. Gandhi's chief political associates to confer with him while he was in prison," a correspondent in the *Manchester Guardian* recalls a parallel

from South African history.

The occasion was one of those instances of injustice towards Mr. Gandhi and other British Indians in South Africa but for which there might perhaps have been no Gandhi question in India at all. General Smuts, as Colonial Secretary, at his wits' end how to deal with a leader who was being followed into gaol by hundreds of other Indians, approached Mr. Gandhi through an intermediary with the object of finding out if he would agree to the number of educated Indians entering the Transvaal to live and work being limited if the Government on its part would subject them to no racial disabilities. "Limited?" said Mr. Gandhi. "Yes assuredly, limited to one, if it comes to that. It is the principle that matters, and the principle is that we as members of the Empire are not going to be treated in another British country worse than any other people."

I know the facts because I took part in the interview. Mr. Gandhi's remark throws light upon what has been said by Sir Francis Younghusband and others, to the effect that it is India's "izzat" (national self-respect) which must be kept ever in mind in these days of crisis.

Mr. Reginald A. Reynolds who delivered Mahatma Gandhi's, "ultimatum" to the Viceroy is now in England and doing his best to explain the present phase of Indian nationalism to English audiences. Speaking in mail week, according to the *Times* report he said:—

Instead, of yielding to a demand which was on the face of it palpably just and right, we had preferred to rule in India by the most atrocious methods that had been seen in that country perhaps since the Mutiny. When he considered the things that were going on in India he was afraid he was in danger of being completely overcome by his own emotions. When the Englishman went to India some evil seemed to get hold of him. His whole code of morality seemed to disappear. The average Englishman forgot that there were Ten Commandments East of Suez. There could be no solution along those lines, any more than there could be a solution by which England could be governed kindly, humanely, and liberally by a Japanese Government. There was only one solution—that of freedom, of handing over to the Indian people that self-determination to which they had every absolute right. Gandhi was fighting with weapons of truth and non-violence. We were fighting with weapons of untruth and violence.

In an article in the *spectator* Mr. A. Yusuf Ali, I. C. S. (Retired), explains briefly why the Simon Report is unacceptable to India. While he does not doubt Sir John Simon's ability as a lawyer, he rightly thinks that "his brilliant abilities in making out a case are themselves a source of dangers in such a delicate adventure. The most suave and courteous of men, he has been able to use his parliamentary skill to persuade his six colleagues to agree to proposals which some of them no doubt consider as going beyond the limits of safety while others as being below the limits of adequacy." But what is really important is his opinion on some of the recommendations of the Report:—

"If the picture painted in the first volume of the Report is accurate", which of course he very much doubts, "India is unfit for representative government, the whole policy solemnly enunciated in 1917 is wrong, and the new proposals about provincial autonomy and an electorate of 10 per cent. of the population are untenable. To give these and mask them with the numerous safeguards, such as non-elected ministers (II. 33), or Governors' overriding powers (II. 35) or the Governor-General's apparently enlarged powers of interference with the Provinces (II. 39), or the Governor's

emergency powers (II. 48-9), is to give a shadow without the substance of autonomy. I am not discussing the need for emergency powers, but to call it complete provincial autonomy seems a mockery."

Mr. John Buchan, M. P., has also written a short letter to the same paper in which he deprecates the use of words "which can possibly be misunderstood." Another thing he stresses is that:

We should avoid emphasizing the word "Dominion." Its use in this connexion involves a confusion between "also" and "likewise". The Dominions are equal and independent partners of Britain; so also must India be but not necessarily *likewise*. The governmental forms which suit Canada may not be those most apt for India's special culture and unique conditions. Surely India in working out the solution of her problem, need not borrow what may be the irrelevant modes of the West, but should set herself, the purpose being agreed, to devise the machinery strictly applicable to her needs.

India would gladly do so, if only the framing of her constitution had been left to a purely Indian, instead to a purely British, Commission.

D. V. A.

Review.

POINTS OF VIEW.

POINTS OF VIEW. A SERIES OF BROADCAST ADDRESSES. By VARIOUS AUTHORS. (Allen & Unwin.) 1930. 20cm. 140p. 4/6.

THIS is a compilation of broadcast speeches, each half an hour in duration, spoken by eminent thinkers. The speakers whose ideas are given in the book under review are G. Lowes Dickinson, Dean Inge, H. G. Wells, J. B. S. Haldane, Sir Oliver Lodge and Sir Walford Davies. The addresses were delivered under the auspices of the British Broadcasting Corporation less than a year ago. This is an experiment in popular education, but unless the listeners have grounding in the ways of thought of these authors, it would seem impossible to understand the drift of the talks, just as a 'Made Easy' abstract—which it is best for students to avoid—gives no real benefit except perhaps as a refresher to those that have read the book itself. But men are impatient in the present age; and perhaps these talks are useful to the average educated person in England and might lead him to go to the books written by the speakers. And there is the great advantage that a listener can close his receiving machine whenever he likes. A reviewer has to 'listen' to the end; but even then, it is most difficult to review titbits of thinking of other people.

The talks are intended to show what these authors think of the world in which we live; of themselves and of democracy, all within half an hour. That the author of Plotinus should have submitted himself to such a task shows that one tendency of progress is to compel every person to standardise. Whether this is an ultimate benefit, is open to serious question.

It is impossible to summarise the various views. To take democracy first: it is interesting to notice that apart from a few small states which have no fear of war, England and its Dominions, the United States and France are the only countries in the world that have 'even the semblance of Democracy'. Dean Inge, Bernard Shaw (his talk is not in the volume, but his views are stated by others) and H. G. Wells do not approve of the democratic systems of these countries. Mr. Shaw says that a good anthropometric method has not yet been found. Dean Inge,

in his customary style says that the silliest of all methods is to break heads; and the next silliest is to count them. Mr. Wells is still engaged in his open conspiracy, which is anything but the rule of the majority. Incidentally, it may be observed that watertight communal electorates, the rule of the majority, and of Mussolinis for adjusting differences, as is proposed in a famous document, amount really to a counsel of despair and the negation of genuine democracy.

As regards less mundane matters, it may be said that Wells, Dickinson, and Haldane seem to find no evidence for an after life. Wells says that we shall never know that we are dead; Haldane that he is a part of nature and like other natural objects from a lightening flash to a mountain range he should last his time and then perish. Sir Oliver Lodge's and Dean Inge's views are well known. Sir Walford Davies is not so well known in India. He is a great musician and artist. Perhaps on this very account he seems to me to be getting nearer the heart of things than scholars and men of mere reason. His talk is well worth careful perusal. Here is a sentence which is highly suggestive: "may it not be that the enthusiasm we sum up in the name 'love' is the creative energy that can fling itself into chosen form, both infinite infinitesimal, with ceaseless movings and unchanging changelessness." It almost reads as an extract from one of the Upanishads. Sir Walford gives a reason for believing in the Incarnation of Christ which is also illuminating. (page 120.)

The question of personality is naturally what intrigues these thinkers most. To the average Indian, with his great traditions of intuition, Wells and other writers of that school will probably seem to be merely ignorant people who do not choose to study the mass of evidence that is available in India and elsewhere to the earnest searcher, to show that death does not end a personality or that our lives are the resultants of various forces, the most powerful of which are spiritual. Oliver Lodge compares a person to the iceberg, with a vast portion of his personality invisible above the sea; Dickinson thinks it is rather a submerged and connected hill range the submerged consciousness being common; while to Wells we are only pearls in a range which is all visible. I believe that none of these analyses expresses the whole truth. Personality is probably, in a sense, Protean; would either become a mountain range, or dwindle into a peak or a valley but has its foundation in the spirit of God.

It is refreshing to note that all these speakers are opposed to war; and all wish to open up opportunities for all classes of people and improve conditions of living. Dean Inge, however, patiently asks what becomes of progress when the Earth is unfit for life—one may add, should the influenza germ sometime become more powerful than the white corpuscles. In spite of all the advance that has been made in science—and for this we cannot be sufficiently thankful—it is always well to remember the ancient advice "If this life were all, we are of all creation the most wretched".

K. CHANDY.

INDUSTRIAL TRENDS.

BRITISH INDUSTRY TO-DAY. By BEN M. SELEKMAN & SYLVIA KOPALD SELEKMAN. (Harper, London.) 1929. 21 cm. 290 p. 10/6.

IN this study of the changes that have taken place in industrial trends in Great Britain and in Europe since the war, Dr. and Mrs. Selekman have rendered a signal service to Trade Unionism in par-

particular and to industry in general. Most people of course are conscious in a rather vague way of the fact that great changes are taking place in industrial world, but it is not until one reads the book like this that one realises the precise nature and importance of those changes. The authors, too, appear to have been peculiarly fitted for this task for, in addition to having specialised in industrial research, they brought to their British and European investigations a fairly close acquaintance of industrial America. And though the study here presented is by no means an exhaustive one but rather, as they themselves prefer to style it, "an explanatory survey", it does enable one to grasp the salient facts and tendencies in the evolution of employer-employee relations since 1918. It is true these facts might have been more clearly set out chronologically but they are there all the same.

For example on page 4 and 5 we have the following picture of the mentality prevailing at the close of the war:—

"Russia had toppled century-old Czarism with an ease which astonished the Bolsheviks themselves. This example restless workers and returning soldiers everywhere seemed eager to follow. In Hungary the old regime soon exploded beneath the push to power. In Italy they seized factories; in Germany, workers' and soldiers' soviets captured towns, cities and states. And even England steeped in historic traditions of constitutionalism and peaceful change, saw in tense succession the threats of the Triple Alliance of miners, railway and transport workers; the railway strike of 1919; coal stoppages of 1919, 1921 and 1926; and, finally, the general strike..... For more than seven years after the Great War, Europe lived in fear (or hope) of revolution."

In England, however, the picture was never at any time really as dark as that. It is true the dominant note in those early post war days was one of conflict and not peace, of class warfare and antagonism rather than of cooperation and common endeavour, all of which had a natural tendency to head for revolution; but it is doubtful if Trade Unionists in Britain ever really had more in view than a policy of steady pressure to secure the best terms possible. Even the general strike referred to was not, in the revolutionary sense, a general strike at all but, as Mr. Walter Citrine, General Secretary of the British Trade Union Congress, stated at the time "a large sympathetic strike—a simultaneous, spontaneous cessation of work by two million people." Indeed the authors themselves are careful to point out that "for over thirty years, and in some industries for a much longer period, industrial relations in Great Britain have been governed in the main by orderly methods formulated in trade agreements." But it is nevertheless true that during the period referred to at least the tendencies were on the whole distinctly militant and that from the "general strike" onward there has been a steady change in the policy and tactics pursued. The value of the book thus lies not only in the manner in which these tendencies are traced and the philosophy behind them laid bare, but also in the light which it throws upon the methods evolved by and adopted to the changing outlook.

The chapter headed: Factors Underlying Success and Failure in Operation of Joint Machinery, is exceedingly suggestive and helpful inasmuch as one is enabled to understand some of the reasons why there is sometimes turbulence in one industry and harmonious relationships in another though both are employing joint machinery. For example a major factor making for instability in British coal (page 63) has been a gradually diminishing world market and increasing competition from continental operators. Another factor is "inefficient management."

Still another, and a "primary one", is leadership. As the authors point out: "Identical machinery may become an active success in the hands of one group and a failure in the hands of another." Experienced administrators tell you repeatedly, "Machinery is not important: the men working it are primary."

The authors also deal at great length with the origin, growth and results of the Whitley Councils, so called after the name of the chairman of the committee which recommended their introduction into industry, and the chapters devoted to the study of the working of these councils, with their numerous shop committees form the heart of the book and constitute one of the most valuable and illuminating record of this experiment we have seen.

Chapter VII deals with unemployment insurance and follows the various phases of its development since it was first introduced as a system 19 years ago. But as the gifted authors themselves admit, after treating us to a wealth of facts and figures in connection with this subject, "unemployment insurance at best, however, must be mainly ameliorative."

Much attention is also devoted to the effort initiated by the Mond-Turner conference which was strenuously opposed by the Left Wing of Labour led by Maxton and Cook, and which has resulted in the definite establishment of a standing committee consisting of representative of the General Council of the Trades Union Congress and the Employers' Associations. The authors compare this method with the "dictatorship of intellectual revolutionaries" in Russia, the Fascist movement in Italy and the conduct of industry in the German republic. It is significant that this latest trend in British industry is based not on any "fevered abnormality of war conditions nor on the aftermath of some sudden collapse but on a sober consideration that the economic basis of the nations' life must be reconstructed. The new trend is the result of a stock-taking—on both sides—of old philosophies. So far as the Trade Unions were concerned the final decision with regard to future policy was taken by the T. U. C. at its annual Convention at Swansea in September, 1928, when the Convention endorsed the report of the General Council on the subject by a vote of 3,075,000 against 566,000. And the key note of the policy then adopted was co-operation, not conflict, but co-operation with a view to securing an adequate voice and share in the reconstruction, prosperity, and material advantages of industry, and that without dictatorship on the one hand or Government control on the other.

But obviously this is not the final stage in industrial trends and from this stand point at least the book is not one to enthuse over.

ERNEST KIRK.

BOMBAY CORPORATION.

EVOLUTION OF LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT IN BOMBAY. By R. P. MASANI. (Oxford University Press, Bombay.) 1929. 23cm. 421 p. Rs. 15/-

THE city of Bombay, *urbs prima in Indis*, has been extremely fortunate in her historians. She can boast of a galaxy of distinguished men of light and leading as her chroniclers. Sir D. E. Wacha, the veteran publicist and financier, is the author of three books. His book, "A financial chapter in the History of Bombay city", gives a narrative of the rise and growth and collapse of that colossal speculation, popularly known in Bombay as "the share mania." In his second book, "The Bombay Municipal Government" Sir Dinshaw Wacha has collected the

dry bones of Bombay's civic history and breathed into them flesh and blood. His third book entitled "My Recollections of Bombay from 1860 to 1875," gives a graphic account of Bombay in its formative periods. There are other books equally important and interesting written by DeCunha, Malabari, Michael, Edwards and Sheppard. Mr. Masani's is the latest on the subject. He has laid under contribution the various authors mentioned above in writing his book. He had been long connected with the Bombay Corporation as Secretary, Deputy Commissioner and lastly as Commissioner. Further, he has had the unique opportunity of studying the working of the London County Council and other Municipalities in England in the year 1920.

Mr. Masani begins his book with a history of local self-government institutions in India prior to British rule to prove that such institutions were not foreign institutions introduced into India from a foreign land. The book gives a complete history of the constitutional growth of the city from the year 1661, when Charles the Second by marrying Catherine of Braganza got Bombay from the Portuguese as a dowry, down to the latest reforms embodied in Act VI of 1922. The incidents in the early history of Bombay, viz., the transfer of the capital of the East India Company from Surat to Bombay in the year 1669 by Gerald Aungier who laid the foundations of the city and introduced the Panchayat system in the administration of the city, the establishment of Mayor's court in the year 1726, to control the price of foodstuffs and other necessities of life, the great civic improvements that were introduced between the years 1776 and 1784, the great fire of 1803, which laid the foundations of the new settlements, the passing of the Municipal Act of 1865, the Magna Charta of the Bombay Municipality, all these have been well told by the author. Then we read of the brilliant period of civic activities under the able statesmanship of Sir Bartle Frere. Roads and public buildings, harbour and defence works were constructed during his regime. In short, the city of Bombay owes its growth to the liberal statesmanship of its Governors like Sir Bartle Frere, and Lord Reay, to its enlightened legislators like Sir P. M. Metha and Telang whose enthusiasm and patriotism were instrumental in giving the Bombay Corporation a body and form, and lastly, to the public-spirited philanthropy and benefactions of the merchant princes like Sir Jamsetji Jeejeeboy, Premchand Roychand, Sir David Sassoon and Cowasji Jehangir, which have made Bombay what it is today.

Mr. Masani's book is a remarkable production in the sense that it is a successful and painstaking attempt at tracing the growth of the Bombay Municipal Government. It embodies the results of strenuous labour and study of the records both in India and in England, besides a lot of literature on the subject already published. It is well written, neatly got up and illustrated. All those interested in local self-government will find the book interesting and instructive.

S. R. V.

SOUTH AMERICA.

LIBERTY AND DESPOTISM IN SPANISH AMERICA. By OECIL JANE. (Oxford University Press.) 1929. 22 cm. 177p.

A HISTORY OF LATIN AMERICA. By WILLIAM WARREN SWEET. (The Abingdon Press, New York.) 1929. 21 cm. 404p. \$3.00

AMERICA to an average Indian reader is essentially

a Teutonic land. Of the vast regions of American soil outside North America he probably heard this last in his school days. We, therefore, sincerely welcome these two publications the first of which presents a critical picture of the politics of the Latin American peoples and the second their connected history from the first colonisation in 1493 down to the Pan-American Conference of 1928. Mr. Jane set himself the task of interpreting the political character of the Latin peoples of Central and South America apparently to the bewildered and rather hostile students of political institutions who find in their history nothing but a long continuous civil struggle. As an exponent of the Latin-Iberian culture in its political phase, Mr. Jane could not possibly have hit upon a better theme; nor could he have more accurately gauged the typical attitude of a foreigner to the political life of the Latin American republics. To succeed in his task, Mr. Jane started by analysing the fundamental characteristics of Spanish people as revealed in the evolution of their political life on the continent. This analysis leads the author to formulate the thesis that the political history of Spain has largely been determined by the inter-play of two opposite traits of the popular mind—a passion for freedom and a regard for efficiency. In interpreting the political life of Latin American republics through the long years of storm and stress since the early years of the last century Mr. Jane has found in the same racial characteristics an explanation of this unfortunate state of their political instability. Plausible as such a thesis undoubtedly appears, one however is yet disposed to wonder if freedom and efficiency are not universal aspects of political instinct of every civilised people, at least of the west. Yet political life has nowhere been in a state of greater disequilibrium than among the Latin peoples of America. Mr. Jane has kept the history of the republics almost entirely out of his canvass. Such a background if introduced in the book would have probably made it more interesting reading.

Prof. Sweet's work traces the history of Latin America through the long 300 years of Spanish rule, describes the wars of independence and the subsequent careers of the various republics. There is a clear narrative of recent events in Central America which helps the readers to appreciate the trend of United States policy to her American neighbours. Prof. Sweet has himself discussed the two important political issues which emerge out of the relation of the U. S. and the Latin Republics, viz. the Monroe Doctrine and Pan-Americanism. On the whole, the work is at once informative and interesting and will fully repay study.

K. M. P.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

PALESTINE TO-DAY AND TO-MORROW. By JOHN HAYNES HOLMES. (Allen & Unwin.) 1930. 23cm. 271p. 10/-.

ENCLAVES OF ECONOMIC RENT FOR 1927. By CHARLES WHITE HUNTINGTON. (Fiske Warren, Harvard, Mass.) 1928. 21cm. 291p.

THE JUST PRICE. Ed. by V. A. DEMANT. (Student Christian Movement.) 1930. 20cm. 151p. 4/6.

THE SOVIET UNION LOOKS AHEAD. THE FIVE YEAR PLAN FOR ECONOMIC CONSTRUCTION. (Allen & Unwin.) 1930. 20cm. 275p. 8/6.

THE DETHRONEMENT OF THE KHEDEVE. By ARDEN HULME BEAMAN. (Allen & Unwin.) 1929. 20cm. 190p. 6/-